

https://dspace.org/

Explaining East Africa's interstate wars, 1977-2000: towards a typological theory?

Ndzendze, Bhaso

2020
https://hdl.handle.net/10539/30715

Downloaded from a DSpace repository. https://dspace.org/

EXPLAINING EAST AFRICA'S INTERSTATE WARS, 1977-2000

TOWARDS A TYPOLOGICAL THEORY?

by Bhaso Ndzendze

Supervisor: Professor Gilbert M. Khadiagala

Submitted to the Department of International Relations at the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, in fulfilment for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

2020

Declaration

I, **Bhaso Ndzendze**, hereby declare that the following PhD dissertation titled '**Explaining East Africa's Interstate Wars, 1977-2000: Towards a Typological Theory?**' is my own unaided and un-plagiarised work which has not been previously submitted to any other institution for a qualification.

SIGNATURE: DATE:



9 March 2020

"Ertra, Ertra, Ertra,

The barbarian enemy humiliatingly defeated

And martyrdom has paid for freedom."

- **Eritrean National Anthem (Stanza One)**

"Stop fighting each other

Come back with strength and joy and do be friends again

It's time to look forward and take command

Defeat your enemies and unite once again.

become strong again and again."

- **Somali National Anthem, 2000-2012 (Stanza Two)**

"And with neighbours all

At our Country's call

In peace and friendship we'll live."

- **Ugandan National Anthem (Stanza Two)**

ABSTRACT

This dissertation tested the causal relevance of the 'democratic peace thesis', 'economic interdependence', and the 'hegemonic stability theory' to cases of interstate conflict in East Africa: the Ogaden War, 1977-1978; the Uganda-Tanzania War, 1978-1979; and the Eritrea-Ethiopia War, 1998-2000. Quantitative economic and military data as well as archival materials, journal articles, and contemporaneous sources on political history were utilised along with interviews with former mediators, government officials and experts on the societies and economies of East Africa in the making of these determinations and reaching of the respective conclusions.

Findings indicate that the democratic peace thesis has an imperfect causal relevance with the interstate conflicts that took place between 1977 and 1997. Two of the three cases (Somalia and Uganda) appear to be consistent with the literature which indicate a greater probability of power loss for an authoritarian regime upon losing a war. The dissertation therefore closed a gap by indicating and then clarifying issues within the present literature on the democratic peace thesis; before these, it was not cognizant of the role of what we term here as the institutional legitimacy-information asymmetry problem across regimes in leading up to an outbreak of conflict.

With regards to the economic interdependence thesis, the dissertation also found causal validity. Overall, the share of Ethiopia in Somalia's exports was insignificant, at less than 0.018% (the high mark reached in 1975) at any given point. This thus demonstrates a lack of opportunity cost for Somalia in initiating a war with Ethiopia. As this case demonstrates, while Somalia was an exporting nation prior to the war, these exports were declining in the years leading up to the war and they had already had a minimal share within its total GDP. Similarly, we find that trade between Tanzania and Uganda started to increase gradually soon after independence but subsequently declined after the Idi Amin coup of 1971. Tanzanian people also showed a higher preference for Western and Tanzanian-made products first over East African ones, showing that the literature needs to be cognizant of populations as both a political audience (as is done in the democratic peace thesis) as well as consumers whose procurement choices determine the level of interdependence, or lack thereof. Finally, we noted that Eritrea's new currency, the Nakfa, made trade with Ethiopia virtually impossible; it also made the border, hitherto managed and handled at the level of the local governments, salient as free movement of goods was now made a matter of dispute. The diversion of exports away from Massawa and Assab to Djibouti further made retaliation against Eritrea less costly for Ethiopia. The pre-war years also coincided with diversification of Eritrean export markets, but overall decline in their aggregate values, further eliminating any opportunity cost for disrupting the status quo.

A test of the hegemonic stability theory found it to be congruent with the cases as well. Overall, the findings would appear to be consistent with the hypothesis; the comparative lowness of the Kenyan military budget compared with growths in those of belligerent states in the region appear to have been

correlated with interstate conflict outbreaks. This also explains Kenya's lack of capacity to mitigate conflicts even after they had broken out. Because of Kenya's proactiveness, however, the US did limit its arms supplies to Somalia, as these could hypothetically have been redirected towards Kenya, against whom Somalia had irredentist claims over the Northern Frontier District. Finding all three theories to be causally relevant, the dissertation thereafter proposes a typological theory by sequencing all variables accordingly to account for the region's interstate wars.

KEYWORDS: Africa; Democratic peace thesis; Economic interdependence; Errol A. Henderson; Ethiopia-Eritrea War; Hegemonic stability thesis; Interstate war; Ogaden War; Uganda-Tanzania War

TABLE OF CONTENTS

***Declaration*……2**

***Abstract and Keywords*……...4**

***List of Acronyms Used*……..……..……....8**

***List of Tables and Figures*…….....11**

Chapter 1: Introduction…….14

1.1. Aims of the Dissertation.……14

1.2. Rationale for the Study……16

1.3.Brief Methodological Overview ……19

1.4.Summary of Findings……20

1.5.Chapter Outline……27

Chapter 2: Interstate War and Africa: Concepts in Context……...29

2.1. Introduction……29

2.2. Overview of War.……29

2.3. Overview of African Interstate War..……34

2.4. War in Colonial Africa: Actors and Institutions……39

Chapter 3: Theoretical and Methodological Framework……45

3.1. Introduction.……45

3.1. Conceptualising the Democratic Peace Thesis ……46

3.2. Economic Interdependence-Peace Thesis Conceptualised ……52

3.3. Conceptualising Hegemonic Stability..……58

3.4. Variables and Research Agenda ……64

Chapter 4: Case Study 1: Ogaden War, 1977-1978……..……69

4.1. Introduction.……69

4.2. Background and Onset.……71

4.3. Case Study Analysis I: democratic Peace Thesis.……80

4.4. Case Study Analysis II: Economic Interdependence and Peace.……99

4.5. Conclusion.……118

Chapter 5: Case Study 2: Uganda-Tanzania War, 1978-1979……..…122

5.1. Introduction.……122

5.2 Background and Onset.……123

5.3. Case Study Analysis I: Democratic peace thesis.……128

5.4. Case Study Analysis II: Economic interdependence and Peace.……156

5.5. Conclusion.……168

Chapter 6: Case Study 3: Eritrea-Ethiopia War, 1998-2000…….171

6.1 Introduction.……171

6.2 Background and Onset.……172

6.3. Case Study Analysis I: Democratic Peace Thesis.……181

6.4. Case Study Analysis II: Economic Interdependence and Peace.……193

6.5. Conclusion.……202

Chapter 7: Case Study 4: Hegemonic Stability Theory in East Africa?.....209

7.1. Introduction.……208

7.2. *Methodology*……213

7.3. *A Test of Hegemonic Stability Theory in East Africa*……214

Chapter 8: Conclusion: Towards A Typological Theory of East African Interstate War ……....229

8.1. Introduction.……229

8.2. A Methodology for Theory-to-Theory Interaction……229

8.3. Typology-Building……230

8.4. Overall Typology……237

8.5. Conclusions……241

Bibliography…….251

Archives…….285

Interviews……..287

Appendices……288

Appendix A: Proof of Growths and Declines in East African Military Budgets ……..288

Appendix B: Historical Price of Coffee……292

Appendix C: Letter to Participants……292

Appendix D: Ethical Clearance Certificate Information…….293

Appendix E: Insights from Interviews……294

Acknowledgements……..…296

List of Acronyms Used

ADP	Amhara Democratic Party
AMISOM	African Union Mission in Somalia
ANC	African National Congress
AU	African Union
AfDB	African Development Bank
CCE	Constitutional Commission of Eritrea
CCM	Chama Cha Mapinduzi
COW	Correlates of War
CTT	Competitive theory testing
CUF	Civic United Front
DPT	Democratic peace thesis
EAC	East African Community
EIC	Ethiopia Investment Commission
EIPDC	Ethiopia Industrial Parks Development Corporation
EPDRF	Ethiopian People's Revolutionary Defense Front
EPRP	Ethiopian People's Revolutionary Party
ELF	Eritrean Liberation Force
EMU	Economic and monetary union
EPLF	Eritrean People's Liberation Front
EPPF	Ethiopian People's Patriotic Front
FCO	Foreign and Commonwealth Office
GDP	Gross domestic product
GERD	Grand Ethiopian Renaissance Dam
GNP	Gross national product
HST	Hegemonic stability theory
IPB	International Peace Bureau
IGAD	Intergovernmental Authority on Development

IGO	Intergovernmental organisation/International governmental organisation
IMF	International Monetary Fund
MEISON	All-Ethiopia Socialist Movement
MIT	Massachusetts Institute of Technology
NFD	Northern Frontier District
NRM	National Resistance Movement
NRM-A	National Resistance Movement-Army
OAU	Organisation of African Union
ODA	Official development assistance
ODP	Oromia Democratic Party
OLF	Oromo Liberation Front
OEC	Observatory of Economic Complexity
ONLF	Ogaden National Liberation Front
P5	Platform Five
PFDJ	People's Front for Democracy and Justice
PRC	People's Republic of China
RPF	Rwandan Patriotic Front
RTA	Regional trade association
SALT	Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty
SNA	Somali National Army
SRC	Supreme Revolutionary Council
SRRP	Somali Revolutionary Socialist Party
SSDF	Somali Salvation Democratic Front
SWP	Somali Workers Party
TANU	Tanganyika African National Union
TPLF	Tigray People's Liberation Front
TPDF	Tanzanian People's Defence Force
UA	Ugandan Army
UBC	Uganda Broadcasting Corporation

UK	United Kingdom
UN	United Nations
UNECA	United Nations Economic Commission for Africa
UNCTAD	United Nations Conference on Trade and Development
UNLA	Uganda National Liberation Army
UNMEE	United Nations Mission in Eritrea and Ethiopia
UNSC	United Nations Security Council
UPC	Uganda People's Congress
US	United States
USSR	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
VOA	Voice of America
WPE	Workers' Party of Ethiopia
WSLF	Western Somali Liberation Front
WWI	World War I
WWII	World War II

List of Tables and Figures

Tables

Label	Page
4.1. Somali and Ethiopian military indicators, 1977	75
4.2. Values of Ethiopian exports, 1974 and 1978	102
4.3. Somali total export and GDP data, 1975-1977	118
5.1. Uganda's major trading partners, 1971-1976	161
5.2. Uganda's production and trade, 1960-1986	162
5.3. Tanzania's trade with Kenya in EAC, 1969-1980 (in millions of US$).	165
5.4. Tanzania's trade with Uganda, 1968-1980 (in millions of US$)	166
6.1. War-related Eritrean obligations to Ethiopia per the Claims Commission	206
7.1. Arms imports and military consumption in East Africa, 1971-19	222
8.1. Taxonomy of theory relevance on the basis of the dissertation's findings	231
A1. Military budgets in East Africa, 1963-2003	284

Figures

Label	Page
2.1. Types of imperial wars (derived and amended from Zeleza [2008]).	41
2.2. Anti-colonial wars in Africa (derived from Zeleza [2008]).	42
3.1. Typology-construction algorithm.	68
4.1. Ethiopia and Somalia's Polity IV scores	91
4.2. Share of Ethiopia's exports, 1974	103
4.3. Share of Ethiopia's exports, 1975	104
4.4. Share of Ethiopia's exports, 1976	104
4.5. Share of Ethiopia's exports, 1977	105
4.6. Share of Ethiopia's exports, 1978	105
4.7. Total Somali exports, 1962-2016	106
4.8. Top 10 Ethiopian import partners, 1974 (by share of Ethiopia's total imports)	107
4.9. Top 10 Ethiopian import partners, 1975 (by share of Ethiopia's total imports)	108

4.10. Top 10 Ethiopian import partners, 1976 (by share of Ethiopia's total imports) 108
4.11. Top 10 Ethiopian import partners, 1977 (by share of Ethiopia's total imports) 109
4.12. Top 10 Ethiopian import partners, 1978 (by share of Ethiopia's total imports) 110
4.13. Share of Somali exports, 1968 110
4.14. Share of Somali exports, 1969 111
4.15. Share of Somali exports, 1970 111
4.16. Share of Somali exports, 1971 112
4.17. Share of Somali exports, 1972 112
4.18. Share of Somali exports, 1973 113
4.19. Share of Somali exports, 1974 113
4.20. Share of Somali exports, 1975 114
4.21. Share of Somali exports, 1976 115
4.22. Share of Somali exports, 1977 115
4.23. Share of Somali exports, 1978 115
4.24. Mutual shares in exports between Ethiopia and Somalia, 1962-2010 115
4.25. Total Ethiopian exports, 1962-2016 116
4.26. Somalia GDP to exports ratio, 1975-1977 119
5.1. Uganda's Polity IV score, 1962-2013 141
5.2. Tanzania's Polity IV score, 1961-2013 144
5.3. Polity IV scores of Uganda and Tanzania, 2961-2014 151
5.4. Growth/decline in Uganda and Tanzania's mutual shares of export markets, 1961-2015 168
6.1. Ethiopia and Eritrea's Polity IV scores, 1993-2015 189
6.2. Eritrean export partners in 1993 by share of total exports (in %) 196
6.3. Eritrean export partners in 1994 by share of total exports (in %) 197
6.4. Eritrean export partners in 1995 by share of total exports (in %) 197
6.5. Eritrean export partners in 1996 by share of total exports (in %) 198
6.6. Eritrean export partners in 1996 by share of total exports (in %) 198
6.7. Total Eritrean exports, 1993-2010 199
6.8. Pre-war movements in Eritrean economic indicators 200
6.9. Mutual exports between Ethiopia and Eritrea, 1993-2010 200

7.1. Kenya’s nominal GDP, 1963-2018 213
7.2. Kenya’s GDP growth, 1963-2017 213
7.3. Kenya’s military budget, 1963-2013 215
7.4. East African military budgets, 1963-2003 216
8.1. Political typology of causes of interstate conflict in East Africa 238
8.2. Political-economic typology of interstate conflict in East Africa 240
8.3. Political-economic-regional typology of interstate conflict in East Africa 234

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Few, other than committed academics or the citizens of the implicated countries themselves, appear to have an awareness of African countries' histories of conventional interstate wars against one another in the postcolonial era.[1] Far better known, as will be shown,[2] though perhaps no better understood, are the continent's civil wars. Moreover, the interstate wars pose a theoretical puzzle; being apparently being inexplicable with a single causal account. It is entirely possible, however, that this presents opportunity rather than insurmountable conditions for theorisation. For many scholars, sifting through the cases requires first a sifting through and selecting over the litany of theories for the one which could offer the sole explanation. The apparent inexplicability of African interstate wars with a single causal account is the first puzzle that has given rise to this study. The persistent relevance of the democratic peace, interdependence and hegemonic stability, as causal accounts of war, without sufficient examination on cases derived from the African continent is a puzzle in itself. This, then, is the second puzzle for this dissertation: determining whether African conflicts readily fit the conventional theoretical explanations of conflict, or whether they form a class (or classes) of their own. In other words, are African conflicts particular expressions of a universal phenomenon? Or, alternatively, do they present explicit outliers? Even so, do they do so entirely with shared characteristics, or do they present expressions of both? Thus, the side-by-side examination of three different theories that speak to different levels of war initiation (or at the very least its lack of prevention) and continuation at the domestic, bilateral, and systems level, appeared to offer the first comprehensive analysis of these conflicts. The side-by-side comparison approach stood to give insights not only on different theories, but also shows the ways in which the wars themselves are similar and/or different when compared to each other in what social scientists call triangulation.

1.1. Aims of the Dissertation

The overall objective of this dissertation is to determine the causal relevance of three theories of interstate conflict to East Africa's interstate conflicts on case study bases and for the entirety of the panel and thereby either reject or confirm their causal relevance on this basis. Essentially,

[1] From a discussion with Ambassador Legwaila Joseph Legwaila, former special representative of the UN General Secretary to the Eritrea-Ethiopia conflict.
[2] See Chapter 3 of this dissertation.

as each theory is a shorthand for specific variables and sums up a specific set of hypotheses, they can be unbundled and tested with relative accuracy. In accepting a theory's causal relevance, the dissertation will do so either by accepting the entire theory as is presently articulated in the variation of the theory being tested or with case-specific modifications. The dissertation will then formulate a typology for the three theories in terms of how their posited variables interact with one another in explaining the conflicts.

This dissertation's contribution is centred around furthering our understanding of Africa's interstate wars, and, meta-theoretically, the extent to which their causes can be argued to be similar to those of conventional state-to-state warfare in Europe up to the 20th century (which is the site of generation and engagement for all three theories, most pointedly in the 'Great Debates' in International Relations [Lake, 2013: 567]). Further, the dissertation will make a contribution insofar as it can distil, on the basis of these case studies, the causal overlaps among these three theories, especially as they have at least one factor in common; that conflicts are rooted in rational opportunity cost weightings. Going back to the 19th century, the notion of opportunity cost stipulates the effect of scarcity (choice between two alternatives) and the possibly higher gains that are lost by choosing one course over another (Quackenbush2004). In this sense refers to the notion that one course of action (such as going to war) necessitates forfeiture of certain gains which would be made by pursuing the alternative (i.e., trade gains from the continuation of the status quo [Polachek and Xiang, 2008: 87]).

This dissertation is an attempt at applying what some early 21st century scholarship has seemed to be arguing for, namely mid-range theory testing as well as theory synthesis and a re-opening of the 'Great Debates' in IR (Hermann, 2002: 123; Jupille, Caparaso, and Checkel, 2003: 7; Bennet, 2013: 459). This involved in-depth engagement with the existing literature, extensive empirical research (quantitative economic and political data, interviews with mediators, government officials and experts, archival materials and visits) and specific methodological application. Finally, as it will be a study into the precursors of cooperative and uncooperative behaviour among African states on a historical basis (as has been done, for example, by Khadiagala [1994]; Alence [2006]; and Moshoeshoe [2012] for Southern Africa in apartheid and post-apartheid contexts, as well as Ranelletti [2018] in the Maghreb on water; and Meyers [2002] on West Africa's international labour mobility), the dissertation contributes to the field on a theoretical basis as well as to policy studies insofar as is an empirical review of some of the continental and regional bodies' pursuits (i.e., democracy and intra-continental trade

promotion, as well as strengthening of regional bodies) on which are predicated greater peace and economic prosperity.

The thesis is also in tune with policy questions which have been weighted and considered ever since the majority of African state gained their independence in the 1960s, namely, identifying the drivers of peace, be they in the form of enhancing trade (so as to give each state a stake in the wellbeing of another), the promotion of democracy or giving a role to the regional leaders to bring these about. Indeed, from its foundations, as the OAU and presently as the AU, the continental body has sought to avert interstate conflict by resolving that the borders, inasmuch as they were colonial in their origins, ought to be respected and territorial integrity imbued on each of the sovereign nations. Subsequent programmes and proposals saw the body take up institutional consensus around the importance of increasing intra-continental trade, promoting democracy and increasing intra-continental funding as well as regional peacekeeping forces to form the African Standby Force. All three have some moorings with the theories which this dissertation is focused on; the first is to do with the economic independence-peace thesis, the second is to do with the work of the African Peer-Review Mechanism (APRM) and is consistent with the democratic peace thesis, and the third gives a role to the more economically and militarily strong in the continent and is in line with some of the ideas of hegemonic stability theory which have been noted by some scholars.[3] It would appear, then, that the ideas which this dissertation evaluated are already present in much of the continental thinking. The role of this dissertation is to put them under specific historical analysis. The dissertation could therefore make prognostications about the future of the continent interstate conflict, given certain, specific and clear conditions.

Further, the dissertation will distil patterns of conflictual interaction among African states, an almost overlooked class of conflict in the African setting as much of the literature tends to focus on intra- rather than inter-state conflicts. This area will make findings relevant to peacemaking; but beyond this, it will be a study in the precursors of uncooperative behaviour among African states on a historical basis. Thus, as the study makes use of domestic, transnational and regional-systematic components of conflict (by looking at the role of democracy, increased trade and the presence of hegemons in the regions as halters of conflict),

[3] As Alence (2006) argues, the Southern African Customs Union, founded in 1910, survived to the present mainly due to the fact that South Africa has been willing to play the role of leader and has shouldered much of the cost (i.e., has provided a public good for the region) due to its own motives. See Alence, Rod. "SACU and the Political Economy of Regionalism: Towards Deeper and Broader Integration?" SAIIA Trade Policy Briefing, May 7, 2006.

it will make three-tier analyses of the forms of behaviour that assorted configurations in each of these can bring about.

Finally, what follows is a work of theory which modulates our understanding of Africa's twentieth century experience by re-looking at those intra-continental factors which are relatively free of the traditionally blamed Cold War-derived external influences (especially the Uganda-Tanzania and Eritrea-Ethiopia wars). As an assessment of interstate conflict at a time when much of the world was not experiencing interstate conflict among states in the same region,[4] it will contribute to the fuller story of the latter half of the twentieth century in terms of the phenomenon of interstate conflict as well as, where relevant, the impact of the Cold War. It is therefore critical to assess why, at a time when interstate conflict was considered relatively outmoded or occurring with less frequency in the rest of the world (Goldstein, 2012: 12), so much of it took place among African states – and, just as well, why it subsequently decreased.

Having provided an overview of the significance of the study being undertaken in this dissertation, this Introduction will now turn to providing a rationale for the study (section 1.2), a brief description of the methodology being applied in the dissertation and the rationale for typology-building as the endgoal of the dissertation (section 1.3). The Introduction will then turn to explicating the findings and original contributions of the dissertation to International Relations scholarship, as well as areas for further research (section 1.4). Finally, the Introduction give an outline of the role of each of the upcoming chapters accordingly (section 1.5).

1.2. Rationale for the Study

Many of Africa's states have peculiar histories which primed them for clashes with one another. As many of them obtained their independence from colonial metropoles, "the artificial and poorly demarcated borders of many countries were considered the most potent source of conflict and political instability" (Ikome, 2012: 1). This resulted in lively debates centred on whether to revise or maintain the colonial borders. This made this period one of unprecedented thought and cross-continental intellectual engagement. The argument split the continent's leaders and academic leaders into two broad camps; one composed of revisionists and another by anti-revisionists as far as the borders were concerned. In the end, the continent's premier institution, the Organisation of African Unity (OAU), elected for a status quo on borders

[4] With the exception of the Middle Eastern wars involving the Arab-Israeli conflicts (1967, 1973, 1982) and the Iran-Iraq War (1980-1988); and some pockets of Asia – particularly the India-China (1962) and Sino-Vietnam (February 1979 – March 1979) wars.

(Organisation of African Unity, 1964: 19; Ani and Matambo, 2016) so as to avert the fears of chaos and anarchy resulting from boundary contestations from either within (i.e., secessionism) or between states. Despite the decisions of the OAU and its successor, the African Union (AU), border conflicts did become a source of instability and conflict, however; with, as shall be seen, East Africa taking up the lion's share of the continent's interstate conflicts. Significantly, although intra-state conflicts seem to have replaced inter-state conflicts as the principal source of instability on the continent since the late 1980s (with the exception of two involving Eritrea in 1998 and again in 2008 against Ethiopia and Djibouti, respectively), the continent's past of border conflicts still stands to offer some insights, while also remaining largely under-compared and under-theorised. This has renewed pertinence in the face of the prospect of destabilising border conflicts still being very real, particularly "against the background of Africa's ever-expanding population, which is accompanied by shrinking economic resources and opportunities, and high levels of migration" (Ikome, 2012: 1). Prospective flashpoints still exist, more practically, between Somalia and Kenya, Egypt and Ethiopia, Djibouti and Eritrea as well as Uganda and Rwanda. These are the interactions which form the basis for this dissertation. The three case studies which the dissertation will look at are as follows:

1. The Ogaden War, 1977-1978
2. The Uganda-Tanzania War, 1978-1979
3. The Eritrea-Ethiopia War, 1998-2000

The Ogaden War occurred between Somalia and Ethiopia between 1977 and 1978 over the Ogaden region formally part of Ethiopia but claimed by Somalia. In somewhat similar fashion, the Uganda-Tanzania War broke out in 1978, over the Kagera region claimed by Uganda but formally part of Tanzania and the Eritrea-Ethiopia war broke out over the disputed Badme region claimed by Eritrea but formally under Ethiopia. These cases also form the entire universe of cases of interstate conflict in the East African region since these states became independent. Some running threads across the cases include the following:

1. All three were territorially motivated, which is conceptually relevant to the economic interdependence thesis insofar as it implies an economic opportunity cost appraisal.
2. All countries involved were authoritarian in nature, which is conceptually relevant to the democratic peace thesis.

3. Two of the three the conflict initiators (Uganda and Somalia) had recently undergone military coups within a decade or less, which is conceptually relevant to the democratic peace thesis.

4. All the countries involved were members of more than one regional organisation (and extra-continental regional organisation in the case of Somalia's Arab League membership), which is conceptually relevant to the hegemonic stability thesis.

5. Two of the three conflicts (the Uganda-Tanzania war and the Eritrea-Ethiopia war) took place soon after a failure of a common market scheme (and a shared currency in the case of Eritrea and Ethiopia). This is conceptually relevant to the economic interdependence thesis.

However, and importantly, the domestic and dyadic settings also offer instances of heterogeneity; some were more politically open than others, others were personalist dictatorships whereas others were characterised by party dominance but within-party pluralism, and other dyads were characterised by considerable amity and friendliness until a change in regime, whereas others had stronger economic relationship than others, whereas others had no trade relations at all.

The conditions for case selection which these cases met was that they are characterised by interstate war between East African states. Therefore, extra-continental military actions such as those of various personnel from the continent during the two World Wars (a period which, in any case, precedes the attainment of formal sovereignty by these countries), those of Ethiopia and South Africa during the Korean War in the 1950s, and of African states in Iraq as part of the US-led 'coalition of the willing' in the 2003 invasion of Iraq will not be studied. Likewise, the actions of extra-continental states and coalitions against or in states on the continent, such as those of Israel in Uganda during the Entebbe raid, and NATO against Libya are to be excluded in the dissertation. Further, in order to make more generalisable conclusions, this dissertation has made use of the entire universe of cases which meet this classification for this region. Thus, there was no room for research bias in the case selection. However, it is to be acknowledged that the study has limitations insofar as generalisation is concerned; hence the study sought to find causes behind the wars which did take place in terms of the common and uncommon variables/features and their configurations. Thus the study is not an analysis of all dyads with non-war outcomes, but only of this class of interaction.

Conceptually, these cases are to interact with the theory by being used to test the theory. That is, as a point of entry, the dissertation will be interested in testing the extent to which each theory is capable of explaining the various conflicts. Upon doing so, and deciding the relevance of each theory on a case-by-case basis, we will then distil an overall classification and determining which theory has had the most explanatory power. As will be discussed in the methodology chapter, since this dissertation makes use of qualitative comparative analysis (QCA) in its typology-building, it is open to more than one variable (and by implication more than one theory) having causal relevance. Secondly, these theories are all informed by an attribution of rational choice mechanisms to conflict; all see the states as weighting costs and benefits of carrying out warfare, and in that way they are driven by the same logic of action. So it is a matter of determining what tips the scales across the different interfaces in all these countries. It is also a matter of understanding incentives.

This dissertation therefore heeds the need to

> "incorporate in our analyses the interplay of historical and contemporary processes, the intersections of politics, economy and culture, the connections between local, regional and global systems, the role played by national and transnational formations, by the state, capital and civil society, and how material forces and popular discourses, institutional conditions and symbolic constructs structure and reproduce conflicts" (Zeleza, 2008: 16).

In proceeding, each incidence of interstate conflict will be looked at through the prism of all three theories to determine whether that theory is conceptually relevant to the particular case study. This is done primarily through quantitative analysis, with economic and governance ranking data being correlated with the outbreak of the conflict on an ex post basis, and a combination of within-case analysis in the tests involving hegemonic stability theory. While the methodology and its rationale are given in greater detail in Chapter 3 (i.e., after unbundling the theories' testable variables), I provide below a brief overview of the key variables, which will then allow for a summary of findings to be more comprehensible.

1.3. Brief Methodological Overview

The following is the overall research question of the dissertation: Can the interstate wars which took place among East African states in the period between 1977 and 2000 be explained with the conventional causal accounts (hegemonic stability theory, democratic peace thesis, and trade interdependence) of interstate war? Specifically, the dissertation seeks to answer the following questions per case study per theory.

Theory	Research question	Hypothesis
Democratic peace thesis	Do lower scorers in democracy indicators always initiate conflict in dyadic contexts?	All interstate conflicts have been initiated by a state which is a lower scorer in the Polity IV ranking than its targeted adversary. States scoring higher in the Polity IV ranking have never initiated conflict against one another.
Economic interdependence thesis	Do states initiate a conflict against a state with significant export markets?[5]	The presence of an export market larger than 1% within another state decreases the likelihood of initiating a conflict with that state.
Hegemonic stability theory	Does the decline of the relative GDP of the largest regional economy correlate with an outbreak of a conflict among states within the given region?	Sustained or increased relative economic relative size by the state with the largest comparative GDP in Africa's regions decreases the likelihood of an interstate conflict breaking out within that region.

To gauge answers to these questions, the dissertation makes use of mixed methods, with quantitative trade and budgetary data, as well as archival materials, numerous interviews with former mediators, government officials and experts, and a secondary survey. These consisted of participants with expertise/experience on Ethiopia (9), Eritrea (4), Kenya (4), Russia (in terms of its relations with Africa) (3), Somalia (2), Tanzania (3), and Uganda (3). At the same time, some individuals had overlapping expertise and experience across the countries, state-to-state relations and the conflicts and their aftermaths. Some of these elected to be quoted anonymously.

1.4. Summary of Findings

Chapter 4's findings indicate that the theory of democratic peace thesis has an imperfect causal relevance with the conflict of 1977-78 between Somalia and Ethiopia, but still has some congruence with the path to war and may explain why there has been no war since 1978. What has been notable however is the manner in which these have been manifested in the actual conflict. Noticeably, Somalia, the initiator of the conflict, scored less than Ethiopia in the governance index on openness, which was in line with the hypothesis proposed. Furthermore,

[5] As shown in Chapter 3, the threshold of a "significant" export markets is ambiguous and hardly established, and one of the aims of this dissertation is establishing this (at least for the entire universe of cases of interstate war in the East African region).

other causally insights were made. On the first instance, while relations were flawed from the onset, with Somalia having irredentist claims, a conventional conflict between Ethiopia and Somalia took place upon the two countries undergoing governmental transformations. The chapter's findings are also indicative of a possibility that the Somali regime appraised the situation in Ethiopia to be 'ripe' for it to initiate the war without anticipating resistance from the apparently weaker Ethiopia. The present literature on the democratic peace thesis is presently not cognizant of the role of what we term here as the *institutional legitimacy information asymmetry* across regimes in leading up to an outbreak of conflict. This chapter therefore offers this original contribution. Barre noted and sought to use internal discord in Ethiopia as an opportunity to attack and claim a territory that was seen as being part of Somalia. Indeed, while Somalia was not a democracy, Barre had risen to power in 1969 after a coup and maintained a dictatorship partially because of popular support for the irredentist cause he ostensibly sought to realise.

In Chapter 5 we noted the difficult relationship between the two leaders of Uganda and Tanzania as obviating some relevance of the democratic peace thesis. Regime heterogeneity, for one seems to explain the root causes of the war as internal dynamics within Uganda both encouraged and allowed a conflict to be initiated against Tanzania. While at the same time, regime difference also accounts for the manner in which the war was fought and embraced by the different populations and concluded with the demise of the Amin regime. It also appears to be consistent with the work of Weeks (2012), whose findings indicate a greater probability of power loss for an authoritarian regime upon losing a war. We can alter these results in the Uganda-Tanzania case by stating that the more authoritarian regime was at the same time more hastened to initiate a war, while also having its power retention more threatened by the loss of the war. In line with the arguments of the democratic peace thesis, the Tanzanian government sought to appeal to the populace by attributing undemocratic features of the adversary. If indeed the domestic situation in both countries was allowing for the war to take place, it is deducible that no war has broken out between two countries since the 1970s due to regime changes which since took shape in the wake of Idi Amin's fall. On the other hand, Uganda's peacekeeping zeal since Museveni may – in accordance with the Henderson thesis – be having a legitimising effect on the government that prevents vulnerability from the outside because of its cooperative behaviour towards other states, unlike the behaviour observed under Amin.

Chapter 6 of the dissertation found relevance for both the democratic peace thesis, despite the undemocratic nature of both countries, as well as the economic interdependence thesis. This

allows us to formulate a typology accounting for both these variables. In 1997, there was were prospects of the opposition gaining channels through which to challenge the Isaias regime. The constitution had been completed by the Constitutional Commission of Eritrea, and elections were pending within a matter of months. The hypothetical information privilege that Eritrea ought to have had was diminished by a misperception of Ethiopia; the regime in Asmara incorrectly assumed that the rest of the country would mutiny and not back the Tigray-led government. Anti-Eritrean sentiment however was widely spread in Ethiopia.

The findings on Chapter 4 and 6 of the dissertation overall contradict, or at least with regards to the East African region, Henderson's model according to which "dyads comprising domestically legitimate African states are more likely to experience international conflict" (Henderson, 2015: 239). Thus, the present case studies, which have been looked at individually and collectively, would appear to be 'outliers.' Indeed, the reason they undertook such military excursions was because of their problematic legitimacy: Somalia and Uganda because of their economic stagnations, and Eritrea because of the completed work of the Constitutional Commission of Eritrea which would have curbed the powers of the executive. In other words, it was not their sense of legitimacy that drove their war-making rationale. Rather, and central to this dissertation's original contribution, they took a strike due to their own sense of threatened legitimacy combined with a perceived lack of legitimacy in their targeted adversary.

With regards to the economic interdependence thesis, Chapter 4 also found that the economic interdependence thesis has validity for the Ogaden War as well. Overall, the share of Ethiopia in the country's exports to was insignificant, at less than 0.018% at any given point. This thus demonstrates a lack of opportunity cost in initiating a war with Ethiopia. Rather, at more than 95% of its trade with extra-continental states, Somalia had no economic interdependence with Ethiopia and indeed much of the region (with Egypt as the only African trade partner the country had had prior to 1977). This case study has also demonstrated that the literature on interdependence, either on potential adversaries and would-be mediators, ought to take into account the overall lack of external reliance of the aggressor country in question (in this case Somalia) in the first place. As this case demonstrates, while Somalia was an exporting nation prior to the war, these exports were declining in the years leading up to the war – which coincided with the consolidation of power by a regime whose leader was considered Ethiopia reliably weak between 1974 and 1977 based on signals of social unrest and mutinies – and they had already had a minimal share within its total GDP.

In Chapter 5, we found that trade between Tanzania and Uganda started to increase gradually soon after independence. The years following 1961 had seen two-way trade (both imports and exports) grow between the two states. This trade was further bolstered by the formation of the East African Community (post-1967). Following this, Tanzania's imports from Uganda were worth USS14.8-million in 1970 and its exports to Uganda were US$7.8 million. Noticeably, this was height of the trade, however. With trade growing but unsubstantial (with Tanzania taking up less than 1% of Uganda's exports at any given point), the relations were buoyed by political cordiality. The increase in trade between Tanzania and Uganda was also influenced by the improving relations between leaders Julius Nyerere and Milton Obote. After Idi Amin's coup, the political relations changed, which also impacted the trade between the two states; trade reached only US$3.8 million in 1971 and did not grow much thereafter. With regards to our typology, this case study demonstrates a clear case wherein political relations (based on regime type) can be an antecedent for growth in trade and economic interdependence (this has some similarity with the EU, which was a politically-motivated economic entity formed in the wake of WWII), the lack of which can in turn be an antecedent for a conflict between formerly cordial neighbours if there are territorial hang-ups to dispute over. This is thus the unique feature of the Uganda-Tanzania war when compared to the other two cases studied here. This Chapter also drew a link with the research of Rugimbana, Carr, Balitho and Walkom (2000) who found Tanzanians to be disinclined towards products sourced from the East African region. This Chapter therefore makes the theoretical amendment that this may at least indicate a synergy/overlap between the democratic peace thesis and the economic interdependence thesis; the domestic audience in any of the prospective adversary states qua consumers also have a role in determining the degree to which a country will be interdependent with the given external state. This showcases a mediating role for the domestic population as it indicates that their preferential inclinations have an indirect but significant role that should be a factor as trade does not occur in a vacuum.

Finally, in Chapter 6 we noted that Eritrea likewise demonstrates a case of a coincidence of external economic and internal political factors in driving the path to interstate war. As seen, by May 1998, the Eritrean constitution had been completed by the Constitutional Commission of Eritrea, and elections were pending and scheduled to take place within a matter of months. At this same time, the living standards of the population were stagnating (from a previous GDP per capita growth rate of 7.972% in 1995 to 1.254%, in a still war-ravaged state). So were exports (from a value of US$25.5 million in the previous year to US$23.3 million by 1997).

The new currency, the Nakfa, made trade with Ethiopia virtually impossible as the two countries could not agree on a parity ratio between their two currencies. The existence of a new currency also nullified the existing free trade framework which had been enacted in 1993 between the two states. Further, the currency made the border, hitherto managed and handled at the level of the local governments, salient as free movement was now made a matter of dispute. Finally, Eritrea had a unique trade experience: in addition to the declining export volumes, the country was also having *more* trade partners with each year between 1993 and 1997, all of which may have had the effect of diminishing the opportunity cost of going to war (since there was not much income from trade), but also of diversifying its trade partners such that the risk of war-related trade sanctions was spread out. Thus, these factors all coincided to make the war initiation by Eritrea all but inevitable. The diversion of exports away from Massawa and Assab further made retaliation against Eritrea less costly for Ethiopia.

The test of the hegemonic stability theory found it to be of much relevance in the dissertation as well. To test this out, the dissertation plotted Kenya's military budget alongside that of the rest of the countries in the region, with the aim of determining whether comparative declines in Kenya's military budget would coincide with the three wars under study. That is, the aim was to see whether the Kenyan budget would be relatively less than the adversaries at least a year prior to each war outbreak (1976; 1977; and 1997). From the onset of the dataset, Ethiopia had the highest military budget. However, it was taken over by Uganda after 1971. Uganda in turn was superseded by Tanzania, whose military budget was the largest in the region between 1973 and 1979. Within the dataset, Kenya's military budget has never been the largest in the region; it has reached second-largest status on a number of periods: 1977 to 1979, 1987 to 1993, and once more between 2000 and 2003. On the main, the data observes an interesting pattern, from the 1960s to the 1970s, the entire region saw a growth in military budgets, which was then followed by a decline in the 1980s, with the sole exception of Ethiopia, which between 1980 and 1990 had the single-largest military budget. 1994 marked the beginning of another period of growth in military budgets across the countries, though Eritrea saw the sole dip in military spending in 1997, the year before the outbreak of the Badme conflict. By 1998, the year of the war, Ethiopia and Eritrea had the largest and second-largest military expenditures in the region, respectively. At the same time between 1998 and 2000, Kenya's military expenditure was actually on the decline, from US$263 million in 1998, to US$ US$165 million in 2000. Overall, then, the findings would appear to be consistent with the hypothesis; the comparative lowness of the Kenyan military budget compared with growths in those of

belligerents in the region appear to be correlated with an interstate conflict outbreak. This also explains Kenya's lack of capacity to mitigate conflicts even after they have broken out. Indeed, Kenya's offers to mediate were turned down by Tanzania and Kenya could not compel Dar es Salaam to cease its counter-invasion of Uganda. Thus, though Tanzania and Uganda were comparatively poorer than Kenya, both these countries were able to divert considerable spending to military preparation as proportions of their total revenues. Further motives perhaps lay in differences of regimes as "weapons gathered by Amin were also meant to deter internal aggression" (Hansen, 2013: 92). And towards Kenya, "the relations remained rather stable as Kenya took a patient and conciliatory stand in spite of various outburst from Idi Amin, for instance when he claimed that the Luos in western Kenya should belong to Uganda" (Hansen, 2013: 93). Further, Uganda, as a landlocked state depended more on Kenya than on Tanzania, with whom it also had regime differences that Tanzania appeared unwilling to accommodate and was actively working against (i.e., harbouring anti-Amin forces).

The early years of the 1990s saw Kenyan growth in GDP per capita terms slowed down and then stagnate. Decline then occurred in the second half of the 1990s; with nominal GDP only growing by 2.1% in the entire 1995-2001 period, with true signs of recovery only showing in 2003 and then fully in 2005 (Read and Parton, 2009: 571). This means Kenya was not keeping up with the individual averages of 3.8% and 5.3% for Eritrea and Ethiopia, respectively, and overall 4.6% between them both (World Bank, 2019). The latter two were also diverting much of their budgets disproportionally more to military spending. By condition of its economic slowdown, Kenya's government, which had also recently opened up for multiparty elections in the early 1990s and therefore had some domestic audience considerations to bear, could scarcely afford increasing its military expenditure to guarantee regional peace.

The conflict was made more likely by the end of the Cold War, as it led to a less ideologically inclined Russia that was willing to trade with any country; much of the equipment and personnel were acquired from Russia by both countries (unlike in 1977 when the USSR had refused these to the war instigator, and thus leading to a decisive war for Ethiopia).

With regards to Somalia, Kenya was a vested power with interests and its own rivalries with the region it ought to have ostensibly led. This also drew it closer with another state with a Somali rivalry; Ethiopia, which was signified by the conclusion of a friendship treaty in 1964, and once again, with the Soviet-leaning Derg at the helm, a mutual defence treaty in 1979. This indicates at least a 'shared regional hegemony' between Kenya and Ethiopia which is at once

made inoperable due to overlapping interests and atavistic extra-continental alliances, the determinants of which are explored in Chapter 7. Because of Kenya's prodding, the US, however, limited its supplies to Somalia, as these could hypothetically have been redirected towards Kenya, with whom Somalia had irredentist claims. Thus we may refer to this as Kenya's client hegemony. Additionally, with regards to the Horn, Ethiopia – more than Kenya – has been widely viewed as the regional hegemon. This also demonstrates another important factor; the geography of necessity. As a littoral state, Kenya, unlike landlocked Ethiopia, may not have as much to gain from being as active in regional peace-making (and, where deemed necessary, war-making; as Ethiopia did with post-Ogaden War Somalia) beyond pacifying its northern border.

Among the insights made from the findings in Chapter 7 is that because of the manner in which the three wars played out, we can determine that there appears to be no revealed method for a would-be regional hegemon in East Africa to impose peace *between states* (i.e., excluding civil war contexts). At best, Kenya has been able to prevent conflicts between itself and other states; with Uganda under Amin (before he turned his attention to Tanzania) and with Somalia. In the first instance, the country threatened Kampala with denial of imports and exports, and likewise curtailed US arms imports into Somalia, who at this time was also an ally of the US.

The interrelation among the three theories as presented by the findings in the various case studies are synthesised in the typology presented in Chapter 8. Two of the three conflicts were initiated by states (Somalia and Eritrea) with no true democracies, but nonetheless with channels of popular expression for war preference – at the root of these lay irredentist claims, which was also the case in Amin-ran Uganda. While all three war initiating states were characterised by undemocratic regimes presiding over societies and legislatures without means through which the path to war, carried out in all cases by the executives, could be halted. This also provides a link to the interdependence theory; in the instance that a domestic audience could not mitigate the war-making inclinations of the regime, the next potential blocker, likewise rooted in the rational choice modus operandi posited by the democratic peace thesis, could be the state against whom a war is being considered. The thesis posited that the presence of an external market for the war-mongering state in the targeted belligerent would mitigate its military posture. This would present an opportunity cost in that going to war with such a state would cause economic loss which would bring about potential backlash. For states already in economic problems, such options do not present themselves, however. As discovered in the cases, all three of the conflict initiators were in economically dismal stages in their economic

history, mostly due to the policies of the regimes in power; in Somalia, it was due to the collectivisation of the economy by the socialist Siad Barre regime, in Uganda it was the 'Economic War' waged against the Indian merchant class, in combination with declining coffee prices in the global market, and in Eritrea it was due to the effects of the war of independence, combined with the introduction of the Nakfa currency.

In turn, popular support for conflict initiation determines the other state to which the conflict may be directed; this is the state with whom territorial disputes exist. It is worth restating that none of the territories at the time had revealed mineral or agricultural significance. All the wars were thus *proactive wars* in that the conditions for their occurrence already existed; it was not a matter of the motives for them forming and then being prevented from imploding. The "final" additional factor in the sequencing ought to have been a regional actor able to withhold the conflict from being carried out or halted at an early phase. Regional hegemony presents itself in a series of steps throughout the sequence. Hegemony is also relativistic and is expressed in comparative terms; thus regional hegemony, in security terms, is not conferred by virtue of having the largest economy, but is rather performed through having the largest military budget. Given these findings, I also propose that the second determinant of regional hegemony lies in intra-regional trade; this both increases the motivation and means to enact regional peace. As Kenya is both a littoral and outward-oriented state in terms of its trade, these conditions were both not met. Thus, the findings of the dissertation have been consistent with the hegemonic stability theory, economic interdependence thesis and democratic peace thesis. Further, it has sequenced their relational relevancies to one another to causally explain East Africa's twentieth-century interstate wars.

1.5. Chapter Outline

Chapter 2 of the dissertation gives a conceptual overview of interstate war, and then shines a light on the historical experience of all war types in Africa, paying close attention to the East African region over time, with brief case studies of war in the Kushite, Axumite (and then Abyssinian) and Bantu-speaking polities. The chapter then reviews a typology of war types (including international ones) that took place in the colonial era. By reviewing the pre-colonial and colonial wars, this chapter then sets the stage for Chapters 4 to 7 to pick up the narrative with analyses of the post-colonial interstate wars.

Chapter 3 of the dissertation consists of a theoretical and literature review of the democratic peace, economic interdependence and hegemonic stability theories. Chapter 3 therefore

consists of the nominal literature review in the traditional PhD dissertation. This review establishes the ground from which to determine conceptual frameworks as well as derive the methodological variables and hypotheses to be tested. Importantly, the literature review brings to the fore some relevant works with which the dissertation interacts in the case studies and corroborates its own (quantitative, archival and interview-derived) data against.

Chapters 4 to 7 of the dissertation are the case studies. Chapter 4 conducts the democratic peace and economic interdependence theses on the Ogaden War, while Chapters 5 and 6 do the same with the Uganda-Tanzania and Eritrea-Ethiopia wars respectively. These chapters establish the domestic and bilateral cells of the typology, which is completed by Chapter 7. Chapter conducts a test of the hegemonic stability theory for the entire region utilising economic indicators and military budget data from 1960 to 2000.

Chapter 8 consists of a proposed typology as generated from the data and findings in the case studies. This chapter then concludes with an exploration of the theoretical implications, policy implications and areas for future research stemming from the dissertation, with much of the impetus deriving from the emerging and re-emerging conflict touchpoints in the region.

CHAPTER 2

Interstate War and Africa: Concepts in Context

2.1. Introduction

This conceptual chapter unpacks the notion of war, particularly interstate war, and subsequently gives an historical account interstate war on the African continent. This chapter accomplishes the necessary task of disambiguating a continually-referenced concept in this dissertation. Additionally, it introduces the presence of interstate war as a factor in the African pre- and post-colonial eras; the latter being the focus point of the dissertation from which the case studies are drawn. In this process, we note the pre-colonial polities' wars and in them the significance of power dynamics, the movement of peoples and goods within the continent, state-making and governance. The present work, therefore, is a rendition of this analysis in the postcolonial setting, within three particular cases.

The chapter will firstly draw out different types of conflict – regional conflicts, civil wars, insurgencies and interstate war – and explain each of these in turn, and discuss what differentiates "interstate war", the subject of the present work, and makes it distinct from all the other classes of conflict. Our cascade of war types is adapted from works of Brodie (1973), Singer and Small (1972), Levy (2010), Sarkees, Wayman and Singer (2003). The chapter will then give an overview of interstate war in the African context, with specific reference to the kingdoms of Kush, Axum, Ghana and Mali, the Songhai Empire, and the Societies of East and Southern Africa. Apart from giving an account of differentiated histories, these brief accounts will also provide the context from which East Africa as constructed in the post-colonial era emerged and acted or did not act internally in accordance with the theories being assessed here as some of the independent variables (governance types, interstate trade, and regional hegemony) in some of the cases could have their respective genealogy in these contexts. Utilising the work of Zeleza (2008), the chapter then discusses colonial war in Africa.

2.2. Overview of War

"War has been a persistent pattern of interaction between and within states and other political units for millennia. In its many varieties, it is probably the most destructive form of human behaviour" (Levy, 2010 :2). War also has also made a significant impact in the evolution of the international system. On the first count, many scholars have made reference to the notion that through persistent warfare, states were born. As Charles Tilly (1975 :42) argued, "war made

the state, and the state made war." Tilly's (1990: 20) widely accepted notion is that bureaucracy arose as a result of the military campaigns which took place in late medieval Europe. According to this theory, the process of war-making required tax collection, which in turn led to the formation of accountability between the monarchies and their subjects, or at least the feudal elite. Indeed as the historian-philosopher Terry Pinkard recount: the mounting pressures of this tax-collection (not only for war costs, but also for the benefitting of royal courtiers and the construction of many Versailles-style château by princes all over Europe) "resulted in the growing demand…for a relatively efficient bureaucracy trained in the latest management techniques to administer princely affairs effectively" (2002: 4). After the formation of these states, war went on to further necessitate a system of interaction. The basis of this was the principle of state sovereignty, promulgated through the Treaty of Westphalia, which was spawned from the Thirty Years' War (1618-1648). Through colonialism, this system of sovereignty was spread out across the world outside of Europe. Over the years, "war has remained one of the primary mechanisms for change in the world system, through its impact on both the distribution of military power and wealth and the structure of the world economy. War also has a profound impact on the institutional structures and cultures of states, and it has played a key role in the birth and death of many states" (Herbst, 1990: 117). Essentially, "we cannot understand the development of the modern nation - state system four or five centuries ago, or of earlier or more recent states, in the absence of patterns of warfare" (Herbst, 1990: 117). With the rise of non-state actors – either carrying out conflict against each other or against states – the scholarship has continued to expand and grow from this. In the post-Cold War period, the terminology of war studies has therefore continuously expanded.

Perhaps despite or because of war's ubiquity, it is a phenomenon that is difficult to define in a universally accepted manner. This is even prior to the scholarly debates over war's causes (a factor which, as this dissertation demonstrates at least with regards to East Africa, requires typological analysis which accommodates multiple variables). At the root of this are disagreements over types (which may overlap) and thresholds (which may be hard to determine). On the first count, scholars have essentially sought to determine war by the types of actors involved. Assumed within the type-based conceptualisation of war is a consensus that war is defined by its ends and not by its attendant technologies or manner of conduct – whether in aerial, naval or even nuclear. On the second count, the scholarship utilises a number of methodologies, the most frequented of which is the Correlates of War typology which sets the threshold at 1,000 battle-related deaths within a 12-month period. The issue of types is attended

to first below, upon which the subsequent section will deal specifically with thresholds as they pertain to interstate war, which is what this dissertation principally deals with.

2.2.1. Types of War

Broadly speaking, war occurs in four forms. These are interstate wars, intrastate wars, non-state wars, and extra-state wars. In this section we deal with forms of conflict other than interstate war and its manifest types (e.g., total war, coalition wars, and nuclear war). These include regional conflict, civil war, and insurgencies. "The term regional conflict describes a limited conflict arising out of regional issues. The conflict may be contained within the region, but the effects could reach beyond the region" (Brodie, 1973: 117). These could be termed communal wars and are often an indicator of the lack of full control of the state over the entirety of the territory. Civil war on the other hand is often conducted largely within the boundaries of a state "in which a significant part of the population is associated" or forced to be associated with two or more opposing sides (Brodie, 1973: 117). These may pour over into neighbouring countries, with borders often used as sites of base, training and supply lines. Usually, these conflicts are fought in order to "determine the government of a state, regional autonomy or secession" (Brodie, 1973: 117). Either one or both of the contenders may have outside assistance or support, which could therefore make the war a proxy war. Importantly, these civil wars may also occur along ethnic fault lines, which could then necessitate further reclassification as 'genocide' depending on the extent to which there are demonstrable intentions of extermination of one group by another.

On the other hand, "insurgency describes the actions of a minority group within a state (or in some instances a majority group which lacks power) intent on forcing political change by means of a mixture of subversion, propaganda and military pressure" (Levy, 2010: 6). The intent by fighters is usually to persuade or intimidate the broad mass of the people to accept such change. In some instances, there is no clear distinction between civil war and insurgency. Indeed, a successful insurgency may pass through a phase of civil war. "At its most anarchic, insurgency may see the collapse of the state in any form. Insurgent forces tend to seek to avoid conventional engagements between large forces while seeking the active support of the population at large" (Levy, 2010: 6). These can be drawn-out campaigns.

2.2.2. Interstate War

Interstate war is characterised by many facets. First, and perhaps clearest, war is typified by its violence. "It involves the use of force to kill and injure people and destroy military and

economic resources" (Levy, 2010: 6). As Clausewitz ([1832]1976: 89) put in in the opening chapter of *On War*, there is "primordial violence" which serves as "the first element of warfare" (see more recently Levy, 2010: 5). This point was earlier established in the same book in which Clausewitz states that that "war is an act of force, and there is no logical limit to the application of that force" (Clausewitz ([1832]1976: 76). The question in modern scholarship is what threshold of violence to use to determine whether a war has taken place. Some students of war deploy the "Correlates of War Project" derived criteria (Singer and Small, 1972). The "COW" project stipulated that there be "at least 1,000 battle - related deaths among all participating states and an annual average of 1,000 battle deaths for wars lasting more than a year" (Singer and Small, 1972). That criterion is quite reasonable for COW's purposes of analysing wars during the last two centuries. "It is less useful for earlier periods when populations and armies were much smaller and when fewer battle deaths reflected a larger relative proportion of the army or of the population" (Levy, 2010: 5). The fighting must be sustained rather than sporadic in order to differentiate war from "lesser" uses of military force. By sustained these scholars are making reference to both time (duration) and magnitude. "Termination of war therefore takes place when the warring parties reach agreement, which is usually preceded by the severe weakening of one of the parties" (Sarkees, Wayman and Singer, 2003: 49). The average duration of an interstate war is approximately ten years (Singer, 2006).

Another component in the definition of war involves the mediating word that follows violence in the definition: "between." A war is between two political organisations. "If the target of the initial violence does not fight back, we do not normally call it a war. Thus we treat war as the joint outcome of the behaviour of two or more actors. In an alternative use of the concept, scholars sometimes talk about war as a strategy rather than as an outcome" (Vasquez, 1993: 292).

> Here the question is why a state or other political organization adopts a strategy involving the substantial use of military force rather than some other strategy. In speaking of war as a strategy, it is generally assumed that military action will be resisted. If it is not resisted, however, most scholars would not refer to the outcome as a war (Vasquez, 1993: 292).

In line with this, Most and Starr (1989: 73) had defined war as:

> a particular type of outcome in the interaction of at least dyadic sets of specified varieties of actors in which at least one actor is willing and able to use some specified amount of military force for some specified period of time against some other, resisting actor and in which some specified minimal number of fatalities (greater than zero) occur.

Thus, "violence in warfare separates it from other forms of intergroup and interstate conflict. Conflicts of interests – over power, territory, resources, and more symbolic issues – are common in world politics" (Levy, 2010: 6). There are some exceptions, however, as some "conflicts of interests, rivalries, disputes, and threats of force do not become a war unless they involve sustained violence" (Levy, 2010: 6). Thus the "Cold War" between the US and USSR is considered to have been "a rivalry [but], not a war" (Levy, 2010: 6). Indeed, "one of the distinctive features of the Cold War [was] the fact that the US–Soviet rivalry, unlike most previous rivalries between the leading states in the system, did not escalate to war" (Thomas, 1986: 16). This period, along with its many flashpoints (including near confrontation over the Cuban missile crisis of October 1962), has spawned many theories and counter-theories (Allison and Zelikow, 1999: Ferguson, 2015).

Finally, there is the "sustained" aspect to the phenomenon of war. The aim here is in differentiating between open warfare and "organized violence that is more limited in its magnitude or impact" (Ashworth, 1968: 10). Thus, "a minor border incident involving opposing armies may result in casualties on one or both sides, but we want to preserve the term war for those incidents that escalate and cross a certain threshold of violence" (Levy, 2010: 6). Border clashes between Chinese and Indian forces in 1962 continued to escalate and involved sustained fighting, and we refer to the "Sino–Indian War"; on the other hand, "border clashes between Chinese and Soviet forces over disputed areas around the Ussuri River occurred in March 1969 and then again six months later, but successful crisis management soon ended the crisis without further escalation" (Levy, 2010: 6). Thus, we generally refer to that conflict as a "border clash" rather than a war (Levy, 2010: 6). General war, another form of conflict within the broad category of interstate war is conflict involving most or all of the major powers (and their allies) in which their vital interests, perhaps even their survival, are at on the line. The culmination of war being waged between major powers is a *total war*, which is characterised by mass mobilisation of all national resources and population sectors for the war effort. In this regard,

> it is important to note that populations are mobilized both in terms of activities and psychological states: the former implies comprehensive military and civilian conscription; the latter implies the systematic development of belligerent and hostile attitudes towards the enemy among all or most of the population (Ashworth, 1968: 10).

WWII is the most recent instance as well as a peak example of a general war; based on the global power balance "today, a full-scale attack on a number of fronts against the territorial

integrity of NATO members would be classified as general war" (Levy, 2010: 6). A conflict between the US and the People's Republic of China would serve as an example of such a war, which would also risk the probability of a nuclear war. Nuclear warfare, which has only happened once and which resulted in the termination of the last frontier of WWII, can be defined as simply any conflict which involves the deployment of nuclear weapons (Gordin, 2007: xiii).

2.3. Overview of African Interstate War

Having conceptualised interstate war, we now turn to its manifestation in Africa. Therefore, this section gives an account of African interstate war. It begins with a brief account of war and peace among past African polities prior to the colonial era. Subsequently, the chapter details the different types of conflict which have taken place on the African context. This chapter culminates in a review of the gaps in the literature, noting that the historical accounts are in need of, firstly, more in-depth within-case analysis and, secondly, a modulated and theory-based analysis.

2.3.1. War and Peace in Past Eastern African Kingdoms Before the Colonial Era

"Precolonial rulers in Africa struggled over the centuries to extend their power" (Herbst, 2000: 35). Nevertheless, rulers, at different points in time and in various corners of the continent, always sought to achieve this feat. Indeed, in Africa, "military campaigns were so frequent as to be a normal, though seasonal activity" (Herbst, 2000: 35). As Robert S. Smith writes in *Warfare and Diplomacy in Pre-colonial West Africa* "International relations in peace and war were carried out in a more or less recognisable fashion, and, to go further, in a coherent and rational manner which showed itself capable under favourable conditions of leading to political, economic and technical improvements in society" (Smith, 1976: 141).

The international relations of Africa, with the notable exception of North Africa, may be divided into three phases: isolation, integration, and independence. Prior to the late nineteenth century, with the exception of the Kushites, sub-Saharan Africa was largely isolated from the emerging international system due in large part to geographical barriers of desert and a coastal escarpment that hindered access to the interior of the continent. North Africa did not face these impediments and empires with ties to the Eurasian continent had been in existence for millennia. Below we assess the sub-Saharan kingdoms, and the role war in their formation. This positions the dissertation to then discuss colonial war, prior to more fully discussing post-colonial war among once-more independent African polities against each other.

The Kingdom of Kush. In the year 750 B.C., the Kingdom of Kush then led by King Kashta, centred originally around what is today Sudan, conquered the Egyptian polity. His successor, King Pianki, soon took over the rest of Egypt and reached as further up as Memphis and where he quickly subdued the local leaders and became pharaoh (Dixon, 1964: 121). The Kushites were therefore the 25th dynasty to rule over Egypt. By 663 B.C., however, the Kushites, ("who were still using bronze and stone weaponry" [Fuller, 1997: 105]), were "pushed back by the sword- and iron spear-wielding Assyrians under the ruthless King Sennacherib whom they had also tried to invade in 719 B.C. as part of their northward drive" (Dixon, 1964: 121). The Assyrians drove the Kushites back to their home base in present-day Sudan. They were not done, however; "in the year of 663 B.C., the King of Assyria declared himself King of Egypt and kept the chase upon the Kushites" (Dixon, 1964: 122). By 590 B.C., these new Egyptian rulers had taken over Napata, the Kushite Kingdom's administrative centre. Distance and then war with new rivals who sought to take over the strategically placed Egypt (but not the lands below which included the ancient Kush) rendered the region impossible to administer to. Thus,

> this new southernmost province was largely ignored as Egypt fended off newer and more sophisticated enemies in the form of the Persians under the Achaemenid King Cambyses II (525BC), the Greeks under Alexander the Great and then later partitioned to his general Ptolemy I (the great ancestor of the last pharaoh of Egypt, Cleopatra VII), and the Romans under Augustine in 30BC (Dixon, 1964: 122).

Subdued and then ignored, and without a new local elite, the Kushites "began to decline in stature; the pyramids were now to be built with brick, and the art of reading and writing was soon forgotten" (Dixon, 1964: 122). In 652 C.E., "a horde of Arab Muslims invaded the north of Kush through Egypt" (Dixon, 1964: 123). They were to withdraw, they said, provided the Kushites sent an annual tribute in the form of 400 slaves each year. "They agreed – and the agreement was to be abided by for more than 600 years" (Dixon, 1964: 123). These centuries of relative solitude, guaranteed through the sale of human beings, were concluded in the 1270s when under the rule of Baybars the Muslims began a serious campaign against Kush, by now known as Nubia. "When the land was conquered, the annual tribute was ended, and instead a Muslim was put on the throne of Nubia. This would be so for the next 500 years. But again things changed in 1820 when Mohammad Ali, ruler (khedive) of Egypt on behalf of the Ottoman Empire, sent two armies, each headed by one of his sons, into the Sudan" (O'Connor, 1993: 5). "So came the definitive end to the great and elusive Kingdom of Kush," as since then the lands became jointly administered (as two separate north and southern polities) by the

British and the Egyptians until attaining independence over the 1953-1957 period as the republic of Sudan, which was assumed by ethnic issues – with "regional actors [having] negotiated a brief period of peace (1972-1983) which did not last because of the imposition of Islamic law by the Sudan government, infuriating the predominantly Christian Southerners" (Khadiagala, 2014) – which would see further partition in 2011 and the birth of South Sudan after a referendum.

The Kingdom of Axum. The Kingdom of Axum (alternately spelt Aksum) was centred to the east of Kush, in the western modern-day Ethiopia (especially the present-day Tigray Region) and reached as far as southwest Yemen. The economy of this polity was primarily composed of slaves and ivory. In turn, it imported textiles, metal goods, wine and olive oil. "For an extended period, the Kingdom of Axum competed with the nearby Kingdom of Kush for monopoly control over the ivory trade" (O'Connor, 1993: 5). Probably as an outcome of this competition for the ivory, in the fourth century A.D. the Axum successfully conquered Kush. In 641, Arab forces captured Egypt and by the early 700s, Arabs ruled North Africa's coast west to the Straits of Gibraltar. Despite being Muslim, their relationship with the Christian Axumites were uniquely peaceable for the time and the region. As a consequence of the decline, by the late 8th century CE the old Axum Empire had ceased to exist. The city of Axum – which had sprung among the Amhara – stood in a much better position than the kingdom and remain a religious centre of gravity. "The territory of the kingdom of Axum would eventually develop into the medieval kingdom of Abyssinia with the founding of the Solomonid dynasty c. 1270 CE, whose kings claimed direct descent from the Biblical King Solomon and Queen of Sheba" (Tiruneh, 1990: 19). This Solomonic dynasty was made distinct by having had to change its seat of power constantly in order to "tame independent-minded regional governors and to ward off increasingly important Islamic encroachments from the strings of emirates that had come into existence in the eastern highland and lowland areas during the 12th century" (Tiruneh, 1990: 19). This kingdom was beset by decline in the 1500s following an invasion by the Harar emirate, "and by waves of Oromo migrations from the South" (Tiruneh, 1990: 19). There is some evidence that the Harar invasion had been supported by the Ottoman Empire (Tiruneh, 1990: 19), whereas the Solomonic dynasty had been "saved from total annihilation by Portuguese musketeers" (Tiruneh, 1990: 19). Once again, in line with its strategy of survival, moved its capital centre to the north-western portion of the highlands (in modern-day Gondar). This was challenges by religious disputes and secessionist tendencies of the regional nobles but was aided by transformations between 1640 and 1770 by the improvement in religious

relations, monarchy-nobility relations, and the decline of the Ottoman Empire. By the 1850s, however, there was disintegration which saw the co-existence of an feudal principalities none of whom were sovereign or independent. It is for this reason that this time is known as the "era of the princes." This situation changed with the advent of Tewodros of Gondar (ruling between 1855 to 1868) who declared himself "king of Ethiopia," and who concluded a series of campaigns and managed to assume control over most of the northern highlands, ending the era of the princes (Tiruneh, 1990: 21). Yohannis of Tigre (1868-1889) consolidated this hirtheto unconsolidated formation in the north, and subsequently extended his rule as far as the Red Sea, bringing under his control the port towns of Massawa and Arkiko (previously alternately under the Ethiopians, the Ottomans and the Egyptians):

> Egypt, which in the 19th century had replaced the Ottoman Empire as the regional power, was expelled from the area as recognised as recognised by the tripartite agreement of 1884 concluded between Yohannis, Egypt and Britain (Tiruneh, 1990: 19).

While acknowledging the power of Yohannis, Menelik of Shoa (1889-1913) was in the meantime extending his realm to the south-west, the south, and the south-east, and by so doing brought under his control territories like the Ogaden "which had never been under the jurisdiction of the kingdoms of the north" (Tiruneh, 1990: 22). After Yohannes died in battle in the modern Ethio-Sudanese frontier, Menelik inherited his throne and became the undisputed ruler of the entirety of modern-day Ethiopia (Tiruneh, 1990: 22). At the onset of the scramble for Africa, Menelik sought to participate both for survival as well as expansionary reasons. Taking advantage of the death of Yohannis, in 1890 Italy "carved out the whole of the coastal area and the tip of the northern highlands, christened it 'Eritrea', and then brought it under its control" (Tiruneh, 1990: 22). Then, in 1896, Italy declared a war on Ethiopia, "but was heavily defeated at the hands of Menelik at Adwa (Tigre)" (Tiruneh, 1990: 22). Noticeably, this was not far from what became the Eritrea-Ethiopia boundary. Menelik's apparent disinclination towards pursuing the Italians further and reclaiming Eritrea has since been a matter of debate among the Ethiopians.[6] Nevertheless, through a series of diplomatic engagements, Menelik successfully consolidated Ethiopia's borders; with France over Djibouti in 1897, with Britain over the Ethiopia-Sudan border in 1902 and the Ethio-Kenya border in 1907, and with Italy over the Ethio-Eritrea border in 1908. The former three have since held, whereas the latter

[6] Interview 4.

(Eritrea) proved less stable, and was the source of an intense civil war of independence from 1961 until 1991, and then a deadly conflict between 1998 and 2000.

The Societies of East Africa. South of the Kingdom of Axum, along the Indian Ocean, and inland from the high mountains of Ethiopia lived a kaleidoscope of peoples – with differing languages, cultures and living conditions. "Some subsisted by hunting and gathering food, others lived by raising livestock. Many of them were settlers" (Hughes, 1964: 15). Around 1,000 B.C., the Bantus-speaking farming peoples began a process of downward migration from the Niger River region and into East Africa. They were not invading hoards, however, as "they moved in small groups and moved slowly" (Legum, 1967 :106). Their main produce consisted of millet, sorghum, melons and beans. "They were also in possession of iron and stone tools with which they tilled the land in their farming. It was these Bantu peoples who spread iron-smelting techniques across Africa and spread, too, the knowledge of how to yield crops such as yams and bananas" (Hughes, 1964: 21).

A thousand years later, around the 10th century A.D., the descendants of these Bantu groups established the future Great Zimbabwe, "which was to dominate the trade route that took place along the Indian Ocean coast, known also as the Swahili Coast" (Legum, 1967: 107). From about the beginning of the 1300s to about the middle of the 1400s "Zimbabwe was the wealthiest and the most powerful state in the southern African region. Its prosperity was rooted in the gold trade and worked by the 10,000 dwelled in it" (Legum, 1967: 107). However, decline followed the fifteenth century. A large part of the decline was rooted in the migration of the populations due to agricultural pressures that made it difficult to maintain the livestock as well as grow the crops. Further north, Kilwa (in modern-day Tanzania), the richest town in East Africa, began to decline in the next 200 years. This decline was accelerated by the arrival of the Portuguese, who arrived in the year 1505 and "sacked and destroyed the city's major buildings" (Legum, 1967: 107). Such were the beginnings of the colonial interlude which was to shape future of African states. During the latter part of that century, after the slave trade was suppressed, "powerful European states increasingly eyed the resources and markets of the entire African continent for possible inclusion in their respective empires" (Lloyd, 2010a: 174). As a result, European the roughly 75 years of European colonial administration closed a chapter on Africa's relative seclusion, bringing it into the broader, Westphalian order (Lloyd, 2010a: 174).

In many parts of the continent, in such disparate polities as the Nunu in modern DRC, the Ashanti in modern Ghana, and the Zulu Kingdom in southern Africa, the rights of the sovereign were regarded as "distinguishable from the exercise of authority" such that it was not an uncommon practice for land to "belong to one person but the people to another" (Herbst, 2000: 45). Thus strangers who settled in an occupied part of a guardian's territory could continue to be governed by their own ruler "provided they recognised the ritual control of the original guardian of the land" (Herbst, 2000: 46). This explains why at the onset of colonialism, the rulers in the various African polities allowed European settlers; there was no foreshadowing. In essence, the rulers "believed they could let the whites settle on land without giving up ownership" (Herbst, 2000: 45). There were therefore "very few imperatives to develop a zero-sum understanding of demarcation of authority [based on territory]" (Herbst, 2000: 46). As we shall see – in the section which follows and in the subsequent cases under analysis – this was irreversibly changed, with still-unresolved consequences.

2.4. War in Colonial Africa: Actors and Institutions

Paul Tiyambe Zeleza's (2008) work on African warfare (*The Roots of African Conflicts: The Causes and Costs*) is a useful starting point in terms of differentiating among the types of conflict that the continent has seen; from which we then deduce the broad history of interstate African conflict which will then inform much of the rest of this work. Zeleza "provide[s] a broad historiographical survey of the typologies of wars in Africa" from which the author differentiates among four types: "imperial wars, anti-colonial wars, intra-state wars, inter-state wars, and international wars" (Zeleza, 2008: 2).

The first major considerations in the book are causes and then the composition of the actors ("perpetrators"). In other words, how the war is to be interpreted and classified is a matter of explicating both what is being fought for, where the fight is taking place, as well as the principal participants in the conflict; these two components in turn makes it either a colonial war, an intra-state war, extra state war, an international war, or indeed an interstate war. As he observes, "each of these dimensions could be singled out for analytical and classificatory purposes" (p. 3). This scholar distinguishes between five types of wars which Africa has had encounters with, "basing the distinction primarily on their political thrust and ideological tendencies" (p. 3). A caveat is made here: "it cannot be overemphasized…that in reality there are close and complex interconnections between these wars" (p. 3). But "nevertheless, the classification does have heuristic value" (p. 3). Interestingly, "for each of these typologies further subdivisions can be made" (p. 3). For example, there are argued to have been three forms of imperial war in the

African context. The first two, the First and Second World Wars, were fought when much of Africa was still under colonial rule (indeed with colonial control at its height). African involvement in the two wars consisted, first, of providing troops, second, of serving as a theatre of battles in the wars, and finally, of "mobilization of production for the war effort" (Zeleza, 2008: 3). "All in all, Africa made massive contributions to the two world wars at the expense of its own development, although the wars created the conditions and contradictions that galvanized anti-colonial nationalism" (Zeleza, 2008: 3). After the two world wars, the Cold War constitutes the third imperial war of the twentieth century "in which Africa was implicated directly and indirectly, ideologically and militarily, politically and economically" (Zeleza, 2008: 3). It started when most African countries were still under colonial rule but reached its zenith during after African states obtained their independence. Indeed, it led to "hot" proxy-wars in many parts of postcolonial Africa.

Here Zeleza's typology would appear to be overlapping between type and contingency: the two world wars and the Cold War were not types per se, but were historical developments. In other words they were episodes, and are not to be understood as categories. Nevertheless, we can deduce from this work and built on it by deducing from Zeleza two types of imperial conflict of which the two wars and the Cold War were examples: namely, extra-regional imperial war (which includes conscription, and is characterised by battles in the colonies themselves) and proxy imperial warfare.




Figure 2.1. Types of imperial wars (derived and amended from Zeleza [2008]).

The second form of conflict in the typology is anti-colonial warfare. Like imperial wars, anti-colonial wars can be further broken up into two groups. "To begin with, there were wars waged *against* the colonial conquest itself, that were later followed by wars of liberation *from* colonial rule. The first set of wars involved both conventional and guerrilla wars against invading imperial armies that often contained African troops from other territories or communities within the territory already brought to colonial heel. On the whole, strong centralized states tended to wage conventional wars and after their defeat embark on guerrilla war, while smaller and weaker states or acephalous societies resorted to guerrilla warfare from the beginning" (Zeleza, 2008: 3, emphasis in the original). The wars of liberation, were often triggered by "the obduracy of settler minority regimes supported by the Western powers in defence of global wealth and whiteness, against appeals of common sense and decades of peaceful protests by the colonized, also exacted horrendous costs" (p. 3). These were seen in Algeria, Angola and Mozambique as well as Zimbabwe and Namibia. However, the African societies were not the only ones transformed by colonialism and its conclusion; ripples were also felt back home in the various metropoles. In particular "Africa's anti-colonial wars, […] helped to bring to an end the 'age of empire' transformed European and world history" (p. 5). Noticeably, the Algeria war led to the fall of the Fourth Republic in France via constitutional amendment, while colonialism led to the fall of the fascist regime in Portugal in the advent of the Carnation Revolution (April 1974).




Figure 2.2. Anti-colonial wars in Africa (derived from Zeleza [2008]).

Africa's many postcolonial wars on the other hand have taken two concrete types: intra- and inter-state wars (Zeleza, 2008: 6), which in turn can be further subdivided. In terms of their objectives and how they have presented themselves in the continent's history, we can distinguish between six types of intra-state wars: these are "secessionist wars, irredentist wars, wars of devolution, wars of regime change, wars of social banditry, and armed inter-communal insurrections" (Zeleza, 2008: 6). By secessionist wars, we refer to those wars which were "fomented by groups or regions that seek to secede from the postcolonial polity and establish an independent nation-state. The most famous example is that of the secession of the Igbo-dominated provinces in south-eastern Nigeria that proclaimed an independent republic of Biafra, which triggered the civil war that cost Nigeria dearly in terms of the numbers of people who died – up to a million – not to mention the destruction of material resources and the social and political capital of inter-ethnic and inter-religious relations, national cohesion, and democratic governance" (Zeleza, 2008: 6-7). Irredentist wars, on the other hand, are generated "when a group in one country seeks to be united or reunited with the country to which it is ethnically or historically related" (Zeleza, 2008: 6-7). "Struggles by Somalis in Kenya and Ethiopia wishing for unification with Somalia constitute the best known cases of irredentist conflicts and wars" (p. 7). The Somali government often gave aid to Somali ethnic rebels in the neighbouring states, "thereby turning irredentist claims and conflicts into inter-state wars, as was the case during the Somali-Ethiopian wars over the Somali-populated Ogaden region of Ethiopia" in 1977-78 (Zeleza, 2008: 7), which is one of the case studies in this dissertation.

Wars of devolution on the other hand, come about from attempts by the ethnically and/or religiously marginalised "to renegotiate the terms of incorporation into the state and the national political space and their objective is decentralization rather than outright secession" (Zeleza, 2008: 6-7). The previously touched-on case of Sudan is such an example, as in the immediate post-colonial period it was resolved by the granting of self-rule to the South. When this was abrogated by the central government, which also imposed Sharia law on the majority Christian South, in 1983. This was once again brokered through another interim power devolution scheme at whose conclusion would come a referendum, with independence as the matter in question. The penultimate type of intrastate war are "wars of regime change," which are those often "engineered by self-described revolutionary movements that seek to overthrow the existing government and establish a new socio-economic dispensation, including conditions and content of citizenship" (Zeleza, 2008: 8). An important example is the National Resistance Movement-Army (NRM-A) of Yoweri Museveni, which captured power in Uganda

in 1986 (Zeleza, 2008: 9). These have often led not to state reconstruction as in Uganda and Ethiopia after 1991, "but rather to state retrenchment or even collapse, as in Somalia" (Zeleza, 2008: 8).

By wars of social banditry Zeleza is referring to those acts of violence that are socially organized against the state and other social institutions, "with the objective not of capturing state power as such but of creating chaotic conditions that are conducive to predatory accumulation" (Zeleza, 2008: 8). Warlords and 'terrorists' became interchangeable in some parts of Sierra Leone, Liberia and the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), "but the inability of some of these groups to capture and restructure state power might be an indication of their very banditry, of their *lack of interest* in exercising state power" (Zeleza, 2008: 8). Finally,

> armed inter-communal insurrections are often episodic eruptions of violence, sparked by specific incidents that stoke long simmering antagonisms, anxieties and aggressions. They can lead to great loss of life and if unchecked can mutate into prolonged warfare between ethnic and regional militias, which in turn can develop into guerrilla armies that threaten the viability of the nation-state. The periodic explosions of genocidal violence in Rwanda and Burundi, demonstrated most horrifically in the Rwandan genocide of 1994, show the potential destructiveness of intercommunal conflicts abetted by the state and reinforced by the devastations of economic stagnation, as well as the politicization and manipulation of ethnic differences by a cynical and bankrupt political class (Zeleza, 2008: 8).

In the post-colonial era, the continent has also undergone inter-state wars, although on a far lesser scale than other regions and, much less compared to their intrastate counterparts. One can distinguish, in terms of the combatants involved, "between bilateral wars and multilateral wars" (Zeleza, 2008: 3). Wars of the former sort consist of the Somali-Ethiopian, the Tanzania-Uganda, and the Eritrea-Ethiopian wars; on the other hand, wars of the latter sort include "the multilateral wars are illustrated by the multinational war over the DRC" (Zeleza, 2008: 3).

This dissertation focuses on the dyadic forms of interstate conflict, and will therefore assess the Somali-Ethiopian, Tanzania-Uganda and Eritrea-Ethiopian wars in turn, utilising the theoretically derived variables determined in the next chapter. Therefore, having defined interstate war both by what defines it and by what sets it apart from other forms of conflict, and subsequently visited the history of interstate warfare in Africa, the next chapter turns to a discussion of the theoretical lenses to be used in this dissertation. That *theoretical unbundling*, however, is preceded by a discussion on the necessity of multivariate analysis as well as

typological theorising such that the way is paved for findings which accommodate some or all of the theoretical variables in explaining each war and all the wars collectively.

CHAPTER 3

Theoretical and Methodological Framework

3.1. Introduction

Given the range and diversity of Africa's wars, it stands to reason that their causes are as varied and complex as their courses and consequences (Zeleza, 2008: 15). As the previous chapter discussed, the process of studying conflict is underscored by the goal of understanding and describing their causes. It therefore stands to reason that Africa's wars are products of multiple causes and contexts. On seeking the general causation of interstate conflicts, especially, we find numerous studies, but also a general lack of theoretical investigation through quantitative methods which could give rise to a general or typological theory along the specific theories being proposed in this study.

To be sure, and as will be noted in the review below, substantial seminal theoretical work on African interstate conflict has been done by numerous scholars which will be reviewed in the sections which follow in this chapter. Far from overlooking these works, this dissertation will make constant corroborations or amendments as relevant. This is to make use of some newly accessed data and at the same time build on the existing literature with the goal of synthesising the various variables and reaching comprehensive explanations of the wars and of the theories in relation to each other. "Standardized theoretical and methodological constraints of this kind are designed to render all claims provisional and to structure the intersubjective evaluation of such claims" (Moravcsik, 2003: 134). This is made possible through theoretical dialogue in the form of sequencing (Jupille, Caporaso and Checkel, 2003: 22). The goal of this dissertation is to therefore test three specific theories that focus on domestic institutions and domestic audiences, economic interdependence and regional hegemony in light of newly accumulated historical data as well as available trade and military expenditure data as well as from the 19 interviews with former mediators, government officials and experts, and in turn sequence these theories according to their particular relevance where more than one is deemed to be relevant. These consisted of participants with expertise/experience on Ethiopia (9), Eritrea (4), Kenya (4), Russia (in terms of its relations with Africa) (3), Somalia (2), Tanzania (3), and Uganda (3). Importantly, some individuals had overlapping expertise and experience across the countries, state-to-state relations and the conflicts and their aftermaths.

This chapter will now turn to discussing the three theories being assessed in this dissertation, with a view to discussing each theory's composite claims. The chapter will then detail the general methodology to be used to test the theories. Each chapter then turns to unbundling the core variables of the three theories in the manner in which they will be tested in Chapters 4, 5, 6 and 7.

3.2. Conceptualising the Democratic Peace Thesis

States behave differently to each other based on their regime types. Democracies behave differently toward each other compared to non-democracies. For this reason, scholars have observed what is widely characterised as a "democratic peace". This stems from the observed pattern that democratic polities rarely fight each other though appearing about as likely to engage in disputes generally. Zeev Maoz (1997) sought to provide proof that the DPT was universally valid. Moaz made the argument that both democracy between two states had substantially decreased the likelihood of conflicts erupting when potential causes of dispute existed between them. Making use of the European and the Americas, he found that "these dyads reduced their conflict involvement significantly when they became democratic" (1997: 162). Accordingly, it is argued that "the process of democratization seemingly coincided with the emergence of the North Atlantic security community," and "some of the changes to joint democracy took place well before the formation of the security community, and when this happened conflict levels declined substantially" (Maoz, 1997: 181). Democratisation is argued to have substantially improved the historically bellicose relations between the US and Britain as well as France and Britain. This is also argued to apply to post-WWI Germany under the democratic Weimer Republic constitution during which time its long-held rivals (France and Russia) "dropped significantly" (Maoz, 1997: 181). Indeed, since the early 1980s, the datum that democracies do not wage war with one another has been regarded "as close as anything we have to an empirical law in international relations" (Levy, 1989: 88). With most of the academy convinced of the democratic peace, there are nonetheless debates around why it is (Marwala and Lagazio, 2011: 3-5). Specifically debated is why democracy produces peace.

A strong variant in the literature argues that domestic political factors explain the relative absence of military violence among these states. "States sharing republican norms may be more willing to bargain, compromise" well as "[fulfil] contracts than states without these norms" (Owen, 1994: 93-98). Thus whereas neorealism argues that states make war considerations based on capabilities, this variation of the liberal democratic peace thesis argues that the first consideration they make is whether the state they are interacting with is democratic or not. In

this regard, liberal states are determined to be more peaceable towards one another is that because they know themselves to be "reasonable, predictable, and trustworthy because they are governed by their citizens' true interests, which harmonize with all individuals' true interests around the world," they therefore "understand the intentions of foreign liberal democracies, and that those intentions are always pacific toward fellow liberal democracies" (Owen, 1994: 95). This grounds some liberal scholars' insistence on a qualified typology of democracies as some democracies may have the formal processes of democracy, but be led by a government that lacks the foundational liberal principles which are argued to make liberal policymakers "believe that individuals everywhere are fundamentally the same, and are best off pursuing self-preservation and material well-being" (Owen, 1994: 89). Thus even when war threats are made, illiberal leaders would not be able to "rally the public to fight," as well as make them "fear that an unpopular war would lead to their ouster in the next election" (Owen, 1994: 89). Alternately, and possibly where the norms fail to encourage a passive self-restraint on the part of the regime, democratic institutions may constrain leaders from using force against leaders who are likewise constrained (Owen, 1994: 99-101). According to this structural/institutional model,

> democracies keep mutual peace because of the constitutional checks and balances that tie the hands of decision-makers and the whole complex of structure of democratic civil society (Bueno de Mesquita, and Lalman 1992).

The institutional constraints on a leader's actions "signify that the decision-makers are likely to face high political costs for using force in its diplomacy" (Bueno de Mesquita, and Lalman 1992). Moreover,

> democratically elected leaders are unable to act quickly on account of the separation of powers, and this cautious foreign policy behaviour reduces the likelihood that a conflict will escalate to war (Russett, 1993: 92).

According to Bruce Russett (1993: 164), the basis of the "democratic peace" can be broken down into: the monadic proposition and the dyadic proposition. These two propositions are differentiated by the degree of importance they place on the regime type of the targeted state. The monadic proposition "simply suggests that the more democratic the state, the less violent its behaviour toward all other states, including both democracies and non-democracies, will be" (Rummel, 1995: 457). Most quantitative works done on the monadic proposition seem to have supported the argument. Rummel (1995: 457) therefore argues that "democracies are in fact the most pacific of regimes because costly and unsuccessful wars can increase a leader's

chances of losing his or her position, which makes leaders in democracies less likely to initiate wars that are expected to be severely violent or that are likely to have high overall costs." Others have likewise found that "democratic states are less likely to escalate disputes into wars, which has been confirmed by others, who suggested that domestic political structures constrain democratic leaders from choosing war as a foreign policy" (Clifton and Schwebach. 1992: 305).

According to the dyadic proposition, "democratic states do not wage war *with each other* while they are no less war-prone than other types of states" (Doyle, 1986: 1161; emphasis added). In opposition to the monadic proposition, this proposition suggests that "the regime type of the opponent will crucially affect war decision and democratic states can be war-prone when facing non-democratic counterparts" (Doyle, 1986: 1161). Hostility toward non-democratic states is more likely because it is easier to mobilise public support for military actions because non-democratic governments are "in a state of aggression with their own people," which makes "their foreign relations deeply suspect for democratic governments" (Doyle, 1986: 1161).

Assumed within these tests is that the leaders have their tenures of office under threat should they take on an unpopular war. However, Chiozza and Goemans (2004) "find the probability of an incumbent retaining office is statistically unrelated to her country's involvement in an interstate war." In a follow up study which differentiated between democratically elected and autocratic leaders, these same scholars found that "conflict participation did not alter the probability that a democratic leader will experience either a regular or a forcible removal from office" (Chiozza and Goemans, 2011). However, "autocratic leaders who initiate conflicts decrease their likelihood of both regular and irregular removal from power, as long as they do not subsequently lose an ensuing war" (Chiozza and Goemans, 2011).

In light of these apparent inconsistencies, Carter (2017: 1771) argues that a "largely overlooked feature of interstate war is costlier for democratic leaders than dictators: economic mobilization for war." Weeks argues that "waging interstate war is associated with higher military spending and, often, lower social spending. Variation across regime type in the representation of the general public, civilian elite, and military in leaders' winning coalitions should make democrats more likely than dictators to lose power given wartime patterns of government spending" (Carter, 2017: 1768). The basis of this is to be found on the 1950-2001 dataset which is utilised by Carter. "Between 1950 and 2001, countries fighting in an interstate war allocated, on average, 6.8 percent of their annual gross domestic product (GDP) to military spending, while

countries at peace spent only 2.5 percent of their annual GDP on the military" (Carter, 2017: 1772).

> On average, governments distributed 75.4 percent of expenditures to non-military programs during peacetime but only 50.1 percent to non-military spending when they were fighting an interstate war during the period from 1950 to 2001. This reduction in non-military expenditures often includes cuts to social spending. From 1960 to 1999, governments allocated 16.2 percent less of their annual GDP to health care spending during an interstate war than they did during peacetime…Thus, the increase in military spending associated with war mobilization often is accompanied with a decrease in the proportion of expenditures dedicated to non-military spending. (Carter, 2017: 1772).

Carter takes the above to imply that "the spending patterns associated with mobilization for interstate war should be politically costlier for a democratic leader than a dictator" (p. 1772). Indeed, the findings suggest that mobilisation for war did increase the chances that "a democratic leader loses power to a greater degree than the probability a nondemocratic leader is removed from office" (Carter, 2017: 1769). This is because "an incumbent's prospects of retaining office are linked to her winning coalition's assessment of how she spends the resources available to her" (Carter, 2017: 1769). The diversion of expenditure should therefore threaten the longevity of a government if the costs of the war are incurred by the population (either in new taxes or in the reduction of social amenities) and/or outweigh the prospective gains to be made in such a war.

The dissertation will seek to apply a test of Owen's thesis that democracies do not initiate war due to a lack of institutional constraints by determining whether, if at all, the countries which were the initiators of conflict did so at the behest of a lack of institutional constraints on the executive. Scores in a governance index will be drawn on, along with insights from interviews, archival materials, and contemporaneous literature. But prior to turning to the methodology, it is worth reviewing the literature on Africa and the democratic peace thesis. Specifically, how have the various tenets of the democratic peace been argued to manifest or not manifest themselves in the African continent? Indeed, some scholars have argued that the theory does not hold on the continent. This is turned to in the section which follows below.

3.1.1. The democratic peace thesis and Africa

Despite much of the democratic peace thesis' wide acclaim, there is nonetheless a rarity of tests conducted on the African continent; indeed "quantitative analyses have rarely disaggregated the democratic peace by region" (Henderson, 2008: 25). In essence one of the remaining

"holes" in the democratic peace thesis is indeed an early critique by Cohen (1994) who had written of the democratic peace not being evident in other regions outside the West and the Americas (Cohen, 1994: 207).

Nevertheless, he has found "the existence of a general law of behaviour that democracies as a class do not fight each other has not been demonstrated." However, this study itself was based only on an Asian case study. In assessing regions, he argued that in the world outside of Europe, including Africa, central America, the Middle East and North Africa as well as Australasia "the absence of war [was] less significant than the global statistics might suggest" (Cohen, 1994: 207). He noted that "the democratic states in these regions rarely have the means or opportunity to fight each other" (Cohen, 1994: 207). He advanced other causes for the absence of interstate war in Africa apart from democracy; in the end resorting to US hegemony as an explanatory factor (Cohen, 1994: 207). For Cohen, it is only "the North Atlantic/Western Europe area" that is "both democratic and pacific" where simultaneously "virtually all states possessed the means, motive and opportunity for violent conflict" and there has been no interstate war in the post-WWII era (Cohen, 1994: 207). As previously seen, Maoz (1997: 108) has made the response that the democratic peace is "global phenomenon," and "the effect of democracy on conflict and war in these dyads is identical to the effect of the North Atlantic culture." He makes use of the examples of Peru and Ecuador, Chile and Argentina, Braziland Argentina. Further, he asserts that while India and Pakistan have had wars break out between each other, "none of these wars occurred when both members of these dyads were democratic," and that "Chile and Peru, and Brazil and Argentina, show similar effects" (Maoz, 1997: 108).

Against this background, Henderson's (2008) article reviews and tests "the applicability of the democratic peace thesis to sub-Saharan African states" (Henderson, 2008: 25). In the final analysis, he suggests that "the domestic political framework of African states compels their leaders to engage in international conflict, contrary to what the democratic peace thesis suggests." Accordingly, "empirical analyses of state dyads 1950–2001 demonstrate that politically open African states are more likely to fight each other and, moreover, the democratic peace does not hold in any region outside the West" (Henderson, 2008: 25). Henderson's findings suggest that the African continent inverts the democratic peace thesis, with the undemocratic states being the least likely, especially compared to their more legitimate counterparts, to engage in international campaigns:

> With their domestic legitimacy contested, neopatrimonial leaders generally demur from deploying their troops abroad out of fear that it will leave their urban centres vulnerable to

> insurgency in an African context wherein those who control the capital city can largely control the country…It follows, then, that African states characterized by higher levels of legitimacy are the least constrained from sending their troops abroad to fight and, therefore, are more likely to become involved in international conflicts (Henderson, 2008: 34).

This links to the notion of diversionary conflicts undertaken by leaders and what may lie at the root of these for different types of regimes. Numerous analyses have found that according to regime types, "*mature democracies*, *consolidating autocracies* and *transitional governments* are the only regime types that are likely to use diversionary force" (Panel, 2017: 334-335). Building on earlier works, Mitchell and Thyne (2010) found that, "generally, states are more likely to initiate a militarized dispute if they are involved in a contentious issue claim (such as a territorial dispute), but that this likelihood is even higher when the initiating state also has high levels of inflation (thus, indicating the possibility of diversionary tactics)." Sophie Panel (Panel, 2017: 3345) has likewise asserted that "diversionary tactics are more likely to be used by states within the context of a rivalry or a contentious issue claim, such as a territorial dispute." Brian Lai and Dan Slater take this model further, and highlight that military governments are more likely to take up diversionary behaviour because of their instability, combined with a lack of accountability:

> Lacking a strong party infrastructure that would help them enhance social control, enforce policies, and secure their tenure, dictators backed by the military have often no choice but to resort to extreme measures—such as the initiation of an interstate conflict—to avoid being violently removed from power (Lai and Slater, 2011: 303).

There is still some debate, however, over whether their aggressive behaviour is owed to the smallness of the "winning coalition" in these sorts of regimes (which removes any constraints against the regime leaders), "or whether personalization is simply an epiphenomenon of military influence" (Panel, 2017: 334). Looking particularly at authoritarian regimes in the 1975-2006 time period, Panel (2017) assessed "the relative impact of the leader's affiliation to the military, the military's influence on policies, and the regime's vulnerability to coups on the risk that an autocratic leader initiates a MID" (Panel, 2017: 334). The findings made revealed that, "on the whole, the primary cause underlying the relationship between military regime and militarized interstate dispute is coup risk" (Panel, 2017: 334). The military background of the leader was found to not be a factor, whereas military influence appeared to minimise the changes of a country initiating a military interstate dispute (Panel, 2017: 334-335).

Peceny, Beer, and Shannon-Terry (2002: 15) have likewise insisted that "personalist dictatorships are substantially more constrained than either military or single-party regimes." Peceny and his colleagues' (2002) "autocratic peace" theory has been argued to be useful in explaining the comparative rarity of interstate conflict on the African continent. However, the continent has a mixture of democracies and autocracies, and, further, even among the autocracies, it is still worth noting that they are autocratic in different ways. Further, this has further been amended by Henderson when he argues that rational self-preservation by the lack of domestically secure regimes curtails their capability for interstate campaigns, whereas their more legitimate counterparts "including some democracies" may in fact "be more inclined to fight (including fighting each other)" (Henderson, 2008: 35).

Given these debates, this dissertation tests the relevance of the democratic peace thesis in three specific cases. Chapters 4, 5, and 6 of this dissertation will therefore seek to test the theory and determine the veracity of the findings and conjectures discussed in the preceding sections of this chapter. The methodology for conducting such tests is detailed in section 3.4 of this chapter.

3.2. Economic Interdependence-Peace Thesis Conceptualised

While the previous section focused on DPT, which emphasises the internal, political causes of war, another theory, also within broader liberal paradigm, emphasises the role of economics. To be sure, conflict is an economic phenomenon, with opportunity cost implications. The International Peace Bureau observes that "while the level of global military expenditure is today higher than ever, at an estimated $1738 billions per annum, many states fail to increase their foreign development aid to the UN target of 0.7% of GDP, and to tackle effectively their economic and social development challenges" (IPB, 2012: 3). To counter these imbalances, the International Peace Bureau "advocates general reductions in excessive military spending and a shift of resources to projects addressing human needs, both domestic and international" (IPB, 2012: 3). This advocacy, however, was foreshadowed by 1981 General Assembly Resolution on the 'Reduction of the Military Budget' (35/142), which had never been fully implemented.

As early as 18th century French political philosopher Montesquieu (who in his 1748 work, *The Spirit of the Laws*, argued that "movable wealth" encouraged "peace between and within states"), scholars have advanced the view that "peace is a positive externality of global commerce" (Gartzke, Li and Boehmer, 2001: 392). In Book 20 of the same tract, in a chapter titled 'Of the Spirit of Commerce,' Montesquieu (1748: 346) also went on to further state that

"peace is the natural effect of trade. Two nations who traffic with each other become reciprocally dependent; for if one has an interest in buying, the other has an interest in selling: and thus their union is founded on their mutual necessities." Evidence in recent years appears to validate such observations (D'Anieri, 2013: 65). These studies do indeed link interstate trade with reductions in militarized disputes or wars among the relevant dyads (D'Anieri, 2013: 72). The European Union in particular, insofar as it has led to interdependence among the European states, is argued to have led to a state of passivity.

> In the 75-year period between 1870 and 1945, for example, France and Germany fought each other three times with huge loss of life. The history of modern European integration commenced in earnest with the realization in the early 1950s that the best way to prevent future conflict is to secure more economic and political integration. This led to the establishment of the European Coal and Steel Community in 1951, followed shortly by the European Economic Community (EEC) in 1957 (Batten and Kearney, 2006: 1).

The signing of the Treaty of Maastricht in 1992 led to the renaming of the body into the European Union, and also set in motion the economic and monetary union (EMU), and finally, the introduction of the euro currency in 2002 used by, at the onset, 12 member states (Batten and Kearney, 2006: 2).

Present debates however are around *how* precisely the independent variable of trade leads to the outcome variable that is interstate peace. In 1999 Han Dorussen had demonstrated that "numerous potential trading partners combined with barriers increase the incentives to engage in military contests" (Dorussen, 1999: 443). Papayoanou ([1999] in a work with insights also relevant to hegemonic stability theory as detailed in the succeeding section) contends that "economic linkages act as signals of resolve and credibility: because domestic economic actors in status quo states only support conflicts that protect their interests, these states are more easily constrained from balancing against revisionist states with which they share economic relations" (Papayoanou, 1999: 16). Interdependence may also affect conflict indirectly "by transforming state preferences in such a way that states no longer desire to compete" (Solingen, 1998: 9). Solingen (1998: 9) argues that "domestic coalitions with internationalist preferences may forge cross-national bonds at the regional level, facilitating greater economic interdependence and prosperity." State preferences will converge, "producing regional zones of peace." Finally, Gartzke, Li, and Boehmer (2001: 391) have asserted that "the risk of disrupting economic linkages—particularly access to capital—may occasionally deter minor contests between interdependent states, but at the same time that such opportunity costs will typically fail to

preclude militarized disputes." Thus they offer an extended mechanism: arguing instead that interdependence presents "nonmilitarized avenues for communicating resolve through costly signaling" (Gartzke, Li and Boehmer 2001: 392).

3.2.1. African Context

For their part, leaders on the sub-Saharan portion of the continent have been vocal on the need for and the prospects carried by increased regional integration and intra-African trade (Moshoeshoe, 2012: 2). The notion of development at the regional level being generated "by leaders who have done so badly in national development of their states" has been questioned by some scholars, however (Henderson, 2015: 235).

> In reality, the prospects for trade-based growth were low from the start, given that intra-African trade was largely competitive and asymmetrical, there was negligible intramural trade prior to the formation of RTAs, and factor endowments were not sufficiently different (Henderson, 2015: 240).

Indeed Elbadawi's (1997: 241) earlier work showed that growth had only been seen in the short term and that "by and large, the experience of regional integration in SSA has been a failure." Khadiagala (2001: 149) likewise observed that the continent's "weak" states were hindered by their "fragile bases for regionalism." Lee (2003: 3) argued that this is "symptomatic of a larger problem, which is the failure of African leaders and their governments to make a political commitment to regionalism." For Henderson, regional initiatives are only pursued as regime-guaranteeing "clubs"" (2014: 243), which are in practice "institutional facades more than functioning institutions" (Henderson, 2015: 244).

These works occur against the backdrop of some works, for example Mansfield, Pevehouse and Bearce (2000), who argue that membership in international governmental organisations (IGOs) "has a pacifying impact on international relations." These scholars argue that RTAs "help to mute military tensions by generating expectations of future economic gains" and "since the outbreak of hostilities threatens to scuttle these gains, participants in the same RTA have reason to avoid involvement in military conflict" (Mansfield, Pevehouse, and Bearce, 2000: 801-802). "Even if trade flows are sparse and states actually derive few economic gains from membership…preferential groupings can reduce the prospect of hostilities if participants anticipate that sizeable economic benefits will be forthcoming" (Mansfield, Pevehouse and Bearce, 2000: 780). It is argued that members of these regional institutions avoid conflict with each other because "interstate conflict can hamper the ability of states to realise these *expected*

gains from RTA membership by undermining commitments to sustain commercial liberalisation, inhibiting investments by firms that are reluctant to operate in unstable regions, and damaging the bargaining power of members in negotiations with the third parties" (Mansfield, Pevenhouse, and Bearce, 2000: 780; emphasis added). Furthermore, RTAs "establish a forum for bargaining and negotiation among members, thereby facilitating the resolution of interstate tension prior to the outbreak of open hostilities" (Mansfield, Pevenhouse, and Bearce, 2000: 781).

In a paper titled 'Regional Trade Agreements as Military Alliances', Kathy Powers (2004) agrees with this argument but amends it in two steps. Firstly, she tested the role of the form/type of RTAs on the likelihood of conflict breaking out among their members Secondly, she applied them to non-western contexts. Powers' findings indicate that membership in a regional trade association does drastically reduce the probability of a military interstate dispute outbreak; however, this is only true for those RTAs that simultaneously had security provisions. This therefore modifies Mansfield et al.'s thesis so that it is only specific types of RTAs that lead to decreased MIDs (Powers, 2004: 383). For Franke (2009: 64) the rationale for the inclusion of security protocols in RTAs in the continent include the following: "the deterioration of Africa's security landscape given the declining interest of the superpowers, non-African IGOs, and the OAU/AU to get involved in and help resolve African conflicts following the end of the Cold War; the successful precedent of the ECOMOG intervention in Liberia"; also important is the apparent endorsement "of regional approaches to security by the UN and other international actors." At the same time, "conflict prone states may be more likely to insist on security protocols among RTA members before the joining or the creation of such protocols after joining" (Henderson, 2015: 245). Moreover, the further pacifying impact of RTAs does not seem to result from heightened trade within the region, as Henderson posits that with increased trade there is also increased probability of conflict within a dyad. This is turned to below.

3.2.1.1. When trade may lead to conflict in Africa

In her paper, Powers (2006: 467) notes that "intra-African trade is dominated by primary products and other largely competitive products and other largely competitive rather than complementary goods; and that trade asymmetries lead to skewed distributions of the gains from trade, which may generate trade disputes and broader conflicts." Thus, contrary to the Mansfield-Pevehouse-Bearce conjecture that trade reduces conflict in Africa, and trade within African RTAs specifically "reduces conflict even more", Powers instead asserts that "African

RTAs are not reducing conflict in this way because interstate trade in Africa is associated with an increased likelihood of interstate conflict" (Powers, 2006: 467). As we have already noted, Powers' contribution is that RTAs need to be thought of in terms of typological terms – that it is their manner of institutional design that determines whether or not they will lead to reduced conflict, with security-based RTAs being the most likely to lead to reduced MIDs. Important here also is the fact that "African regionalisation that has been [neopatrimonial] African governments rather than domestic business interests, civil society groups, or other domestic constituencies" (Henderson, 2015: 243). While "organised corporate groups" were the ones to give an impetus to – or in the very least participate in the formation of – the EU and NAFTA, "African governments often remain the principal advocates of [African] regional integration" (UNECA, 2006: 9). Thus, trade which should ideally forge regional security "was largely bypassed for that which would generate rents for leaders to support their patronage networks" (Henderson, 2015: 240). Another factor worth considering is the fact that "it is much easier to import goods from outside the continent than from within" (UNECA, 2006: 55-56; UNECA, 2017). This is further compounded by the fact that African countries participate in more than one regional associations at a time. These "multiple memberships make it difficult for them [governments] to meet their contributions and obligations to the various regional economic communities" and "[a]nother 23% say that multiple memberships are the reason behind low implementation of their programmes" (Henderson, 2015: 243).

"If this trade is dominated by a narrow range of largely competitive goods – as is the case for much of the intramural trade between sub-Saharan African states – then it may actually encourage trade disputes and increased international tensions between states" (Henderson, 2015: 243). In this regard, UNECA findings suggest that "for most African countries, the structure of trade over the past 40 years" between 1964 and 2004 were characterised by "[a] commodity structure of exports dominated by primary commodities…[a] heavy concentration of exports (more than 80%, mostly primary commodities) and imports (a similar share) in markets in Europe, Asia, and North America" (UNECA, 2017: 2). "The low product diversity in their trade portfolios results in the overwhelming competitiveness rather than complementarity of intramural African trade," says Henderson (2014: 243) who offers no historical examples, however.

This dissertation will engage with the East African Community, which sought to increase trade in East Africa (in which Uganda and Tanzania were members). In the 1999 EAC treaty's preamble, the following are identified as reasons for the breakup of the first Community:

> [T]he main reasons contributing to the collapse of the East African Community being lack of strong political will, lack of strong participation of the private sector and civil society in the co-operation activities, the continued disproportionate sharing of benefits of the Community among the Partner States due to their differences in their levels of development and lack of adequate policies to address this situation (Ministry of East African Community, 1999).

External trade is also important to interstate conflict in Africa for another reason. In the twentieth century, "Third World wars [were] fought almost exclusively with imported weapons" (Rosh, 1990). This was in following of earlier work by Sherwin (1983) who had assessed a numerous MIDs and outright wars together with arms transfers in 87 "Third World states" in the near-decade period between 1967 and 1976 and identified a "covariance (but not causal relationships) between arms acquisitions and conflict." A more recent study by Craft and Smaldone (2003) "indicate[s] that the relationship between weapons transfers and war is stronger in sub-Saharan Africa than the literature on the region indicates, and should be included as an integral element in more comprehensive models of conflict" (Craft and Smaldone, 2003: 37).

In effect, this indicates that we should not overlook the role of extramural trade into the continent, especially as the states in the continent appear to be more economically tethered to the outside world than within the continent itself, especially in terms of military equipment, and in some instances military personnel as well. This therefore necessitates consideration not only of the presence or absence of trade *between* two African adversaries, but also the significance of external trade partners, many of whom are outside the continent. This global/systematic-related analysis may therefore be linked to the third cell of our typology; hegemony, about whose effects on interstate conflict in the world much debate persists.

3.3. Conceptualising Hegemonic Stability

As shown in Chapter 2, the phenomenon of interstate war in Africa is attributable to numerous reasons. This influenced the stance of working towards a typological theory, which could accommodate the various causal claims of various theories at various levels of analysis. Notably, then, the cases frequently indicated that there was role for the external world in these conflicts, with many seemingly seeking to play peace-making roles. Evidently, none did. There then appears to have been a lack of a regional power willing or capable of using means at its disposal to halt the bellicosity of the states which initiated the conflicts. Thus, Chapter 7 will seek to determine why that may have been and provide evidence for the claims that it makes. Importantly, this assists the dissertation achieve the goal of comprehensiveness, by utilising

insights from liberal theories (i.e., democratic peace and economic interdependence) and, through the hegemonic stability theory, realism.

While liberalism depends on trade interdependence to produce world peace, other political science/international relations theories suggest that stability can be guaranteed through power distribution. Particularly, some scholars argue that "when power is distributed unevenly, it is often the result of hegemony, defined as a situation in which a single powerful state controls or dominates the lesser states in the system" (Gilpin, 1981: 29). Political hegemony is defined as the ability of a state "being able to dominate the world militarily" (Goldstein, 1988: 281). Theoretically, it has been suggested that the existence of a hegemonic state in the otherwise anarchic international order "is an ingredient for stability" (D'Anieri, 2013: 72; Ogunnubi and Okeke-Uzodike, 2016: 110). The hegemonic stability theory (HST) holds that "a world order dominated by a single country will be most stable and will have the most open economic order" (Ogunnubi and Okeke-Uzodike, 2016: 110). According to Kindleberger, a peaceful international order requires "a country which is prepared, consciously or unconsciously, under some system of rules it has internationalized, to set standards of conduct for other countries; and to seek to get others to follow them" (Kindleberger 1973: 28).

Hegemony rests on two pillars: military power and economic power. "Military power and economic power certainly are not synonymous with one another, but each is dependent upon the other. In order to forge and maintain a hegemonic order, a hegemon must possess certain requisite military capabilities" (Sachse, 1989: 7). For example, "it must be able to prevent other states from using military power to limit access to its key markets" (Sachse, 1989: 7). Stephen Krasner states that "where there are dramatic asymmetries between the capabilities of the hegemon and weaker states, the hegemon may use military power to coerce the weaker states to adopt an open trading structure" (Krasner 1976: 322). However, he emphasizes that "force is not a very efficient means of changing economic policies, and that it is particularly unlikely that force will be utilized to change the policies of medium-sized states" (Krasner 1976: 322). Robert Keohane also noted that it was more difficult in the contemporary world "for a hegemon to use military power directly to attain its economic policy objectives with its military partners and allies" (Keohane 1984: 40).

George Modelski asserted that the world system can be viewed as having gone through a series of hegemonic cycles "with an average period of just over one hundred years" (Modelski, 1978:

217). Modelski states that each cycle starts with the advent of a weak system, that then results in a ("global") war that involves all the major contenders:

> The result of such a global war is the emergence of one world power that is preponderant and thus able to dominate the system and maintain systemic order. Ultimately, the dominant power loses ground relative to competitors, and eventually the system again disintegrates, resulting in global war (Modelski, 1978: 217).

According to Modelski, the cycles have included the following:

> the period of domination by Portugal from 1494 through 1576-1580; domination by The Netherlands (United Provinces) from 1609 through 1672-1678; a first period of British domination from 1713 through the late 1700s; a second period of British domination from 1815 through 1939; and a period of U.S. domination beginning in 1945 (Modelski, 1978: 217).

The Modelski thesis though not universally agreed to is adhered to by a significant amount of the scholarship. Overall, there are no major disagreements over the period of the Netherlands/United Provinces, or the second British period, or even the US-dominated cycle. However, there is some debate (e.g., Keohane 1984) over the Portuguese as well as what Modalski terms "the first British period." There is also dispute over the precise end of the second British period, with some scholars placing its end in 1939, rather than 1945 as seemingly implied by Modelski.[7] Critically, Keohane advances the litmus condition that a hegemonic player "be able to protect the international political economy that it dominates from incursions by hostile adversaries" (1984: 39). In line with this, he notes that "a state need not be dominant militarily world-wide in order to be hegemonic" (1984: 41). Accordingly, "neither British power in the nineteenth century, or American power in the decades following World War II, ever reached such a level" (1984: 42). For much of the 1800s, the UK was constantly under challenge from would-be powers in the continent; particularly Napoleonic France, and then unified Germany. By indicating zones of impenetrability by a powerful state, this brings to the fore the concept of regional hegemony; that regardless of the global situation, regions are defined by their own order through which the dominant power "out there" must at least be modulated by and filter through in the respective regional contexts.

[7] Notably, one of the first cracks in the British formation was in Africa, in the form of the Anglo-Boer War, which, though the Dominion lost, marked the beginnings of South Africa's ascendance as a unified and then major regional player.

3.3.1. Regional Hegemony

"Regional powers can have an impact on their regions in both cooperative and confrontational ways. Much has been written regarding the potential of regional powers in Africa to effectively arrest conflict and underdevelopment on the continent" (Ogunnubi and Okeke-Uzodike, 2016: 110). Among the earliest attempts to define regional hegemony is work by Østerud (1992). Østerud (1992: 12) conceptualised to a type of actor termed a "regional great power". These would be states that are "geographically part of a delineated region; able to stand up against any coalition of other states in the region; highly influential in regional affairs; and, contrary to a middle power, might also be a great power on the world scale in addition to its regional standing" (Østerud, 1992: 12). Lemke (2002: 49) likewise conceptualised regional hegemony as "local dominant states supervising local relations by establishing and striving to preserve a local status quo."

Flemes (2007: 11) distinguishes regional hegemons by using four vital gauges: "claim to leadership, power resources, employment of foreign policy instruments and acceptance of leadership." Assuming the role of "regional leadership" is taken to mean that such a state has seen itself fit for "the responsibility of entrenching peace and stability and crafting policies for economic initiatives" (Flemes 2007: 11). In similar fashion, Kappel (2011: 275), describes a regional hegemon as "a country that has unrivalled economic strength 'in a given region,' the influence of which extends from regional to global proportions" (Flemes 2007: 11). According to Douglas Lemke,

> Regional hegemons can be identified by the assumption of a stabilising and leading role, and the acceptance of this role by neighbouring states. Similarly, regional hegemons…have also been conceived as states that are influential and powerful in certain geographic regions or subregions (Lemke, 2002: 49).

Cast in this manner, "regional powers not only possess superior power capabilities and exercise leadership within the region but are also able to convince other states (both within the region and beyond) to accept their leadership" (Lemke, 2002: 49; Mugambi, 2015: 41; Qobo, 2010: 13-28). More recently, Ogunnubi and Okeke-Uzodike (2016: 112) have provided the following as an exhaustive list of the features of regional hegemons:

> material preponderance (based mainly on its economic, military and demographic power), which makes it a giant in its region; close interconnectivity with other states in the region in political, economic and cultural terms; decisive impact of its economic development on the economic fortunes of other countries in the region; having various instruments of foreign policy

> at its disposal to assert its interests and equip it for a pre-eminent role in and on behalf of its region; the expression of an ambition, claim or willingness to play these dual leadership roles; predominant influence in regional affairs in terms of setting security, political and economic agendas; and the recognition and respect of other states (within the region and beyond) as a leading state in and on behalf of the region.

This is in line with what Prys (2010) identifies as "the three 'P's" that are the "fundamental criteria" for any would-be regional hegemon. These are "provision, projection and perception" (2010: 2). Prys summarises this triad as: "firstly, the provision of public good; secondly, the projection of the regional power's values and interests; and lastly, the perception of the regional power as a state both internally and externally with a special responsibility and capacity to have an impact on behaviour and outcomes in its sphere of influence" (Prys, 2010). Regional hegemons operate within a regional hegemonic system as an outcome of a 'certain foreign policy strategy'. The main argument is that these three criteria must necessarily be blended with a fourth factor (material preponderance) for a regional hegemon to be recognised as one: "the leadership and preponderant power status occupied by a regional power can be depicted as regional hegemony" (Ogunnubi and Okeke-Uzodike 2016: 112). Overlaps in Ogunnubi and Okeke-Uzodike and Prys' work can be found in the similarities in items 3 and 5 to 'provision', item 4 to 'projection', and items 1, 2, 5 and 6 to Prys' 'perception'.

3.3.2. Conceptualising Regional Hegemony in Africa

"The future success of these newly independent African states was further complicated by the fact that they were born into the contentious, polarized, and militarized international environment of the Cold War" (Lloyd, 2010b: 172). In their respective moments of independence or soon thereafter, "they tended to gravitate toward one side or the other of the Cold War" (Lloyd, 2010b: 172). This variously created contexts in which bordering states often had tenuous relations with each other. In East Africa, for example, "a pro-West Kenya was bordered by a socialist Tanzania" (Lloyd, 2010b: 172).

As to how the regions in Africa can be demarcated (i.e., how to specify Kappel's "given region"), Markus Kornprobst (2002: 369) had earlier suggested that the regions on the continent, though perhaps arbitrary, are an ontological reality. This is because they are self-demarcated by the states themselves;

> they are socially constructed and reproduced through the regional associations on the continent – thus we can distinguish a country's region of belonging by the regional association within which it is a member – thus West African states are members of ECOWAS (Economic

> Community of West African States), those in the Southern African region are members of SADC (Southern African Development Community), and likewise those of the Horn and East Africa are members of IGAD (Ogunnubi and Okeke-Uzodike, 2016: 112).

Some observers have argued that in the African continent, "there has never really been a single dominant hegemon like by illustration the US in the Americas. Instead, the continent has three states that have emerged as key players based on their region" (Mugambi, 2015: 39). These are South Africa, Nigeria and Ethiopia. "South Africa is the dominant player in southern Africa, it led initiatives in Lesotho's intervention in 1998 and Burundi in 2003. Since the fall of apartheid and crystallization of democracy in South Africa in 1994, the country has pursued economic integration in to the global economy, it has sought to benefit Africa as a whole and on several occasions has acted as the link between the North and the South" (Mugambi, 2015: 41). "Its foreign policy since 1994 has shifted from one marked by hegemonic domination to one of multilateral partnership vis-à-vis its south African neighbours" (Mugambi, 2015: 41). Nigeria, for its part, "has provided leadership in western Africa and was the foremost champion in the creation and sustenance of Economic Community of Western African States Monitoring Group (ECOMOG)," and in Eastern Africa, "Ethiopia has been the major power and has been involved in fighting Islamic terrorist groups in the Horn of Africa from as back as 1995" (Mugambi, 2015: 40).

Kornprobst (2002: 369) observes some unevenness in that "in Africa, the management of border disputes varies from sub-region to subregion." The most distinct gap, he argues, is between West Africa and the Horn of Africa. "In the latter, border disputes are much more likely to escalate into war than in the former" (Kornprobst, 2002: 369). This indicates that a factor which this dissertation aims at, which is to funnel hegemony, and look at it in the regional front and test out their influence as, in fact, regional powers can have an impact on their regions in both cooperative and confrontational ways. While some note that in the past the country has been itself a warmonger within the region, as seen in the Border Wars with Angola and Namibia (Ricks, 2015), South Africa has similarly been criticised for taking up the route of quiet diplomacy in times of crisis, while others have deduced that its initiatives on the continent only succeed when they coincide with, or are couched within, those of the broader West/Global North (Monyae, 2014). The present dissertation focuses on East Africa and will therefore focus on Kenya.

Some scholars have argued that the claim has no validity when empirically tested.[8] Others have asserted that hegemonic status, in the present era of exponentially increased number of sovereign states as well as non-state actors, hegemony may well be a *casus belli* rather than a cause for peace due to the heightened avenues and challenges being responded to with conflict waging measures; Ricks (2015: 1) for example observes that "if you're a super- or hyperpower committed to fighting for your security across the oceans, all over the world, then predicting where every potential war is going to turn into a real one is almost impossible." Further still, Graham Allison (2017), harking back to the work of Thucydides and observations made over the Peloponnesian War (431 BC–404 BC) and assessing the contemporary US-China power shift, notes that the inevitable transition from one hegemonic order to another can leave rampant conflict in its wake if not properly managed, with the rising power and the status quo power likely to clash if neither is willing to make some compromises.

How, then, might one assess the relationship between the existence or lack of a regional hegemon and its impact on war or peace? The research agenda for assessing hegemonic stability stems from the claim that "in the past, the dissolution of a hegemonic system may well have led to a system disequilibrium that would be solved only by…war" (Sachse, 1989: 112). Further, Gilpin's claim that the most important factor is not the distribution of power, but the dynamics of power relations over time gives indication as to the variables which form the bedrock of the theory: "changes in the relative power among the principal actors lead to war and change" (Sachse, 1989: 112). This demonstrates that at a minimum the independent variable is the *change* in relative power (e.g., comparative movements in GDP and defence budget of the hegemon compared to every other state in its region) chronologically prior to a year of an outbreak in interstate conflict (since that is the outcome of interest in this dissertation). Thus, as the theory would have it, we should not find conflict between states in the same region in the same 2-year period wherein the regional hegemon is experiencing uninterrupted higher growth than its neighbours. By contrast, we should expect a higher probability of conflict between states in the same region in a period wherein the regional hegemon is experiencing lower economic growth compared to its neighbours. The overall variables utilised in this dissertation are unpacked in the section which follows.

[8] For example, Edward Spiezio (1970) has examined Gilpin's hypothesis on the case of Britain. As hypothesized, the frequency of international conflict should be inversely related to Britain's relative power during her entire cycle of leadership. However, although wars occurred more frequently during Britain's decline than during her ascendancy, the difference was not overwhelming (54% to 45%). Wars occurred frequently in both phases.

3.4.Variables and Research Agenda

3.4.1. Variables

This study makes use of the method of most difference in that it is composed of case studies of differences in their independent variables (i.e., not all the conflict dyads necessarily had the same components), but which have similarity in their outcomes (i.e., all cases studied resulted in conflict between these states). Thus, for this study, the dependent variable for all cases is the initiation of conflict between African states. For this study, the independent variable will be the following (possibly competing) factors:

(1) relative trade levels

(2) comparative scores in the Polity IV typology, and

(3) sustained relative economic growth and military budgets of the three regions' economic leaders.

The case studies will be composed of historical analyses, case studies as well as interviews with mediators, experts and government officials in order to assess the role of these variables.

3.4.2. Operationalisations

The dependent variable is operationalised as the initiation of conflict by one state on one another which yields at least 1000 battle-related deaths (as per the Correlates of War typology). Thus, it is a marked event in a horizontal timeframe resultant in a transformation from a peaceful state of affairs to a state of affairs of conflict. The question is what has brought about this outcome; in other words, the independent variable.

The independent variables are varied. The first independent variable is operationalised as scores (in numerical figures) ranging from -10 to 10 in the Polity IV typology, which "defines democracy as a system which has institutions in which citizens can express their preferences, has *constraints* on the power of the executive, and a guarantee of civil liberties" (in Bradley, 2007: 100; emphasis added). On the other hand, it characterises an autocratic governance "as a system that restricts political participation by citizens, has executives chosen within the political elite, and executives with *few institutional constraints*" (in Bradley, 2007: 100; emphasis added).

The second independent variable is operationalised as the share of the initiating belligerent's in the retaliating adversary's total imports (as measured in monetary terms, in US dollars

throughout this dissertation). One of the challenges for this theory, or at least in the literature which espouses it, is the lack of a universal definition of 'interdependence', a concept that is elemental to the very concept of what it argues. Thus, this dissertation will enlighten us as to the threshold levels of non-interdependence; in essence, the state, among all the case studies tested, which had the highest export markets in another state but which still initiated a conflict with it will allow us to detect the minimum amount of trade required, all other things being equal, for conflict to not break out.[9]

The research agenda for testing out the correlation between trade interdependence and peace stems from Morrow (1999: 481) who gives "a coherent basis for questioning the statistical association between trade and conflict" who did this by "outlining an explanation for the causes of international crises and disputes and provides two reasons why trade and conflict may not interact the way researchers typically expect" (Morrow, 1999: 481); these are:

> First, because firms anticipate conflict between states with volatile relations, trade will be reduced ex ante where the risk of conflict is greatest. Thus, trade and conflict are both endogenous; states will not be deterred from conflict if the threat of conflict deters trade. Second, the deterrent effect of trade should be modest. Any factor that discourages aggression by one party encourages aggression in others. States can use trade to signal, informing others by demonstrating a willingness to pursue costly acts (harming trade).

These sections of the dissertation should therefore be aimed at tracing the volumes of trade prior to the outbreak of conflict and should seek to find either absence of trade or uninterrupted decreases in trade for a period of at least two consecutive years prior to the outbreak of the conflict. Given that "intra-African trade is dominated by primary products and other largely competitive products and other largely competitive rather than complementary goods" (Powers 2006: 467), we should be especially interested in the decreasing exports of the conflict initiating state to the adversary.

The third independent variable is operationalised in terms of comparative GDP and military budget, as measured in monetary terms (in US dollars throughout this dissertation), of Kenya compared to the rest of the region.

[9] This is discussed in Chapter 8, section 8.5.1.

3.4.3. Proof of causality

In terms of the first variable, causality can be drawn from the correlation of scores and the onset of the conflict as we should expect the state with the greater degree of authoritarianism to be the one being attacked first (as typical liberal democracies have tended to attack authoritarian regimes, these 'lesser autocracies' could be predictable to initiate conflicts against the more authoritarian counterparts as there may be features about them which render them 'attackable' by states with lesser or without autocratic features about them).[10] In the second variable, causality can be drawn from a lack of export markets or, when markets did exist, the continuously declining export markets in the adversary in the years leading up to the conflict which could be explained by a declining opportunity cost of initiating a conflict against them. In terms of the third variable, causality can be drawn from the comparative movement in the relative GDP size of the identified hegemon and whether there is an outbreak of conflict in the region in the subsequent years after a decline in the relevant figures; this should be because the sustaining of peace through military expenditure is an expensive undertaking; conversely, years of higher economic growth may correlate with years of peace.

3.4.4. Method of inquiry

The method of inquiry used in this dissertation is 'before/after' in that it will make use of antebellum conditions across the political and economic configurations within the countries and the region in terms of hegemonic stability theory to understand what led to the war.

3.4.4.1. Aims of the dissertation: Why typology-construction?

Typologies can be defined as "organized systems of types" and are a well-established analytic tool in the social sciences (Collier, LaPorte, and Seawright, 2012: 217). The origins of the development can be dated back to Max Weber among whose methodological contributions is the notion of "ideal types" (Weber, 1949). The purpose of typology is to make caveat-based generalisations. This means through typologies we can deduce a discernible pattern of behaviour by a particular unit of analysis such as a state, or a coalition of states in a given situation; and within these actors, we can deduce patterns most frequented by a *kind of state or coalition of states* (e.g., a democracy). In practice, this means that we can state with certainty, that given a specific set of variables, a certain type of actor is likely to behave in a certain way.

[10] Some within-case analysis will be carried out to complement the initial scores; to, for example, assess how exactly might have the decision to initiate conflict been reached and carried out, and the role of regime type in the reaching, initiation and sustaining of such a decision.

Further, typological theorising is open to multiple variables accounting for a certain outcome. In their widely noted book, King, Keohane, and Verba (1994: 48, emphasis original) argue that "typologies, frameworks, and all manner of classifications, are useful as temporary devices when we are collecting data." However, these authors "encourage researchers *not* to organize their data this way" (Ibid.). But as George and Bennet (2005: 233) note "its advantages include its ability to address complex phenomena without oversimplifying, clarify similarities and differences among cases to facilitate comparisons, provide a comprehensive inventory of all possible kinds of cases, incorporate interactions effects," and, above all, "draw attention to "empty cells." Further, typological theorising assists in generalising pathways, "whether a path has occurred only once, a thousand times, or is merely hypothesised as a potential path that has not yet occurred" (George and Bennett, 2005: 236).

There are two main approaches to typological theorising, namely the inductive and deductive approach. The approach which the dissertation will take is the inductive approach, whereby "the researcher studies cases to see what causal pathways might operate in them" (George and Bennett, 2005: 234).[11] "In contrast to general theory of a given phenomenon, typological theory provides a rich and differentiated depiction of a phenomenon and can generate discriminating and contingent explanations" (George and Bennett, 2005: 235). Typological theory is also open to the prospect of equifinality: "the same outcome can arise through different pathways" (George and Bennett, 2005: 235). Depending on the scope of the investigator's intended research objectives, identifying a single type may suffice, "or the investigator may need to develop a differentiated typology of many types" (George and Bennett, 2005: 238). This is what this dissertation seeks to accomplish.




Figure 3.1: Typology-construction algorithm.

The literature review has indicated the possibility of multiple causes of interstate conflict in the region (Henderson, 2008; Valeriano, 2011: 198; Nhema and Zeleza, 2008: 3). It is for this

[11] In the deductive approach, "the researcher creates a logical structure of possibilities before studying cases." This is not the case here, as we have no pre-determined pathway of how the three theories might interact (and perhaps counteract) vis-à-vis one another. Rather, the typology will be built on a bottom-up approach. See George and Bennett (2005: 235).

reason that this dissertation will have the creation of a typology as its end goal. As Figure 2 demonstrates, the first phase of the thesis will involve unbundling the theories (in terms of the variables each proposes and the hypotheses they postulate). This will lead to testing out whether individual cases are exemplary of the causal accounts predicted by these theories. The latter phase of the dissertation will involve theory-to-theory interaction of those theories which prove themselves to causally relevant (i.e., whose variables have had explanatory relevance for at least one theory), with classification of cases by fit to certain variables and hypotheses and in turn of each of the cases according to the overlapping theories when overlap is proven to be the case. By making use of qualitative content analysis (QCA) the dissertation will remain open to multiple causal factors; thus, each conflict could be described by more than one theory, provided the findings from the case analysis point to this; i.e., no one variable is a sufficient condition, but that rather some are necessary conditions that explain the outcome of interest only in combination with one another. The dissertation will make use of truth tables to cascade the causal mechanisms of each conflict.

Conversely, the dissertation is open to some cases perhaps not being causally explainable through any of these theories and their attendant variables; these would be the outliers (or empty cells) and exceptions to the theories. This dissertation will therefore be an attempt at applying what some early 21st century scholarship seemed to be arguing for, namely mid-range theory testing as well as theory synthesis (Hermann, 2002: 123; Jupille, Caparaso, and Checkel, 2003: 7; Bennet, 2013: 459). A further methodological framework, utilised for sequencing the findings to generate the typology, will be introduced in Chapter 8 of the dissertation.

CHAPTER 4

Case Study 1: Ogaden War, 1977-1978

4.1. Introduction

Though there had been brief "border wars" between 1961 and 1964, the war of 1977 and 1978 was characterised by large-scale mobilisation and annexation by Somalia of territory under Ethiopia. Further, the Ogaden War was the first interstate conflict in Africa in the post-WWII period (Lewis, 1980; Clapham, 2017). The Ethio-Somali rivalry over the Ogaden, along with failure by the two states to reach an amicable conclusion to it, along with Somali irredentism after the 1969 coup set in motion the road to the conflict, which outlived the official cessation of hostilities by Somalia (March 1978), and was characterised by protracted negotiations and covert operations by Ethiopia that weakened Somalia (finally doing so by 1988), to consequences that reverberate to the present. The continental body, the OAU, to whose judgement Somalia only agreed once it was weakened, asserted the status quo *ante bellum,* judging in favour of Ethiopian administration over the Ogaden territory.

A recent and widely cited study on the war which incorporates theoretical lenses, is by Valeriano (2011), who attempts to apply the steps-to-war theory to explicate the war. A factor uncovered by that study was that internal armed opposition groups, where they do exist, may cause leaders of states "to display strength to enforce their hold on power" (Valeriano, 2011: 203). Particularly, Valeriano argues that "since they both had what they deemed reliable alliances, both sides continued to assert their claims in the conflict" (Valeriano, 2011: 203). Overall, Valeriano (2011: 206) concludes that "the constellation of alliances that Ethiopia's Mengistu was able to assemble resulted in an Ethiopian victory and domination of the region for years to come." For the purposes of this study, the primary point of interest is the role of domestic regime type in leading up to the war. Additionally, the present literature overlooks the role of economic determinants, particularly through the prism of the opportunity cost. As the relations between the two countries have not since culminated in another full-scale war, it is worth investigating – i.e., empirically reviewing – the role of the absence or presence of political and/or economic factors.

The chapter's findings indicate that the theory of democratic peace thesis has an imperfect causal account with the conflict of 1977-78, but still has some congruence with the path to war and may explain why there has been no war since 1978. What has been notable however is the

manner in which these have been manifested in the actual conflict. Noticeably, Somalia, the initiator of the conflict, scored less than Ethiopia in the governance index on openness, which was in line with the hypothesis proposed. Nevertheless, further insights were made.

On the first instance, while relations were flawed from the onset, with Somalia having irredentist claims, a conventional conflict between Ethiopia and Somalia took place upon the two countries undergoing governmental transformations. Further, the democratic peace thesis also offers insights in that the war did not take place until Mengistu Hailemeriam, the more hard-line leader, took over from Teferi Bante, who was proposing a more cordial approach towards Somalia. This is significant in that it indicates a transition within Ethiopia being a prerequisite for the initiation of the war by Somalia's own regime (itself autocratic). That the war was initiated by the more autocratic Somalia is also indicative of a possibility that the Somali regime appraised the situation in Ethiopia to be 'ripe' for it to initiate the war without anticipating resistance from the apparently weaker Ethiopia. The present literature on the democratic peace thesis (including most recently Henderson, 2015; Carter, 2017) is presently not cognizant of the role of institutional legitimacy information asymmetry across regimes in leading up to an outbreak of conflict. This chapter therefore offers this original contribution.

Simultaneously, the chapter found that the economic interdependence thesis has validity as well. This chapter's findings indicate that the theory of democratic peace thesis has an imperfect causal relevance with the conflict of 1977-78 between Somalia and Ethiopia, but still has some congruence with the path to war and may explain why there has been no war since 1978. What has been notable however is the manner in which these have been manifested in the actual conflict. Noticeably, Somalia, the initiator of the conflict, scored less than Ethiopia in the governance index on openness, which was in line with the hypothesis. Indeed, further interesting insights were made. On the first instance, while relations were flawed from the onset, with Somalia having irredentist claims, a conventional conflict between Ethiopia and Somalia took place upon the two countries undergoing governmental transformations. The chapter's findings are also indicative of a possibility that the Somali regime appraised the situation in Ethiopia to be 'ripe' for it to initiate the war without anticipating resistance from the apparently weaker Ethiopia. The present literature on the democratic peace thesis is presently not cognizant of the role of what we propose here to be an 'institutional legitimacy information asymmetry' problem across regimes in leading up to an outbreak of conflict. This chapter therefore offers this original contribution based on the fact that Barre sought to use what he *perceived* as internal discord in Ethiopia as an opportunity to attack and claim a

territory he and his population saw as being part of Somalia. Indeed, while Somalia was not a democracy, Barre had risen to power in 1969 after a coup and maintained a dictatorship partially because of popular support for the irredentist cause he ostensibly sought to realise.

With regards to the economic interdependence thesis, the chapter also found that the economic interdependence thesis has validity for the Ogaden War as well. Overall, the share of Ethiopia in the country's exports to was insignificant, at less than 0.018% at any given point. This thus demonstrates a lack of opportunity cost in initiating a war with Ethiopia. Rather, at more than 95% of its trade with extra-continental states, Somalia had no economic interdependence with Ethiopia and indeed much of the region (with Egypt as the only African trade partner the country had had prior to 1977). This case study has also demonstrated that the literature on interdependence, either on potential adversaries and would-be mediators, ought to take into account the overall lack of external reliance of the aggressor country in question (in this case Somalia) in the first place. As this case demonstrates, while Somalia was an exporting nation prior to the war, these exports were declining in the years leading up to the war – which coincided with the consolidation of power by a regime whose leader was considered Ethiopia reliably weak between 1974 and 1977 based on signals of social unrest and mutinies – and they had already had a minimal share within its total GDP.

The chapter will firstly offer a comprehensive historical background to the war, by providing the chronology of events in the war and the major turning points in the conflict and peace settlements between the warring nations. Subsequently, the chapter will present an analysis of the role of the domestic institutions in motivating or mitigating the path to warfare. In the fourth section, the chapter will offer an analysis for the role of the lack of economic interdependence between the two countries in eliminating the opportunity cost for war initiation by Somalia. Finally, the chapter presents a working typology of these two causal variables, in anticipation of Chapter 9 which presents a typology for all the variables in all the case studies.

4.2. Background and Onset

4.2.1. Political Background

Ethiopia and Somalia had had a difficult relationship since the achievement of independence by Somaliland and Italian Somalia in 1960, when those two former colonies came together to form the united Republic of Somalia (Lewis, 1980: 181). For Somalia, the unification of these two territories was a welcome achievement, but one which indicated an incomplete puzzle; this laid at the root of its issues with neighbouring Ethiopia as since then, the basis of Somalia's

foreign policy was 'liberation' of, and unification with, the Somali-inhabited territories (Makinda, 1982: 97; Lewis, 1980: 248). The source of the friction was Somalia's irredentist pursuit of "Greater Somalia": after all, "Somalia's irredentist claims would swallow up one-fifth of Ethiopia's territory" (Yihun, 2014: 677). For four years (1950-1954), Somalia had temporarily been reunited with the Ogaden in the middle of the twentieth century, but prior to their decolonisation. In 1950, the British drew a frontier between Ethiopia and Somalia which was meant only to be provisional. But in so doing, it included the Ogaden within Somalia. But after Ethiopian diplomatic efforts, the Ogaden region was returned by the British in 1954. This thus sowed the seeds of the Ethio-Somali rivalry "in which both claimed the territory and people of the region" (Valeriano, 2011: 203; Clapham, 2017: 81).

The ultimate aim of Somalia, "which has a five-pointed star on her flag denoting the distribution of the Somalis in five different territories," was the forging of a 'Greater Somalia' inclusive of all Somali speaking peoples straddled in its neighbouring states (Makinda, 1982: 97). In other words, at least at the time, the Ogaden region, which is mostly desert, "had no distinguishable wealth or strategic value" (Lewis, 1998: 110). Somalia claimed the Ogaden region in Ethiopia due to the presence of ethnic Somalis living within the boundaries of Ethiopia. The view from Addis Ababa was predictably different; Ethiopia deemed the territory as part of its "historical sphere of control" (Lewis, 1998: 110):

> Ethiopia quickly asserted its territorial claim over Ogaden on grounds that it had been a part of their empire only years earlier and based their assertion on claims of sovereignty recognized in the 1942 and 1944 Anglo-Ethiopian Agreements. Eventually, the Ogaden was restored to Ethiopia on September 23, 1948, in fulfilment of British promises. Doing so did not solve the problem and set the ground for future conflict (Valeriano, 2011: 204).

The people of the Somali Republic considered parts of their country as having been stolen and misappropriated by colonial-era partitions (Valeriano, 2011: 204). "The new republic was committed to the unification of all Somalis, including those in the Ogaden, the then French territory of Djibouti, and the North Frontier District of Kenya. But it was the Ogaden which became the primary focus of Somali irredentalism [sic]" (Laitin and Samatar, 1987: 131). As will briefly introduced, this dissertation posits that the roots of Somali military attention towards Ethiopia and not Kenya are explainable through the prism of the democratic peace thesis as well as the hegemonic stability thesis. International attention at this time was mostly on the side of the status quo arrangement. For their parts, both the OAU and the UN denied Somalia's irredentist allusions to the Ogaden from Somalia's independence, to the Ogaden War

and the period thereafter (Clapham, 2017). Nonetheless, Mogadishu "pointed to at least 500,000 Muslims of Somalian decent living in the Ogaden at the time as support for its territorial claim." (Valeriano, 2011: 205). Somalia's claims were further bolstered, and the situation further complicated, by the presence of rebel groups in the territory (Clapham, 2017). The Somali government not only sponsored rebels within the Ogaden but likewise harboured Ethiopian Eritrean and Tigray dissident groups and personalities in Mogadishu. In turn, the pursuit of this "Greater Somalia" shaped Ethiopian foreign policy vis-à-vis Somalia:

> After 1960, the intensification of Somalia's diplomatic offensive on the irredentist issue instead provoked a worsening of relations between the two neighbors. Frequent border clashes during the 1960s, and virulent anti-Ethiopian propaganda emanating from Mogadishu, reflected the irrevocable positions taken by leading Somali politicians (Yihun, 2014: 677).

Hitherto, Somalia had been under the SYL, which had led the path to independence. This was to change in 1969. That year, "Ethiopia became diplomatically more isolated" (Yihun, 2014: 678). In that year, regimes with anti-Ethiopian forces successfully overthrew their governments in Sudan and Somalia. The new government of Siad Barre would go about pursuing the irredentist agenda with greater zeal than its predecessor. Efforts by the Ethiopian imperial regime as well as the Derg government which followed it after its military overthrow of 1974 "focused on trying to bring pro-Ethiopian groups" and personalities into power in Somalia:

> As the papers contained in the archives of the Ethiopian Foreign Ministry make clear, more drastic measures, such as the closing of the border and the abetting of opposition activities in Hargeisa, were intended to exert more direct pressure on the government of Somalia. Attempts were also made to contain the state of Somalia within the diplomatic framework defined by the principles of the OAU (Yihun, 2014: 678).

Under Siad Barre, the renamed Somali Democratic Republic's approach regarding the Ogaden issue became more aggressive towards Ethiopia, but it was changes *within Ethiopia* itself that set the two countries on a war path. This is discussed below.

In its first year after its own overthrow of the monarchical government of Haile Selasie, the Derg pursued a policy of rapprochement with Siad Barre's government. This was based on self-preservationist calculations: Somalia had the apparent backing of the USSR, and thus seemed a more than plausible threat.[12] This concern was also warranted as Somalia was known

[12] Interview 3.

to be actively upgrading its military strengths (see Table 4.1) and "had concentrated its army along the border" (Yihun, 2014: 679).

Table 4.1. Somali and Ethiopian military indicators, 1977

Country	Regular Army	Population	Combat Aircraft	Tanks
Somalia	40,000	3,500, 000	66	250
Ethiopia	55,000	28,620,000	36	178

Source: *The Military Balance, 1976-77*. London Institute for Strategic Studies.

The nascent Derg regime was also otherwise occupied as "liberation secessionist movements mushroomed in every corner of the country, and existing ones intensified their offensives as the Derg took over" (Yihun, 2014: 678). The Eritrean Peoples' Liberation Front (EPLF) and its ally the Tigrayan Peoples' Liberation Front, along with the Oromo Liberation Front, the Western Somalia Liberation Front (WSLF), and Somali Abo Liberation Front (SALF) all fought with the Derg in military confrontations in its first months (Yihun, 2014: 678); "this led to a lot of instability within the country and it was in no position to confront an outside adversary." In the meanwhile, "political turmoil in Ethiopia soon after the revolution of September 1974 and the resultant power vacuum in the country encouraged Somalia to attempt to annex the contested region of the Ogaden" (Yihun, 2014: 679). Among others, the WSLF and the SALF were put to use in spearheading the plan to incorporate Ogaden into the Somali Republic (Lewis, 1980). Officials of the Derg were aware of Siad Barre's activities; they alleged that between March and July 1974 that there had been 44 cross border raids (Lewis, 1980). The leadership within the new government were divided on the correct response to this. Leaders such as Teferi Bante, the Chairman of the Derg and *de jure* head of state, were in outright opposition to the idea of a pre-emptive war against Somalia.[13] It was at this time, that peace talks were held in the Ethiopian capital in January 1976, between the two Generals who ran their two countries. These talks, however, only served to demonstrate the lack of desire to make any lasting commitment to give up the territorial claims on the part of Somalia:

> As it had done previously under Emperor Haile Selassie, Ethiopia raised once again the possibility of confederation with Somalia, asked for the reinstatement of diplomatic relations at ambassadorial level, urged the renouncement of Somali smear campaigns labelling Ethiopia "Black Colonialist," and asked for the return of its fighter jet that had crashed in Somalia when

[13] Interview 3, Interview 4; see also Yihun, 2014: 678; and Schwab, 1985: 96-97.

> on a "training manoeuvre." Barre, in reply, dodged the gesture at reconciliation, simply alluding to the feasibility of confederation and the willingness of his government to mend relations with Ethiopia (Yihun, 2014: 679).

Though not visible to the Somalis at the time of these "peace talks," their source of comparative strength was set to diminish. By the 1977 invasion by the Somali army, the dynamic of the relations had shifted in favour of the Ethiopians; the alternation of USSR allegiance to the now-socialist government of Ethiopia bolstered the Derg. This coincided with the midst of the purges within the Derg clique, that led to the removal of those who sought peaceable relations with Somalia (Clapham, 2017: 65).[14] In their assessment of Somali's policy and posture towards their country, the Derg adjudged that their adversary "was intent on waging war and would not entertain other alternatives" (Yihun, 2014: 679). This was in January of 1976.

> Thus, just as the Derg's external strength grew and its internal politics toughened up so too did its response to the Somali threat. As a consequence, by 1977, the Derg adopted policies aimed at the total destabilization of the Republic, thereby implementing the strategy that the imperial regime had held only as a last resort policy. After 1977, even when engaged in peace talks and attempts at reconciliation, Mengistu's Ethiopia saw safety only in the total disintegration of Somalia (Yihun, 2014: 678).

4.2.2. The War

By mid-1977, Somalia's military build up along the Ethio-Somali border was in continuation, while "armed insurgencies in Harar, Bale, and Sidamo had reached a new level" (Laitin and Samatar, 1987: 135). Along with this, "Somalia also intensified the propaganda campaigns among Somalis of Ethiopian nationality" (Laitin and Samatar, 1987: 135). This only further fortified the Ethiopian leaders' certainty that an open conflict was an inevitability (Bahru, 2001: 182). As previously noted, internal power struggles inside the ruling Derg had also worked to provoke a more bellicose posture towards the Somalis. Colonel Mengistu Haile Mariam became the primary leader of the country in February 1977 following the "third internal coup" within the Derg (Bahru, 2001: 182).

[14] Taking place under the name of the 'Red Terror', this saw up to 500, 000 killed. Interview 7 at the Red Terror Museum, Addis Ababa. According to a 1991 Human Rights Watch report by Alex De Waal (*Evil days: 30 Years of War and Famine in Ethiopia*), "in mid-1976, responding to a government crackdown on student members of the opposition, the EPRP began to assassinate leading members of the Dergue and its client institutions, notably the urban dwellers' associations" (De Waal, 1991: 102). Furthermore, "On October 2, the EPRP assassinated Fikre Merid, a leading MEISON [All-Ethiopia Socialist Movement] and government cadre. Ten senior government officials and 15 members of the secret service were killed in the next two months. The public assassinations continued into 1977; several hundred were probably killed in this way" (De Waal, 1991: 102).

> The political upheavals and purges within Ethiopia's military junta at this time tightened Mengistu's grip on the reins of power, as a succession of senior members of the Derg were dismissed from their posts, including the chairman, Teferi Bante. Teferi's killing in February 1977 consolidated power in the hands of the revolutionary nationalists, bringing to an end a period in which the leadership had been less certain and more willing to compromise in its dealings with Somalia (Yihun, 2014: 679).

The new undisputed leader Mengistu turned his attention to Somalia, accusing its government of sponsoring the WSLF (Laitin and Samatar, 1987: 135). The attacks by the WSLF, indeed at the backing of the Somali government and composed of former Somali officials among its ranks, "were cleverly planned operations intended to take advantage of internal Ethiopian instability" (Laitin and Samatar, 1987: 141). Formally, however, "Somalia invaded the Ogaden region on July 23, 1977, with a force of 35,000 soldiers and 15,000 WSLF fighters" (Laitin and Samatar, 1987: 141). From the onset, Somalia had the advantage:

> By 17 August elements of the Somali Army had reached the outskirts of the strategic city of Dire Dawa. Not only was the country's second largest military airbase located here, as well as Ethiopia's crossroads into the Ogaden, but Ethiopia's rail lifeline to the Red Sea ran through this city, and if the Somalis held Dire Dawa, Ethiopia would be unable to export its crops or bring in equipment needed to continue the fight (Laitin and Samatar, 1987: 141).

Nevertheless, the Ethiopians began to retaliate, raising and training a force of one hundred thousand that was merged with the standing army.

> The fighting was vicious as both sides knew what the stakes were, but after two days, despite that the Somalis had gained possession of the airport at one point, the Ethiopians had repulsed the assault, forcing the Somalis to withdraw. Henceforth, Dire Dawa was never at risk of attack (Laitin and Samatar, 1987: 141).

External forces were also at play during the war's course. The USSR had actively supplied both the Derg and the Somali Democratic Republic with armaments whilst attempting to mediate between its two, at the time, allies. But "when Somalia continued its assault, the Soviets cut off all aid to Somalia and increased aid to Ethiopia, sending nearly 1,000 advisors, and 15,000 Cuban troops" (Laitin and Samatar, 1987: 141–142). Interestingly, as the Ethiopians had been a US ally under the monarchy, they had to speedily ingratiate themselves to weapons sourced from the communist bloc. By September of 1977, "Somalia initially controlled as much as 90 percent of the Ogaden and the Ethiopian defenders had been pushed back into the non-Somali areas of Harerge, Bale, and Sidamo" (Lewis, 1980: 183). It was at

this point that Soviet and Cuban assistance, along with supplies valued at US$7 billion, proved helpful. By March of the following year, Ethiopia had reasserted its authority over the Ogaden, "prompting the defeated Somalis to give up their claim to the region" (Lewis, 1980: 183). Finally, air superiority on the part of Ethiopia meant that it was able to target the Somalian tank forces and also cut off its supply lines. Faced with this, on March 9th Siad Barre ordered his army to retreat; though the WSLF continued its own activities for some three more years. With fighting, at least by the Somali government, the diplomatic end to the war, which is discussed in section 4.2.3 below, proved protracted as Ethiopia sought to further weaken its once powerful adversary through covert means of sponsoring the anti-Barre forces in the length and breadth of the country. The final agreement materialised more than ten years after the initial Somali retreat, on April 4th in 1988, when a communiqué bearing both leaders' signatures officially ending all aggressions was issued (Valeriano, 2011: 203).

The war was to prove very costly; especially for Somalia. Overall, "a third of the initial Somali National Army invasion force was killed, and half of the Somali Airforce destroyed; the war left Somalia with a disorganized and demoralized army and an angry population. All of these conditions led to a revolt in the army which eventually spiralled into a civil war and Somalia's current situation" (Lewis, 1980: 187). Defeat for the Somali government was "a moment of national embarrassment to Somalis, [signified] the bankruptcy of the Greater Somalia dream, and the onset of large-scale uprisings and rebellions in the Republic" (Yihun, 2014: 680). As early as 1979, the first strong anti-Barre force, the Somali Salvation Democratic Front (SSDF), was brought into existence, consisting mainly of disillusioned former army officers of the Somali Armed Forces. On the other hand, at least in the interim, the conflict turned out to be "a nice war" for Mengistu as it allowed the Derg, with him atop it, to marginally consolidate its power (Yihun, 2014: 680).

4.2.3. Negotiations

While Somali representatives were participating in lengthy peace talks that were "essentially a decoy tactic on the part of Ethiopia," the Derg went about initiating "covert discussions with anti-Barre elements within Somalia who might collaborate with Ethiopia" (Yihun, 2014: 680). The goal of Ethiopia "was neither to replace Siad Barre with friendly elements nor to ascertain its suzerainty over Somalia, but merely to destabilize and incapacitate the Republic" (Yihun, 2014: 680):

> Any political, economic, or psychological setback that could be inflicted on Barre's government was pursued after Somalia's defeat in the Ogaden War, and the widespread popular discontent

> in Somalia, first in northeast region and later in the south, was fully exploited (Yihun, 2014: 680).

Somalia's own approach was to "internationalize the problem", and in 1978 brought the issue to UNSC attention (Lewis, 1980), in the hopes that they would garner a UNSC "resolution ruling for the deployment of UN supervisors along the contested area," while Ethiopia preferred the route of the OAU as well as bilateral engagement (Yihun, 2014: 681). Repelling the Somali invasion and re-taking Ethiopian territory under Somali occupation were given precedence by Addis Ababa. Though officially neutral, some scholars suggest that most states were of the view that Somalia was in the wrong: "the indifference to OAU Good Offices Commission initiatives (August 1977, July 1978, June 1980, and August 1980) could be attributed to the resentment against the Somali invasion and the determination to punish the Republic for this cardinal sin" (Yihun, 2014: 681). This was reinforcing for Ethiopia's strategy as "Somalia's rejection of OAU resolutions perfectly suited the retributive scheme the Derg had in mind" (Yihun, 2014: 681).

> In the meantime, though, the resolution by the OAU Good Offices Commission (August 1980) recognizing Ogaden as an integral part of Ethiopia was considered a major diplomatic victory. The fact that this happened soon after an alleged Somali cross-border incursion (between 27 May and 17 July 1980) came as a relief to Ethiopia. At its Nairobi meeting in 24–27 June 1981, the OAU adopted the report and recommendations of the OAU Good Offices Commission on the Ethio–Somalia dispute. Parallel unilateral mediation efforts by Madagascar, Uganda, and Italy equally failed to broker a meaningful deal between Ethiopia and Somalia (Yihun, 2014: 681).

Importantly,

> Ethiopia's initial readiness to accept peace proposals, as long as they were conducted under the auspices of the OAU and its member states, soon changed following its apparent military success over Somalia. Understandably, the Derg started to project its military success into dictating the proceeding of events (Yihun, 2014: 681).

To Ethiopia's advantage, most of the leaders that Somalia approached in its attempt to place pressure on, as well as isolate, Ethiopia – including those in the US, the Arab states, Madagascar, Algeria and East Germany – repulsed its advances, and "advised Somalia to first accept Ethiopia's conditions to enter into any form of negotiation" (Yihun, 2014: 681). This was not missed on the part of Ethiopia as Article 16 of the 1979 Somali constitution stated that "The Somali Democratic Republic adopting peaceful and legal means shall support the

liberation of Somali territories under colonial occupation and shall encourage the unity of the Somali people through their free will," despite Article 17 pledging a peaceful disposition for Somalia, claiming that the country would, going forward, "fully recognise the principle of peaceful co-existence of the peoples of the world" (1979: 7).[15]

> During the first three sessions of the Ethio-Somalia Joint Ad Hoc Ministerial Committee (6–9 May 1986, Addis Ababa; 23–26 August 1986, Mogadishu; and 1–3 April 1987, Addis Ababa), Somalia steadfastly refused to entertain any discussion on the border issue. Instead, Somalia argued for troops to be withdrawn from the common border areas and for hostilities to be ceased. The talks were in deadlock. The Ethiopian foreign minister, Berhanu Bayeh, therefore issued a press statement outlining Ethiopia's regret at the failure to reach an agreement on the content of the agenda at the three meetings. He described Somalia's unwillingness to discuss the frontier issue as "the stumbling block to the resolution of the problem," warning that if future confrontations occurred over the border, then Somalia should be held responsible (Yihun, 2014: 681).

President Barre pleaded for a further summit meeting, which was finally scheduled in Djibouti in 1988:

> During the three-day talks (20–22 March), the leaders again intensely argued on the merits of their respective approaches toward the negotiation without making any significant progress. Mengistu was doubtful as to the purpose of any further meeting, but a decision was nonetheless made to hold the fourth session of the joint ad hoc committee in Mogadishu "on a date to be agreed upon by the two governments." The agenda agreed upon by the leaders for this meeting included, as a last item, the "consideration of the boundary question between the two countries.

The fourth session, which would result in the peace settlement that led to normalisation of relations, was thereafter scheduled in Mogadishu in April of 1988:

> Based on the Djibouti agreement, Ethiopia presented a draft agenda and a draft agreement for the normalization of relations. The item dealing with boundary demarcation was deliberately omitted from the draft agenda, but a binding article referring to the convening of the ad hoc committee in the immediate future for the consideration of the issue was inserted in the draft agreement (Yihun, 2014: 683).

These "Mogadishu talks" were rightly seen as a major diplomatic success for Addis Ababa (Ogundele, 1987:30). In particular, Somalia's acceptance of the insertion of the reference to

[15] Somali Democratic Republic. 1979. "The Constitution". Available at: https://www.worldstatesmen.org/Somalia-Constitution1979.pdf (Last accessed: 30 September 2019).

OAU principles, especially "of the clause dealing with national integrity and sovereignty, was perceived as a departure from its previous policy" of claiming the Ogaden (Lockyer, 2018: 181). This was taken as Somali acceptance of the Declaration of Cairo (1964) which crystallised the colonially-derived borders and the decision reached in the 18th OAU summit that considered the Ogaden "an integral part of Ethiopia" (Lockyer, 2018: 181). Finally, there were references to key principles including "noninterference in the internal affairs of each other [Article 2]" as well as "refraining from acts of destabilization and subversion [Article 6]" (Yihun, 2014: 683). Steps were immediately put in place to implement the agreement by a committee made up of personnel from both sides and the OAU, who also administered the disengagement by either side from the border which was completed within a month, from April to May of 1988.

As a consequence of the war, the Barre regime would collapse as a result of the covert operations of Ethiopia, with the Somali state collapsing in the early 1990s. This had far-reaching implications for the rest of the region, with a central Somali state only being partially put back together in the 2000s. In the interim, as part of the Derg's strategy, there has been no Somalia capable of posing an interstate threat to Ethiopia. These developments demonstrate an inexorable link between regime type and institutional set-up in either state of the warring states and the war and will be discussed in greater depth in the upcoming section which tests the democratic peace thesis. The subsequent section (4.4.) will explore the bilateral dimension, through the lens of trade (or, precisely, the lack thereof) – and the economy more broadly – between the two states and its role in the breaking out of conflict between the two states, and in relation to the political situations in the two countries.

4.3. Case Study Analysis I: Democratic Peace Thesis

4.3.1. *Methodology*

This section gives a descriptive overview of the methodology applied in this section of the chapter intended on testing the validity of the democratic peace thesis to the Ogaden War. A necessary caveat in the below is that at the time of the outbreak of the war, both states could not be considered liberal democracies. But the theory can be modulated to the case study through extracting the relevant variables it proposes in the mechanism it proposes them to operate to bring about certain outcomes. As the democratic peace thesis literature asserts that democracies tend to avert war with each other, and at the same time they go to war with non-democracies, we can expect regime heterogeneity to be a factor; the comparatively more closed society to be the one to initiate the war for reasons related to the nature of the regime in the

adversary. Beyond this, we are interested in corroborating the extent to which there was a role for domestic audiences and institutions in either inhibiting or accelerating the adoption of the policy of war. Further, we are interested in the extent to which this follows the pathways proposed by the literature. Therefore, even in the incident that neither of the cases could be considered as democracies, we will nonetheless gain some important insights about the drivers of interstate war in Africa that we otherwise would not gain if we were to not apply the theory to this case study. In this case, we gain insights as to the popular or institutional determinants or inhibitors of conflict in the Ogaden War and why another dyadic war between the two countries has not occurred since 1978. Further, we can gain insights regarding the theory by extracting if there are any necessary modifications needed to the theory in order for it to be considered valid.

Methodologically, the following section will seek to determine whether the government of Somalia at the time could be described as being be more open or more closed compared to its Ethiopian counterpart at the time of the outbreak of the conflict. The relationship being examined in this case analysis are the scores of the two countries in terms of the Polity IV typology of authority as well as corroborations from historical literature as well as interviews with 5 experts on the two countries. Further, the case study will look at the regime-related implications of the war for both countries.

Given the causal claims made by the democratic peace thesis, we can expect that the closed society should be the one to initiate the attack given that there should be less of a domestic audience cost for such a policy towards the authoritarian regime; though we also should anticipate uniquely Somalian reasons for this, most likely to do with the irredentist claim. Upon assessing the outcome on the numerical variables, the section will extensively corroborate this data with historical data and insights from interviews in order to determine in narrative and historical form the routes to the conflict and the manner in which they manifested themselves and the results that took place in their wake. The purpose of this is to assess the workings of the variables beyond the numerical data, as well as to determine the relevance of these variables since the two countries took to war to assess whether – by their absence or despite their presence – these two countries have maintained a relative peace because of them.

The section proceeds by giving an overview of the two states' domestic polities in terms of their state-society relations, and then goes on to conduct a comparative test of the role of

domestic institutions and popular politics in leading up to the Ogaden War and in the relations between the two countries since the war.

4.3.2. Data Analysis

4.3.2.1. Ethiopian State-Society Relations (1941-1991)

"No other African leader during the independence era was revered so widely as Emperor Haile Selasie of Ethiopia" (Meredith, 2006: 206). This appeal rested on his resilient stands against Italian advances in the 1930s, and his restoration to the throne in 1941 after a brief interlude in exile after a 1936 invasion by Italy. Further, the country he presided over had renown which drew from an old written language, and its own, non-colonially derived and centuries old, church. The latter among these, however, was also a domestic political instrument and gave the Emperor a divine right to rule over the 27 million subjects by the early 1970s (Meredith, 2006: 207). At this time, the Ethiopian social structure was feudal, and thus "what helped to sustain his power was the considerable extent to which the emperor, together with the Coptic Church [sic] and influential aristocratic families in the provinces, owned and controlled the land and thereby the livelihood of millions of peasants who worked it" (Meredith, 2006: 207). These privileges were further buoyed by a new decree in 1967, by which tenants were required to pay 75% of their harvests to their landlords, to provide free labour in their farms, as a result of which "tenants lived in perpetual fear of eviction" (Meredith, 2006: 207). This was captured in the slogan "*siso leras, siso lelevers eminet, siso lemengist*" which roughly translates to "one third for the farmer, one third for the government, one third for the Church."[16]

In imperial Ethiopia, the Ethiopian Orthodox (Tawedo) church "provided the basis for legitimacy for the state, thus maintaining the status quo" (Larebo, 1986: 149). Through its "virtual monopoly" over the education system, the Church and state "moulded the minds of the peasantry to respect the established authority and to pay taxes" (Larebo, 1986: 149):

> The mutual support between the monarchy and the church was clearly demonstrated in the coronation service, when the Emperor swore to maintain the Ethiopian Orthodox Church and, in return, received the emblems of the authority and the submission of the patriarch in the name of the whole Ethiopian Orthodox Church (Larebo, 1986: 149).

Politically, the Church gave the Ethiopian state tools that did not exist in other African countries, as "church support meant using the weapon of excommunication against insurgents and subverting the allegiance of a rebel's followers" (Larebo, 1986: 149). After being codified

[16] Interview 10.

into the constitution of 1931 and reaffirmed in the 1955 constitution, this practice, which had been based on "tradition and customary law" was made into law (Larebo, 1986: 149). This symbiotic relationship was nonetheless characterised by the monarchy being the more senior partner. This is signified in a 1969 statement by Patriarch Thewophilos recounted below by Larebo (1986: 149): "there is no church without the state. In Ethiopia church and state are one and the same" (Larebo, 1986: 149). In practice,

> the Emperor behaved as though the church were the temporal as well as the religious authority of the country. Just as [the Emperor's] temporal orders were executed by his ministers and generals, so were his religious orders executed by the church. In practice, he was both Pope and King (Larebo, 1986: 149).

This nexus, and the power within it, remained with the monarch and the church until early 1974. By one assessment, "the absolutist state began to decompose as a result both of the gradual penetration of capitalism and of its own 'reforms' which undercut its feudal base without enabling it to broaden its social support" (Luckham and Bekele, 1984: 11). In that year, there took place a litany of otherwise small, random incidences which culminated into the most dramatic transformation in twentieth century Ethiopia. Firstly, on the 12th of January, in Neghelle in southern Ethiopia, there was a mutiny due to food and water shortages. In response to this insubordination, the Emperor uncharacteristically promised improvements to the conditions, and appears to have carried out no punishments (Meredith, 2006: 213). Soon the news spread throughout the country, however, and inspired similar mutinies. On the 25th of February, there took place a larger revolt in Asmara under the direction of seven, middle-aged sergeants and generals over their pay conditions. They made use of radio to spread their message. In much around the same time, in Addis Ababa rebel officers took eight ministers hostage under charges of corruption. Once again, the Emperor responded with concessions. This inspired further protests by students, teachers, taxi drivers and unionists for a variety of issues, including payments, social amenities and broader reform. In response, the Emperor agreed to a governmental restructuring, whereby his Prime Minister would account to a legislature (Meredith, 2006: 214).

"Within the armed forces, however, a group of radical junior officers conspired to take control" (Meredith, 2006: 214). They first conspired in the Fourth Division Headquarters in Addis Ababa, in late June where they formulated a 'Derg' or 'committee', made up of 108 'representatives' chosen by various units of the armed forces, who were to run the country. Their first public statement (issued on 4th of July), they spoke of their loyalty to the Emperor

and to the smooth running of the country. In fact, as they put it, they were interested only in advancing the country, ridding the country of corruption, which was arguably perpetrated by those around the Emperor and not the Emperor himself. Their slogan, 'Ethiopia Tikdem' (Ethiopia First), was vague enough to suit this projection (Meredith, 2006: 214). Further steps taken conveyed this message; none more so than the arrest of ministers in July and August 1974. However, this did not last very long as they next turned to the Emperor. "Haile Selasie himself was accused of squandering the country's meagre resources on expensive trips abroad and of being wilfully negligent" (Meredith, 2006: 215). A particular point of accusation was his alleged negligence of the Wollo famine of 1974, wherein around 10,000 peasants had died as a result of a drought, and during which the Emperor had taken no steps to seek international assistance in ameliorating (Meredith, 2006: 212).

The power of the church was brought into a sudden end by the interim constitution put in place in August 1974 in which the wall of separation between church and state was declared and "the equality of all religions began to be increasingly emphasised" (Larebo, 1986: 149-150).

> As a result, the revolution swept the church aside, putting it on the same level as other religions and denominations for the first time in the country's history, thus destroying its position as a state religion. Orthodox Christianity remained the major religion of the country, but purely as a matter of private conscience (Larebo, 1986: 149-150).

On September 12th, the monarchy was officially dethroned (Mengistu, 2006: 216). To further consolidate the removal of any remaining vestiges of the monarchical institutions, the Derg executed the grandson of the Emperor, the Emperor's former Prime Minister, and kept Haile Selassie in captivity. In these developments, there emerged Major Mengistue Haile Mariam, who ordered most of these executions. He made common cause with the ordinary soldiers and non-commissioned officers who made up a large part of the membership and who would become his power base. He also forged links with the radical students and Marxists, "many of whom had returned to Ethiopia from exile in 1974 demanding revolutionary change" (Larebo, 1986: 148; see also Meredith, 2006: 243).

According to some contemporary and historical studies, the new regime did not have "any well-defined doctrine or any fixed political programme except for the vague notion of Ethiopia Tiqdem (Ethiopia First)" (Larebo, 1986: 148; see also more recently: Lockyer, 2018; Interview 6). It from this ill-defined concept that the choice of Marxism-Leninism was selected. In practice, this brand of Marxism resembled that of many countries on the continent and in the

broader developing world: "it was essentially nationalist in character, though its political slogans were of global import" (Larebo, 1986: 148). Within the country, the Ethiopian Revolution "also unleashed other social forces, including the mobilisation of the peasantry during the earlier stages of the land reform and the struggle for national autonomy at the periphery of the Ethiopian state" (Luckham and Bekele, 1984: 11). In this way, it posed a challenge to the "Amhara grip on state power" that had been the norm under the monarchy (Luckham and Bekele, 1984: 11).

> On the other hand the Revolution also brought about a recentralisation of the state around the Dergue and the military establishment. Moreover the state and security apparatus became even more exclusively Amhara-based, shedding in the course of the events of 1974-77 much of their non-Amhara component (Luckham and Bekele, 1984: 11).

In relation to the primary issue of interest – i.e., the political origins of the Ogaden War, and particularly the Somali-perceived ripeness of the situation in Ethiopia for declaration of war with Ethiopia – "the revolution detonated or reactivated a series of armed revolts by national peripheries against the state framework which had been imposed on them during the preceding century" (Luckham and Bekele, 1984: 11). One of those peripheral areas was populated by the Somali peoples. Hagmaan (2014: 175) observes that state-sanctioned violence "significantly shaped the daily lives of people living in the Somali parts of Ethiopia" (Hagmann, 2014: 175). Before the rise of the Derg regime, and thus the reshaping of the state's relations with the Somali minority, the southeastern, Somali inhabited lowlands of Ethiopia had had a history of incurring "highly escalated conflicts" which, by then, had spanned close to 80 years, most of which elicited, or were in response to, rebellions by Somali groups that were usually armed (Hagmann, 2014: 175):

> The repression of armed uprisings in the Ethio-Somali frontier by imperial (ca. 1890–1974), socialist (1974–1991), and contemporary (1991 onwards) government troops translated into repeated abuses of civilian populations. State violence originated in the conquest of the Ogaden between 1891 and 1906 when imperial armies began regular campaigns, or zämächa in Amharic, to extort tribute from Somali pastoralists. These military expeditions consisted of thousands of soldiers (Hagmann, 2014: 175).

These raids usually spanned some several months, often characterised by "confiscation of hundreds to thousands of livestock as well as the brutalization of local communities" (Hagmann, 2014: 175). The Somali population were forced to make tributary payments to the

monarchy, "and those who refused were punished accordingly" (Hagmann, 2014: 175). In this way, the Ogaden War can be seen as a culmination into a full-scale international war of a broader Ethio-Somali conflict, which had both domestic and external antecedents, both of which had by then been configured to result in the manner of conflict that it did. That it would take place in 1977–1978 indicates the significance of the changes in Ethiopia (and its implications in the treatment of the ethnic Somalis in the Ogaden region) and, as will be discussed in the next subsection, Somalia as well (Hagmann, 2014: 175).

4.3.2.1.1. Somalian State-Society Relations (1962-1977)

This section aims to discuss the domestic political situation in Somalia in 1977 in so far as it had a relation to the declaration of war with Ethiopia. This necessitates a historical look back into the evolution of the polity up to the 1970s. The first notable characteristic is Somalia's pre-colonial (ca. 1884) political heritage which was typified by "longstanding traditional forms of governance of clan relations in a stateless, presumably "anarchic" pastoral setting" (Menkhaus, 2014: 558; Clapham, 2017; Lewis, 1980). In the absence of an all-encompassing, centralised state, "clan-to-clan relations were mediated through clan elders through a combination of customary law (or *xeer* in Somali), blood compensation (*diya*) to victims' families"; "threat or use of violence" (Menkhaus, 2014: 558) formed an important aspect as well. Even in the wake of the colonial and postcolonial periods, "clans [have] continued to act as important but fluid, situational social actors," which are central in both protecting and advancing "lineage members' access to critical resources, including pasture, wells, and markets" (Menkhaus, 2014: 558; De Waal, 2015: 110-111). In the same vein, *xeer* "has remained the primary source of law and order in the country" (Menkhaus, 2014: 558).

> In the decades when Somalia was governed by a functional state, customary law remained the dominant form of conflict management and rule of law, though many observers argue xeer became much more vulnerable to manipulation by political elites. The enduring importance of customary law and authority was especially true in British Somaliland, where the protectorate was governed on the principle of indirect rule, ceding much day to day authority to clan leaders (Menkhaus, 2014: 558).

Additionally, "the fascist period of Italian colonialism introduced a particularly harsh campaign of forced labour called "colonya" which reached its peak from 1935 to 1941" (Menkhaus, 2014: 562), which was also accompanied by confiscation of lands in the irrigable areas in the south of Somalia (Lewis, 1980). The postcolonial state in Somalia managed for a while manage in achieving "a near-monopoly on the legitimate use of violence within its borders," but it never

became the sole "legitimate source of rule of law" (Menkhaus, 2014: 558). After the Italians were driven out of Somalia by the British and native Somalis in 1941, "the ensuing period of British Military Administration (BMA) was focused almost entirely on maintaining basic order at minimal cost. Local clan authorities were left to govern their communities" (Menkhaus, 2014: 562). A new, "disciplined Somali and East Africa gendarmerie" of some 3000 soldiers was established for the purposes of helping to "ensure law and order and disarm Somalis who came into possession of arms during the turbulent, militarized period of 1936–1941" (Menkhaus, 2014: 562).

State-sanctioned violence was a rarity *within* Somalia in the three decades between 1950 and 1980, "but it dominated Somalia's foreign relations, and makes the Somali historical case study quite distinct" (Clapham, 2017: 141). This is rooted in a number of political reasons turned now turned to, with the aim of tracing the trajectory to the war with Somalia. To begin with, the victorious party in Somalia's first ballot in March 1969 was the SYL, which had been originally established for gaining independence in British Somaliland. Once in power, however, SYL, "became increasingly authoritarian" (Menkhaus, 2014: 567). In October of the same year, however, a policeman assassinated the president, Muhammad Egal. "A few days later, in the face of a mounting political crisis, the commander of the army, Mohamed Siad Barre, seized power" (Lewis, 1980). Soon Marxist motifs began to emanate from the government as Siad instituted a socialist dictatorship, "insisting upon the supremacy of party and nation as opposed to the local clan loyalties which are a strong feature of Somali culture" (Clapham, 2017: 141). Looking at the politics of pre-coup period in Somalia has led many scholars to see it as a period of comparative stability, in which the "rules of the game" were observed.[17] In that period,

> politics was managed with negotiations and deals; open debate and criticism were embraced; power-sharing (or, more precisely, revenue-sharing) was the principal means of keeping the peace between clans and maintaining legitimacy; and recourse to political violence was, for the most part, taboo. The "elite pact" that held during this period was, moreover, *relatively* inclusive – or at least met the criteria of "inclusive enough" coalitions to keep the peace (Menkhaus, 2014: 567; italics in the original).

To be sure, there were winners and losers, but in as much as groups representing a large portion of the population (including the Digil-Mirifle, minority groups, and women) "were

[17] Interview 15.

marginalized the division of political spoils, they lacked any major capacity to resort effectively to political violence as a means of articulating their grievances" (Menkhaus, 2014: 568). Further,

> historical accounts of Somali politics of the 1950s and 1960s also suggest that, for all of the rancorous debates, divisions, corruption, and nepotism that featured prominently in Somali politics during the final years of Trusteeship and into the first decade of independence, the emerging political elite did share a social contract that made recourse to political violence taboo (Menkhaus, 2014: 568).

This was due to a combination of three factors. Firstly, there was the resilience of Somali political culture of "negotiation and compromise that managed to survive decades of high levels of political violence from 1900 to 1941" (Menkhaus, 2014: 568). Secondly, there was the presence of a young emerging leaders "socialized to embrace a political culture of nonviolence during an unusually (by colonial standards) benign period of transition to independence in the 1950s" (Menkaus, 2014: 568). Finally, there were numerous political luminaries "whose commitment to good governance had at least a temporary impact on how political disputes were waged" (Menkhaus, 2014: 568). In this way, then, the events of October 1969 were quite transformative. The coup that brought the military into power, "introduced new actors whose political socialization was quite distinct and who brought new "rules of the game" to Somali politics" (Menkhaus, 2014: 568).

> From this perspective, the military mindset, combined with its embrace of Marxist ideology and its close alliance with the Soviet Union, produced leadership indifferent or even hostile to the notion of an intraelite social contract. The fact that the military possessed a near-monopoly on the tools of political violence gave it a powerful instrument it was not going to relinquish (Menkhaus, 2014: 568).

A quite generous historiography of the Barre regime asserts that his leadership "came to view the old social contract as tied into dysfunctional patterns of patronage, clannism, and corruption from which the country needed to break if it were to maintain unity and promote national goals, and that a certain degree of coercion and violence was necessary to achieve both domestic and international goals" (Lewis, 1980: 192; Menkhaus, 2014: 569). Another, broader explanation, however, suggests that the collapse in the social values and "elite compacts" that had previously typified Somali society and held it together was diminished by "the cumulative impact of armed conflicts" (Menkhaus, 2014: 569). Specifically acknowledged is the role of the Ogaden War "with Derg-ruled Ethiopia, which resulted in the militarization of Somali society just before

(and after) the war" (Menkhaus, 2014: 569). With Ethiopian sponsorship, in the wake of the loss in the Ogaden War, militia groups were formed along clans and regions mushroomed within and around Somalia with the aim of toppling Siad's government. Clapham (2017: 141) advances the view that though externally sponsored, there were also internal reasons and motivations for this, namely opposition and disillusionment with "Siad's repressive and centralizing regime." By 1988, the country was in a full-blown civil war, with the Siad regime finally collapsing in 1991. Siad "withdrew to the safety of his own clan, becoming one warlord among many in this increasingly chaotic nation" (Clapham, 2017: 141). In 1991 the faction in control of the formerly British colonised Somaliland, the Somali National Movement (SNM), declared their independence as the Republic of Somaliland. Iqbal Jhazbhay, who is also South African former ambassador to Eritrea, has pointed out that the elders are "the engine that drives all reconciliation efforts in Somaliland," with their missing prominence being "partly responsible for the chaos in the south" (Adam, 2009: 271). This combination of "tradition and modernity" is the factor that has given way for the north "to survive two civil wars and… years of peace" (Adam, 2009: 271). The SNM is also unique in Africa for being the only liberation movement to ever voluntarily give up power and dissolve itself and in the process hand over power to the elders, in this case Mohamed Egal (Adam, 2009: 271). Jhazbhay notes in his study that

> In the case of Somaliland, clan leadership ascendancy was facilitated by the modernizing nationalism of the SNM which, ideologically, sought to bridge the cultural gap between tradition and modernity and which, from the standpoint of self-reliant pragmatic survival, depended on the clan elders as pillars of support in mobilizing the social base of insurgency and post-conflict governance (p. 55).


Somaliland went on to formulate a constitution through referendum and held local governance elections that were followed up by presidential and parliamentary (*baarlamaanka*) elections in 2003 and 2005 respectively (Adam, 2009: 272). Follow-up elections followed in 2010 and 2017. Somalia, on the other hand, has continued its own trajectory. The section which follows reverts to the 1970s to conduct a comparative assessment of the two polities and their influence on the Ogaden War.

4.3.2.2. Discussion: Mengistu, Barre, Domestic Institutions and the Ogaden War

Figure 6.1. below gives a description of the two countries' rankings on the Polity IV governance index since the early 1960s to 2015. The dataset demonstrates changes and

movements in the scores of the two countries, with declines and improvements in openness. By 2015 Somalia scored higher than Ethiopia, scoring 6 while the latter was at -2. At the onset of the dataset, Ethiopia was at -9, while Somalia has been at 7. There have been constant transformations in the two countries' rankings. Indeed between 1993 and 2009 Polity IV ranked Ethiopia higher than Somalia. This comparative ranking had earlier taken place during the period of interest in this case study. Specifically, between 1975 and 1984, Ethiopia was a higher scorer than Somalia. But both were ranked as non-democracies at -6 and -9 respectively. Somalia maintained this ranking until 2009, while Ethiopia declined to this same score from 1985 to 1993.

Figure 4.1. Ethiopia and Somalia's Polity IV openness scores, 1960-2015



What is to be made of the domestic situation in terms of civil liberties and the regime in Somalia in the years leading up to the war? And what was the nature of the military meant to conduct this campaign? What was the interaction between the nature of the society and the nature of the army? And, finally, how did these contribute to the breakout of the war? These questions are turned to and answered below.

In the lead up to the war, most scholars assign Siad the role of principal instigator/hardliner in the Ethio-Somali dyad. Barre's irredentist motivation over the Ogaden was in part personally motivated. "Not only was the Ogaddeen area more central to the Somali economy and society, but it also was crucial to the legitimacy of Siyadd's regime. Siyadd's mother was from the Ogaadeen clan, and the Ogaadeen people played a central role in the president's tribal coalition" (Valeriano, 2011: 208). But he was likewise buoyed by domestic and legitimacy-related opportunities in both countries, which give credence to the relevance of the democratic peace thesis.

Firstly, as seen in the Background and Onset section, Siad Barre sought to take advantage of the internal situation in post-1974 Ethiopia to make the first offensive and thereby annex the Ogaden. This statement is perhaps the most exemplary of his source of power: "If you try to force me to stand down, I will leave the city as I found it. I came to power with a gun; only the gun can make me go" (Valeriano, 2011: 208). Siad Barre's rule "was characterized by a monopoly on intrastate violence and the use of external threats to impose order domestically" (Valeriano, 2011: 208). But, just as he was removed from power through the volition of large sections of the population, he was, likewise, kept in power by popular support in Somalia to at least "unite all people of Somali culture into a single nation-state" (Laitin and Samatar, 1987: 131). Robinson (2016: 240) advances the thesis that the coup was indeed staged so as to more vigorously pursue the territorial reunification:

> The military's actions after they seized power and their very natural focus on the irredentist agenda suggest another under-acknowledged reason for the coup. The rapprochement with Ethiopia had already been one of the reasons Ibrahim Egal's civilian government had been brought down earlier in 1969. There had been an attempted military coup at the same time. It is reasonable to believe that on top of disgust with the cheapening nature of civilian government by 1969 was also the fear that the military might be denied, for some time at least, its historical role in reclaiming the lost territories. This would have struck at the very heart of the military's *raison d'être*. This explanation mirrors widely accepted military-corporate reasons for other coups in Africa (Robinson, 2016: 240).

The Somali Armed Forces were originally formed through a merger of the Italian and British mandates' "mobile security forces." In the south, the Somali National Army (known as the L'Esercito Nazionale Somalo) was established through law in April of 1960. This was subsequently merged with the British mandate's Somaliland Scouts. The result was the National Army of the Republic of Somalia on April 12th, which is still marked in the Somali calendar as the "Armed Forces Day." The new force numbered roughly 5000. These armed forces, "drawing from multiple clans, became a unified national force" (Robinson, 2016: 239). This number would actually decrease and reached a figure of 4000 in 1963 (Robinson, 2016: 239). If Somalia was to pursue its "Greater Somalia" plan, this had to change. Already noting the decrease, in 1962, Somalia pursued negotiations with the USSR for military support. The Soviets responded favourably with a US$32-million loan package that was finalised with the aim of propping up "an army of 10,000 men" (Robinson, 2016: 239). In 1963, Somalia also rejected a US$10-million package from the US, West Germany, and Italy that included offers to "train a 6000-strong force for internal security and civil aid tasks" (Robinson, 2016: 239).

Somalia sought a more substantial offer, instead requesting support for building up "a 20,000-strong force" (Robinson, 2016: 239). This was denied as Washington's "primary loyalty in the Horn of Africa was to its allies, Ethiopia and, secondly, Kenya" (Robinson, 2016: 239). Further, it perceived the "Greater Somalia" plan as a threat to the stability of the region. Nevertheless, the Soviet assistance was bearing some fruit as by 1965, it was estimated that the Somali Armed Forces had rebounded to 4600 (Robinson, 2016: 239). With a growing military force, consideration was also given to the balance within the army as since before independence, "clan balance had been a preoccupation of the Somali government and the Armed Forces" and a strict equilibrium was adhered to (Robinson, 2016: 238). The Armed Forces had always been concerned with maintaining a balance consisting of the country's five major clans in terms of its own composition. Any military recruitment notice, up until a year before the Ogaden War, stipulated the number of men who were to be enlisted from each district in the country:

> Periodically, both the civilian and military governments attacked "tribalism." But as his support shrunk after the 1978 defeat in Ethiopia, Barre began to bring in and favour more officers from clans closely related to his own, whilst marginalizing other clans (Robinson, 2016: 238).

Following the coup, with the army in power, "there was no obstacle to pushing ahead with the liberation of at least some of the lost territories" (Robinson, 2016: 240). In this context, the military continued to grow, both in terms of the budget as well as the number of enlisted men.

> There were 12,000 personnel in the armed forces in 1970. By 1977, the force size was estimated at some 35,000–37,000 after the arrival of large amounts of Soviet military aid. Soviet aid equipped the armed forces with the largest tank force in Sub-Saharan Africa and 52 combat aircraft, including 24 supersonic MiG-21 fighters, which faced an Ethiopian Air Force which may have had only 16 jet fighters (Robinson, 2016: 240).

However, in relation to the democratic peace thesis, we find that there were other matters to which the regime had potential domestic audience costs, and which therefore staved off the initiation of conflict even by this undemocratic regime, particularly as the new military government had a broad portfolio, and sought other ambitious pursuits "aimed to combat corruption, improve the economy, and standardize the writing on Somali on one script" (Robinson, 2016: 240). They took to this quite actively:

> Military, as well as police officers, were appointed to head government agencies and serve as regional and district heads. The military began an extensive retraining program to reorientate civil servants toward new socialist, revolutionary principles. Civil servants who were identified

> as incompetent or "politically unreliable" were dismissed. The military government had to pay enormous attention to the economy as times grew tougher (Robinson, 2016: 240).

But, however, rather than put the country's territorial ambitions in abeyance, the filling of these posts also served the purposes of militarising virtually every aspects of the government, in a society that appears to have been eager for a recapturing of the Ogaden. Simultaneously the economic downturn that was facing Somalia may have served to enhance the motivation to pursue the war with Ethiopia as both a means to appease the population (and divert it away from the economic and even political shortcomings of the regime) by taking in the historically valued territory roughly half its own size (Somalia is 637 655 km² while the Ogaden is 327,068 km^2). From 1975 to 1976 the GDP per capita declined from US$183.19 to US$103.81 by 1977.[18] Overall GDP had decreased from US$710-million in 1975 to US$498-million in 1977. This was a push factor. But as the country continued to invest more into military preparedness (from US$23-million in 1975 to US$31-million in 1977),[19] this perhaps demonstrates that the annexation aims preceded the economic downturn. Perhaps more important therefore were the regime-related external pull factors.

> By the late 1970s, a significant opportunity for Somalia to seize the Ogaden region appeared to be developing. The Somali government had maintained guerrillas in the Ogaden from the mid-1970s. Their overtly independent status was a cover for close control over them by the Somali armed forces' regional headquarters and, ultimately, the Somali Minister of Defence. By 1977, a bloody purge by the new leader of the Ethiopian military dictatorship, Colonel Mengistu Haile Mariam, and rebellions around the periphery of Ethiopia, gave the Somali government its chance (Robinson, 2016: 240).

It is for this reason that Mengistu is seen as "accommodationist" in the context of the early onset of the conflict, though he evolved into a security-minded "tough negotiator" (Valeriano, 2011: 208). The Derg had spent a fair share of its early tenure attempting to stifle internal resistance. The Ethiopian state was not ready for war in 1977 and for this reason was disinclined to pursue the issue with Somalia. Indeed, historical evidence suggest that he may have been at least open to the idea of self-government by the various territories, which would hypothetically have appeased the Ethiopian Somalis in Ogaden:

[18] World Bank. 2019. "GDP per capita (current US$) – Somalia." Available at: https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.PCAP.CD?locations=SO (Last accessed: 2 October 2019).
[19] World Bank. 2019. "Military expenditure (current USD) - Somalia." Available at: https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/MS.MIL.XPND.CD?locations=SO (Last accessed: 2 October 2019).

> Notes from a diplomatic meeting between Cuba, Ethiopia, and Somalia in March 1977 indicate that Mengistu was not seeking to push this conflict into a war, while Somalia appeared uncompromising. "This [settlement] proved impossible to attain, because Siad Barre unequivocally rejected all of the suggestions presented at the meeting. While the meeting did not lead to an agreement, nevertheless Siad Barre promised not to attack Ethiopia.

This promise did not prove true, however as Siad Barre was convinced that Cuban and Soviet support would not be forthcoming; at least not as quickly as Addis Ababa needed it. This conviction was further bolstered by his appraisal of "the internal weakness of Ethiopia at the time" (Valeriano, 2011: 208). For Valerianio, "this path to war demonstrates that there need not be hardliners on both sides of the conflict to start a war," as the presence of a determined one is enough to tip the scales towards a conflict (Valeriano, 2011: 208).

Defeat in the Ogaden desert precipitated the fall of Siad Barre's regime. The manner in which this unfolded is also telling as it has congruence with the democratic peace thesis. In sum, "the key agenda linking both civilian and military governments and the people they had originally sworn to serve, was proven overambitious and unachievable" (Ododa, 1985: 285). President Barre's posture regarding the domestic situation after the Ogaden failure took three main forms. Firstly, he promulgated a new constitution. Secondly, he declared a state of emergency, and finally, he shook up his cabinet and party leadership in the SRSP (Ododa, 1985: 285). The implications of these developments are worth examining in turn.

In January of 1979, the politburo of the Somali Revolutionary Socialist Party, Siad Barre's party, approved the promulgation of a new constitution to suppliant the 1961-established constitution, but which had been suspended since 1969. This constitution was then put to and passed a national referendum in August of 1979 from a reported "99.69 per cent" of the reported 3, 597, 592 million voters (Ododa, 1985: 285). "The new constitution restored elective politics and civilian institutions. The People's Assembly, the national legislature, was empowered to elect the President who would serve a six-year term" (Ododa, 1985: 285). In the subsequent election of December 1979, in which a reported 4 million people voted, the People's Assembly was elected, with the SRSP winning 171 out of 171 seats. The Assembly went on to unanimously select Barre as president of Somalia. Reinstated, in October of the following year, he declared a state of emergency and redeployed the Supreme Revolutionary Council (SRC), which was comprised of 17 senior officers, which he led. This state of emergency lasted until March of 1982, in time for President Barre's visit to the United States (Ododa, 1985: 285).

At this time, rumblings against Siad Barre started to gain momentum. The third node of internal resistance to the Siad regime came in the form of growing political opposition. In a context wherein the only legal party was the SRSP, opposition movements were armed; the SSDF, the SNM, and the smaller Somali Democratic Liberation Front and Somali Workers Party (Ododa, 1985: 286). Writing contemporaneously, Ododa (1985: 285) observed that "Somalia's domestic politics since the Ogaden war have been dominated by increasing opposition to President Siad Barre, and by Barre's efforts to shore up his government." The source of this opposition was rooted in a variety of issues they vocalised. These included the following:

> mismanaging the Ogaden war; sending members of tribes other than his own to die in the Ogaden war; nepotism; tribalism; 'fascist rule'; 'tyrannical rule'; repression; abuse of human rights; running 'an absolute and despotic dictatorship'; the 'undermining of the faith and Islamic way of life of the Somali people'; sending assassination squads abroad to infiltrate opposition movements and liquidate their leaders; and pursuing an 'incoherent, ill-conceived, unpredictable and self-defeating foreign policy which has resulted in the isolation of the Somali Republic and international indifference to Somali causes' (Ododa, 1985: 286-7).

The regime responded through extrajudicial killings that both signified and exacerbated the regime's weakening. "Siad Barre's extrajudicial executions waged against the Isaaq and Majerteen clans between 1978 and 1988 had considerably eroded support for his government among the Somali people" (Yihun, 2014: 684). Importantly, Yihun observes that "the normalization of relations with Ethiopia, therefore, had no impact on internal political dynamics within Somalia. Rather, its importance lay in the incentive it gave the Ethiopians to reinforce their policy of destabilization in Somalia" (Yihun, 2014: 684). An observer at the time noted that the SNM had been given "a golden handshake in the form of land cruisers, artillery, and automatic weapons" upon which it went to the north of Somalia and began launching attacks against government outposts and assets there (Yihun, 2014: 684). As Barre was eluded by what had effectively become a northern enclave and as he endured dissatisfaction by the north's majority group – the Issaq clans – this was welcome news in Addis Ababa; "the tactical support to their armed insurgencies removed pressure from the Derg at a moment when it was facing many other challenges" (Yihun, 2014: 684). After 1988, the Derg refocused its efforts on forging cooperation between SNM and the SSDF (Yihun, 2014: 684); this succeeded, as the latter went on to establish the Somaliland Republic, and the latter Putland.

Apart from armed resistance by disaffected clans, opposition to Siad Barre's government was further expressed from within his government in two other methods: an attempted coup and defection of posts by both government and military. The first node of opposition, the coup attempt, occurred only within a month of the Ogaden withdrawal, as "dissident elements in the military staged an unsuccessful coup to topple the government" (Ododa, 1985: 285). This failed putsch came in the context of reports that numerous officers who had been in disagreement with Siad Barre over the Ogaden campaign having been executed. To be sure, he still had those who were loyal to him; at least at this time. This is indeed how the coup was eradicated. "Some of the leaders of the plot fled the country. Of those arrested, 17 were subsequently executed while others were given long prison sentences" (Ododa, 1985: 285).

Defection of government official was the second form of expression of opposition to the President following the end of the war, with mostly members of the civil service and the military being the most inclined to defect.

> One example is that of Hussein Dualeh, who defected in 1978 while serving as Somalia's ambassador to Kenya. Another is Abdullahi En Laye, who defected in 1980 while he was the consul in Djibouti. A third, and perhaps the most visible, example was Mohamed Warsame Ali who defected, also in 1980, from his post as Somalia's ambassador to Washington (Ododa, 1985: 285).

Following the 1978 failed putsch, the military was perceived as a threat by Siad Barre. He began the process of reshuffling the previously proportioned clan balance in the armed forces to be more representative of his own Marehan clan as well as recruit officers from the Darod who were related to his own; at the same time "some military personnel from other clans were transferred to civil administrative positions" (Robinson, 2016: 241). For the rest of his tenure, Barre continued filling senior ranks with officers drawn from clans he felt an affinity and a trust with. In other words, in relation to the literature on the democratic peace thesis, his "winning coalition" decreased. "Five key reserve brigades in Mogadishu and Hargeisa all became commanded by Marehan officers" (Robinson, 2016: 241). A contemporaneous observer wrote that "Colonels and generals were part of the President's personal patronage network; they had to remain loyal to him and his relatives, whether they had command or were temporarily in the cabinet." This had undermining consequences, in a country already divided and with region and clan-based divisions emerging: "This ethnic favoritism and manipulation of the senior ranks, over time, destroyed the military's reputation as a national institution" (Robinson, 2016: 241).

The negotiations between Somalia and Ethiopia towards a post-war settlement, seem also to have been shaped by regime type, which appears to present a unique set of options when taking place between two internally illegitimate regimes. "While the Ethiopian authorities understood the fact that no Somali politician would readily commit on the question of the frontier, on the other hand, Siad Barre was simultaneously desperate to stem the free movement of major opposition groups, including SSDF and SNM, across the common boundary" (Yihun, 2014: 682). Comparatively speaking, "Somalia was more beleaguered by the incessant anti-government insurrections than was the Derg" (Yihun, 2014: 682). By contrast, Somali sponsorship of rebels in the north of Ethiopia, especially the Eritrean People's Liberation Front, was minor.

> The propaganda issued by the EPLF's office in Mogadishu was a nuisance to the Derg but no more than that. In addition, the WSLF and SALF were significantly weakened after the Ogaden War. The former was practically defunct by the late 1980s, with its splinter group, the Ogaden National Liberation Front (ONLF) operating from headquarters in Kuwait. Even though elements of the ONLF would later manage to slip back into the Ogaden, their actions had little impact. Siad Barre's negotiating position was therefore a weak one (Yihun, 2014: 682).

There is ample evidence to also suggest that successive Ethiopian regimes always understood their 'Somalia problem' as being rooted in the kind of regime that presided over that country. Seeking to change this, the Ethiopians always sought to utilise internal discord within Somalia itself; this *finally* succeeded with the collapsing of the Siad Barre regime at behest of undermining by the Ethiopia. "Ethiopia's efforts to incite strife in Somalia using disgruntled groups can be traced back to the imperial era. Many of the past mutinies, election-related violence, and coups in Somalia had occurred with the blessing of Ethiopian authorities" (Yihun, 2014: 684). Furthermore,

> archives also reveal role in the scheme to convince Hargeisa politicians to reject the union formula with the south, in the establishment in 1966 of the North Somalia Liberation Movement (NSLM) and the creation of the South Somalia 35 – Refugees Association (SSRA) the NSLM consisting of marginalized sections of the Isaaq clan in the north, while the SSRA mobilized disgruntled Hawiye and Rahanweyn clan members in the south (Yihun, 2014: 683-684).

Like never before, then, the political upheaval in Somalia post-Ogaden War fermented new opportunities for Addis Ababa's aims of destabilising the rival. The opportunity was signalled

by the failed coup and the declaration of the state of emergency in October 1980. "The repressive measures Siad Barre's government now launched against, first, the Majerteen and Isaaq, and later (in the early 1980s) the Hawiye, led to popular discontent that Ethiopia was able to exploit" (Yihun, 2014: 684).

The Somali Government became alert of this active sponsorship and registered its protests about Ethiopia's infringements of the 1988 agreement.

> In May 1989, one year after the signing of the agreement, Somalia launched a major diplomatic offensive, accusing Ethiopia of supporting the SNM, SSDF, and, after May 1989, the Ogaden Soldiers Movement (later renamed Somali Patriotic Front – SPF) under Brig. Gen. Omar Jese (Yihun, 2014: 685).

By this time, however, Barre's regime was already fragmenting and on the point of collapse. Weighing its options, the Ethiopians came to the following two: They could either "save the Siad Barre regime from the imminent peril it was facing and positively influence its policies toward Ethiopia" (Yihun, 2014: 685). This view held weight due to a "fear of the possibility of the accession to power of a regime even more virulently anti-Ethiopian than was Barre – perhaps seeing Muslim fundamentalists or Ogadenis coming to power in Mogadishu" (Yihun, 2014: 685). Incidentally, this was the Soviet-approved tactic. The other seriously considered option was based on the perception that since Siad Barre's collapse was an inevitability, Addis Ababa "should identify opposition groups that would clearly understand and respect its interests in the future" (Yihun, 2014: 685). This was attractive because it would allow Ethiopia to cut down any anti-Ethiopia government from rising to prominence and power in Mogadishu, thereby diminishing any probability of a Somalia strong enough to initiate or wage war against Ethiopia, in light of the unresolved territorial issue, should it become salient once more (Yihun, 2014: 685). This final option was the one chosen, particularly the SNM in north Somalia, USC in central Somalia and the SPF around Kismayu. "The Ethiopian embassy in Mogadishu was instructed to work toward its realization" (Yihun, 2014: 685). In a final desperate attempt at self-preservation, Siad Barre approached Ethiopia in January 1990. But his appeal "to resolve the border issue in return for Ethiopia's closure of its frontiers and ceasing support to the rebels" (Yihun, 2014: 685) met refusal by Ethiopia. To be sure, the rebels were already in control over much of the country and it is not clear how much leeway Ethiopia, given its own domestic setbacks, had to dictate to these and roll them back. Ethiopian efforts went further, to consolidate the dismantling of Somalia's government and territorial unity; when a "peace

conference" organised by the Egyptians, Italians, Kuwaitis in December 1990, Ethiopia made certain that the rebel groups attended no such conference (Yihun, 2014: 685).

Thus, Siad Barre government finally fell through in January of the following year. Following a UN intervention in 1992, the US followed suit in October 1993, but both had withdrawn by March of 1995 (Robinson, 2016: 241). Ethiopia was optimistic. In a statement, Ethiopia's Ambassador to Somalia, Dr. Asmamaw Qelemu, declared that "the important thing is that Somalia is dangerous no more" (Yihun, 2014: 686).

Like Somalia, the end of the Derg, which followed in 1991, was rooted in its own internal lack of legitimacy; thus, as the Derg ensured the downfall and collapse of Siad Barre, it was itself under siege from its own disgruntled and organised people groups. As the tank-riding and cannon-wielding EPRDF rebel forces took over Addis Ababa on the 28th and 29th of May, a Biles (1991: 1) journalist observed that "the fleeing soldiers abandoned their uniforms. In a courtyard in front of one of the main halls of the palace, shirts, jackets, caps and boots lay discarded on the ground." The ensuing period saw a secession (1993), constitutional consolidation (1993), and eventually a war with a newly independent Eritrea (1998), which will be assessed in turn in Chapter 6.

4.4. Case Study Analysis II: Economic Interdependence and Peace

4.4.1. Methodology

4.4.1.1. Variables

The dependent variable is operationalised as the initiation of conflict by one state on one another which yields at least 1000 battle-related deaths (as per the Correlates of War typology). Thus, it is a marked event in a horizontal timeframe resultant in a transformation from a peaceful state of affairs to a state of affairs of conflict. The question is what has brought about this outcome; in other words, the independent variable. The independent variable is operationalised as the share of the initiating belligerent's in the retaliating adversary's total imports (as measured in monetary terms, in US dollars throughout this dissertation).

The method of inquiry used in this dissertation is 'before/after' in that it will make use of antebellum conditions across the political and economic configurations within the countries and the region to understand what led to the war in terms of hegemonic stability theory.

Causality can be drawn from a lack of export markets or, when markets did exist, the continuously declining export markets in the adversary in the years leading up to the conflict which could be explained by a declining opportunity cost of initiating a conflict against them.

This data will be sourced from various sources including the World Bank, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology's Observatory of Economic Complexity, the UN's TradeMap as well Director of Technology and Investment Information Directorate,[20] National Planning Commission of Ethiopia,[21] the Ethiopian Ministry of Innovation and Technology and the Centre for Food Security Studies, Addis Ababa University.

4.4.1.2. Hypothesis

Since economic interdependence is argued to be a deterrent from war by creating incentives for maintenance of a status quo, we should expect that interstate conflict should be initiated by the state with the lesser export market in its counterpart. Thus the hypothesis is:

> H2: The interstate conflict between Somalia and Ethiopia was initiated by the state which had an export market lower than the targeted adversary in that state's population.

4.4.2. Ethiopia-Somalia trade in historical perspective

4.4.2.1. Ethiopian export profile

Africa's fastest rising economy, Ethiopia's economic progress, beginning in earnest since 2004, has been rooted in growth in industrial activity, as well as investments in infrastructure and manufacturing (World Bank, 2018).[22] A lot of this has stemmed from FDI which, according to the World Bank was at 27.6% in FY 2016/17, "with investments going into new industrial parks and privatization inflows" (Gray, 2018 May 4). In this regard, China has emerged both as Ethiopia's largest source of FDI as well as import and export partner.[23] This is against the stark contrast of the Derg period and the 1990s after the EPDRF came into power:

> "During the period of the revolution it is remarkable that Ethiopia had any economy. The basic economy was agricultural. Upwards of eighty percent of the population is directly or indirectly dependent upon agriculture for their livelihood. Although an overwhelming proportion of the population are engaged in agriculture, agricultural production accounts for only about 50 percent of Gross Domestic Product. Most of the farming (two thirds to three quarters) is for the subsistence of the rural population and consists primarily of subsistence crops such as grains and pulses" (Watkins, 2000).[24]

[20] Including an interview (Interview 2).
[21] Including an interview (Interview 2).
[22] From Interview 2, Interview 3, Interview 5, and Interview 14.
[23] Interview 14.
[24] See online at: http://www.sjsu.edu/faculty/watkins/ethiopia (Last accessed: 3 August 2019).

The consequences of the political instability in Ethiopia after 1974 are reflected in Table 4.1 below. The table demonstrates an overall decrease between 1974 and 1978 in the total value of the country's exports, with two exceptions Firstly, "Coffee production did increase substantially and, fortunately for the Ethiopian people, the price of coffee went up so much that it offset the collapse of the rest of the economy" (Watkins, 2000).[25] The other increase was in the stimulant known as Chat.

Table 4.2. Values of Ethiopian exports, 1974 and 1978

Commodity	Value in 1974 (in millions of Ethiopian Birr)	Value in 1978 (in millions of Ethiopian Birr)
Coffee	151.9	502.9
Pulses	101.9	17.3
Oilseeds	95.9	12.2.
Hides and skins	47.1	66.3
Incense	22.7	2.8
Canned and frozen meats	14.6	0.7
Live animals	13.3	1.0
Fruits and vegetables	11.8	3.3
Oilseed cakes	8.6	3.9
Chat	5.5	5.8
Sugar	4.5	0
Spices	3.2	1.9
Beeswax	2.9	5.3
Others	60.8	8.1
Re-exports	8.9	1.3


Source: MIT Observatory of Economic Complexity. 2019.

Manufacturing played a minor role in the economy, despite the efforts of the government "through state enterprises but had the usual lack of success of socialist ventures" (Watkins, 2000). Furthermore, the Mengistu government took to nationalising the enterprises from 1975 onwards, "thus converting a weak manufacturing sector into a moribund one" (Watkins, 2000).

[25] Ibid.

Figures 4.2. to 4.6. trace over the 1974 to 1978 period Ethiopia's export partners.

Figure 4.2. Share of Ethiopia's exports, 1974 (in %)




Source:

MIT Observatory of Economic Complexity. Figures 4.2 to 4.6 all sourced from the same dataset.

With a view to determine the countries with which Ethiopia was economically intertwined in these years, we note in 1974 that the country's principal export partner was Singapore (at a 29% share of Ethiopian exports), followed by the US (with a 15% share of Ethiopian exports). The remainder of these export partners range from a 5.8% (Japan) share of its exports and 4% (Djibouti). Notably, Djibouti was Ethiopia's only trade partner in the region in this year. Somalia was therefore not a market for Ethiopian goods.


This state of affairs was continued for the remainder of the pre-war period, as in 1975 (Figure 4.3.), the country's exports were mostly destined for the US (with a 19% share of Ethiopian exports), followed by Japan (with an 11% share of Ethiopian exports). Djibouti's share also grew to 7.3%, and also joined by Egypt among as another trade partner in the continent at 5%.

Figure 4.3. Share of Ethiopia's exports, 1975 (in %)



In 1976 (Figure 4.4.), the Ethiopia once again mostly exported to the US (with a 33% share of Ethiopian exports), followed by the UK (with a 9% share of Ethiopian exports), and then by Italy and Japan at 7.6 and 7.4 share of Ethiopian exports respectively. At 3.4% share of Ethiopian exports, Egypt was the only trade partner for Ethiopia in 1976.


Figure 4.4. Share of Ethiopia's exports, 1976 (in %)



In 1977 (Figure 4.5), Ethiopia mostly exported to the US (with a 30% share of Ethiopian exports), and then Japan (with an 11% share of Ethiopian exports), with the rest of the trade


partners ranging between 7.2% (Italy) and 2.7% (UK). Notably, Ethiopia had no significant African trade partners in 1977.

Figure 4.5 Share of Ethiopia's exports, 1977 (in %)



In 1978, Ethiopia continued to have no significant trade partners in the region or in the continent, with the US remaining the country's major export partner (with a 37% share of Ethiopian exports), followed by Yugoslavia (with a 10% share of Ethiopian exports), with the remainder of significant trade partners ranging between 8.4% (Italy) and 1.1% (Israel). There were once again no significant trade partners within the continent for Ethiopia.


Figure 4.6. Share of Ethiopia's exports, 1978 (in %)



4.4.2.2. Ethiopia-Somalia trade relations, 1974 to 1977

4.4.2.2.1. Import-export dynamics

Figure 4.7. Total Somali exports, 1962-2016



Source: World Bank, 2019.


Overall, Somali exports grew from US$29.8-million in 1962, to US$40.5-million by 1968. After a decrease to US$21.1-million in 1969, the country's exports grew under Siad Barre's regime, to their all-time high of US$95.7-million in 1975. However, there were reversions to US$93.3-million in 1976 and to then US$65.2-million in 1977, and then their all-time low of US$20.3-million in 1978 (which has, to the present, remained the all-time low for Somalia in its entire post-colonial period). Further sectorial declines were observed. For example, in 1969, the country was exporting 47,00 tons of sugar. By 1980, however, it was exporting only 29, 100 tons.

Our interest in this section is noting the degree to which Ethiopia's imports were or were not significantly sourced from Somalia and likewise the extent to which Somali exports were or were not proportionally destined for Ethiopia and thus identify whether the latter initiated a war against the former in spite of the existence of an export market which would be contrary to the interdependence thesis. A method of assessing this is through distilling the proportional shares of Ethiopia's top ten import partners from the years of the Derg government and distilling whether Somalia has any presence in this regard, and then turning to the top ten destinations of Somali exports. The 'top ten' limit is a useful barometer because among

Somalia's first ten export partners, the threshold of a 1 to 2% share in exports is reached in 6 of the 8 years. In other words, beyond the level of the top ten, there is no country which could be argued to have an interdependence with Somalia.

In the first year of the Derg coming into power (1974), the country's top ten trading partners consisted of Italy, the UK, East Germany, West Germany, Japan, Iran, France, Kenya, the US and Switzerland (see Figure 4.5). The principal import partner was Italy at 13%, and the least significant trading partner were Switzerland and Kenya, both at 2.2%. Somalia is noticeably absent in this ranking as the country only exported US$74,000 worth of goods into Ethiopia, or a proportion of 0.024% (MIT, 2019).[26]


Figure 4.8. Top 10 Ethiopian import partners, 1974 (by share of Ethiopia's imports)



In 1975, Ethiopia's import partners consisted of Saudi Arabia, Japan, Italy, West Germany, the UK, the US, France, the Netherlands, Taiwan and China. Somalia exported only US$60,000 worth of goods into Ethiopia, or a proportion of 0.018%.


[26] Available online at: https://oec.world/en/visualize/tree_map/sitc/import/eth/show/all/1974/ (Last accessed: 9 May 2019).

Figure 4.9. Top 10 Ethiopian import partners, 1975 (by share of Ethiopia's imports)



In 1976, Japan and Saudi Arabia jointly showed up as the principal import partners (both at 14% of Ethiopia's imports), followed by West and East Germany, the US, Italy, the UK, Singapore, India and finally France at 1.9%.


Figure 4.10. Top 10 Ethiopian import partners, 1976 (by share in Ethiopia's imports)



In 1976, Japan (still at 14% share of Ethiopia's total imports) maintained its position as the principal import partner, followed by the US, Italy, Saudi Arabia, the UK, South Korea, Singapore, France, the Netherlands and finally India at 2.5%. In this year, one year removed from the initiation of the Ogaden War, Somali exports into Ethiopia stood only at 0.0074% or only US$29, 000 worth of exports, in a year that Ethiopia had a total import capacity of US$394-million, and Somalia had an export capacity of US$93.3-million.


In 1977, the year of the war, Ethiopia's top 10 import partners were composed of Japan (at 14% share), followed by the US, Italy, Saudi Arabia, the UK, South Korea, Singapore, France, Netherlands, and India (at 2.5% share). For this year, Somali-sourced imports were non-existent (MIT, 1977).

Figure 4.11. Top 10 Ethiopian import partners, 1977 (by share of Ethiopia's imports)




In 1978, Ethiopia continued to have no imports from Somalia, while the country's top 10 import partners were made up of Italy (at 16% share), Japan, West Germany, West Germany, East Germany, France, Sweden, South Korea, the US, Singapore, and Israel at 1% (MIT, 1978).

Figure 4.12. Top 10 Ethiopian import partners, 1978 (by share of Ethiopia's imports)




It is entirely possible that despite Somalia not featuring in the primary ten importing partners over these years, it is possible that, as a matter of disproportionality, Ethiopia could still have been a major export destination for Somalia. Thus, looking at the trade relations from the other perspective, we can observe the degree to which Ethiopia did or did not feature in Somalia's export markets.

Figure 4.13. Share of Somali exports, 1968




Beginning in 1968, the year prior to the coup which brought about the Siad Barre regime, we find Ethiopia missing in the country's export partners, which were dominated by Italy at 70%. Importantly, the 10th most popular export country, Denmark, totalled only at 0.072% share.

Figure 4.14. Share of Somali exports, 1969 (in %)




From 1969, the country continued to have its exports destined for Italy as its principal export partner, with Italy, Democratic Republic of Yemen, Greece, France, Switzerland, the USSR,

Figure 4.15. Share of Somali exports, 1970 (in %)



Belgium, the US and Egypt following thereafter. The country with the least share of Somali exports – Egypt – had only a 0.37% of such a share. From 1970 through 1977 (Figure 4.15 to 4.23) Ethiopia continued to be an absentee among Somalia's export destinations.

Figure 4.16. Share of Somali exports, 1971 (in %)



In 1971 and 1972, the country's chief export partner was Saudi Arabia at 44% and 28% of Somali exports, respectively. For both years, this was followed by Italy at 20% in 1971 and then 22% in 1972.

Figure 4.17. Share of Somali exports, 1972 (in %)





Figure 4.18. Share of Somali exports, 1973 (in %)



In 1973 (Figure 4.18) and 1974 (Figure 4.19), Somali exports continued to be primarily exported to Saudi Arabia, with Kuwait and Italy at second-place in the respective years. In 1973, exports to Saudi Arabia stood at a 44%, whereas exports to Kuwait were at 11%; in 1974, exports to Saudi Arabia were at 36% and their Italian counterparts were at 17%.

Figure 4.19. Share of Somali exports, 1974 (in %)





Figure 4.20. Share of Somali exports, 1975 (in %)



This trend among the top 2 trade partners continued to be primarily destined to Saudi Arabia in 1975 and 1976 at 50 and 51% share respectively. Italy followed in second place in both years 10% in 1975 and then 17% in 1976.

Figure 4.21. Share of Somali exports, 1976 (in %)






Figure 4.22. Share of Somali exports, 1977 (in %)



In 1977 (Figure 4.22), Somali exports were at 53% share of Somali exports, with Italy-bound exports at second-place at 29%. The following year (Figure 4.23), Saudi-bound exports stood at 73% share; followed by the comparatively declined Italy-bound exports at 11%.


Figure 4.23. Share of Somali exports, 1978 (in %)



4.4.3. Analysis: Correlating interdependence and the onset of conflict between Ethiopia and Somalia


Throughout the data of Somali access to the Ethiopian import market, it was clear that Somali's access was severely limited, never reaching the threshold level of being 1% of Ethiopian imports, or of Ethiopia being a destination of 1% or more of Somali exports. This took place alongside, at least in 1969, and again in 1977, Somalia being a market of 1.5% of Ethiopian exports. Thus, while Somalia did not penetrate the Ethiopian market, Ethiopia was *comparatively* gaining more access to its market. At the same time, this may have not been high enough to avert the bellicosity of Somalia as the Siad Barre regime and Somali population was *not dependent enough* on Ethiopia.

Figure 4.24. Mutual shares in exports between Ethiopia and Somalia, 1962-2010



As Figure 4.24 above and Figure 4.25 below (in comparison with Figure 4.7 previously alluded to) demonstrates, from the 1960s onwards Ethiopia had far greater export capacity than Somalia, which may partially account for the balance of trade being skewed in the former's favour.

Figure 4.25. Total Ethiopian exports, 1962-2016



Noticeably, however, after the war, the two countries have seen minimal trade, and marked by an absence of Somali access to the Ethiopian market. If lack of economic interdependence was the sole cause of the war in 1977, then we could expect another war to break out. As this has not happened, we should deduce that the lack of economic interdependence was not the only cause of the Ogaden War; in other words it was a necessary but insufficient cause.

However, a likely better explanation is that the lack of interdependence *combined* with the domestic desire for the territory led to the war and that a war has not broken out since due to the lack of a government with institutional channels to facilitate this. In other words, substantial interdependence may have prevented the war from taking place as it would have reframed the opportunity cost and made it less desirable to regain the territory. A question worth pondering, however, is how much possible it would have been for these two countries to have formidable trade relations in the light of their territorial disputes. "The Somali–Ethiopian rivalry started with the independence of Somalia in 1960 and conforms to the class of rivalries born fighting" (Goertz and Diehl, 1995: 30).

Nonetheless, the war cannot be understood outside the frame of interdependence in the broader global context as in the lead-up to the outbreak of the conflict there had been a regional arms race fuelled by imported arms. "This led to a tit for tat increase in weapons acquisitions by Ethiopia, which acquired advanced Northrop F-5 aircraft from Iran" (Lewis, 1998: 234). Furthermore, in the year 1974, Mogadishu took the decision to join the Arab League after which "[it] was able to solicit resources and military supplies from its new Arab allies. The militarization of each side further raised tensions in the dyad" (Goertz and Diehl, 1995: 30).

Another pattern was noticeable between the two countries' outward (extra-continental) trade pathways; these trade relations had overlaps as to who which countries were also present in the negotiations as mediating states both before and after the war. As we have seen, Italy, Saudi Arabia, the US and the USSR were among the most active in attempting to prevent the tensions from escalating and reinstating a peace settlement once the war had taken place. Italy and Saudi Arabia in particular, which had the largest share of Somali exports, and sought to play significant roles in the negotiations. Nevertheless, there appears to have been limits to the amount of pressure they, particularly Italy (which had made the most concerted attempt at an early settlement of the war [Schwab, 1985: 96]), could exert on the Somali regime. Importantly, Saudi Arabia had unfavourable relations with the Derg and was hopeful of a Somali victory in

the war (Erlich, 2006), whereas the Soviet Union, which was the principal supplier to Somalia for military equipment in the immediate pre-war period appears to have variously been an important export partner but not the most significance export partner, and also failed to dissuade the Barre regime away from initiating a war. Interestingly, these countries' shares in Somali exports may have been expanding, but overall Somali exports were in decline in the years between 1975 and 1977; from US$96.7-million in 1975 to US$65.2 by 1977. Additionally, although there were no exports to Saudi Arabia in 1978, exports to Italy accumulated the major portion of Somali exports at 73%. Thus, in keeping with the interdependence thesis, we do not see Italian pressure being adhered to by Somalia because Italy did not make use of the threat of commercial harm to Somalia for carrying out a behaviour it publicly disapproved of (i.e., Somali aggression towards Ethiopia).

Another factor worth considering is the degree to which exports were or were not a significant factor within the Somali economy at this time. To gauge an answer to this we turn to an assessment of the total Somali GDP to determine the share of exports in that total. In 1975, Somalia's GDP was US$711-million, in 1976, the country had a total GDP of US$807-million, and in 1977 it had a GDP of US$499-million.[27] There was thus a clear discrepancy between income from exports and the total size of the economy that shows a lack of dependency on exports. This was further widened in 1976 as exports declined but GDP still grew. Further, in real figures, the disparity was maintained despite the downturn in total GDP in 1977 as both GDP and income from exports declined significantly.

Table 4.3. Somali total export and GDP data, 1975-1977


Year	Exports (in US$)	Total GDP (in US$-millions)
1975	95.7	711
1976	93.3	807
1977	65.2	499

Source: World Bank (2019)

This is visually depicted in Figure 4.26. below:

[27] *Country Economy*. 2019. 'Somalia GDP'. Available at: https://countryeconomy.com/gdp/somalia (Last accessed: 31 July 2019).

Figure 4.26. Somalia GDP to exports ratio, 1975-1977



This demonstrates that literature on interdependence, either on potential belligerents and would-be mediators, ought to take into account the external reliance of the country in question in the first place. As this case demonstrates, while Somalia was an exporting nation prior to the war, these exports were declining in the years leading up to the war – which coincided with the consolidation of power by a regime its leader reliably considered weak between 1974 and 1977 based on signals of social unrest and mutinies – and they had already had a minimal share within its total GDP. In other words, the concept of weaponised interdependence conceptualised by Farrell and Newman (2019: 42), as situations in which, for example, larger states favoured by commercial asymmetry "can employ the "chokepoint effect" to deny network access to adversaries" in order to extract favourable behaviour from the comparatively smaller. In this, instance, then, there was insufficient interdependence to be weaponised.

This begs the question of whether this was replicable in the other case studies. In other words, how much external pressure could be exerted on the entire Horn of Africa by commercially linked external (non-African) players? This, being the essence of hegemonic stability theory, will be teased out in the subsequent two chapters (5 and 6) on a case-by-case basis, and then for the entire region in greater detail in Chapter 7.

4.5. Conclusion

To conclude, though it was fought by two states that were not democracies, the Ogaden War nonetheless carries congruence with the literature within the democratic peace thesis. Firstly, Somalia saw a coup attempt only within a month of the Ogaden War withdrawal in which the

country lost. This indicates an example of the leader/war-monger's winning coalition becoming disinclined towards the regime once it has lost a war because of its loss of power in the state. Further congruence is to be noted in that opposition to the regime by the rest of the country, organised along clans and regions, was characterised by armed resistance, as the literature predicts to be the case in context of one-party state due to a lack of other channels for opposition, and at the same time the state not having the means to repress it. As we saw, this was further bolstered by Ethiopian sponsorship. At the same time, the state of emergency was lifted in 1981 in pursuit of US funding. These points indicate a role for the regional and international actors, which will be explored in full in Chapter 7.

A working typology consisting of both the democratic peace and economic interdependence theses is beginning to emerge as at least a combination of a lack of interdependence between Somalia and Ethiopia and domestic audience appeasement; with the hypothetical institutional constraints on the executive's war-making being curtailed by the fact that the country's constitution had been suspended since 1969. This case study has demonstrated that the literature on interdependence, either on potential belligerents and would-be mediators, ought to take into account the external reliance of the country in question in the first place. As this case demonstrates, while Somalia was an exporting nation prior to the war, these exports were declining in the years leading up to the war – which coincided with the consolidation of power by a regime its leader reliably considered weak between 1974 and 1977 based on signals of social unrest and mutinies – and they had already had a minimal share within its total GDP.

CHAPTER 5

Case Study 2: Uganda-Tanzania War, 1978-1979

5.1. Introduction

The Uganda Tanzania War, taking place between October 1978 and June 1979 was fought by the two countries in two stages, consisting of the Tanzanian front (October 1978 to January 1979) and then the Tanzanian counter-invasion (January to April 1979). The war led to major changes in Uganda and the overall region; leading to the downfall of the Idi Amin regime, and then the subsequent civil war which saw the Yoweri Museveni-led government emerging in 1986. On the other hand, the war signified the collapse of the East African Community, which did not re-emerge until 1999, as well as a southern African tilt on the part of Tanzania.

The territory fought over has been described as "a small slice of not especially fertile land" (Valeriano, 2011: 210) along the frontier between the two countries which was under Tanzanian administration. Uganda sought claim over this particular area because it served as a training grounds for anti-Idi Amin forces. "But Kampala has given a dubious rationale for the invasion by asserting that the Kagera River was once the recognized line between German and British spheres of influence in East Africa" (Darnton, November 8, 1978). The war remains under-theorised. This is perhaps blameable on the fact that only a single contemporaneous book – Avirgan and Honey's 1983 volume titled *War in Uganda: The Legacy of Idi Amin* – was written about this war at the time.

Scholarly literature on the war indicates that the it is "distinct among contemporaneous African conflicts for its noticeable lack of a Cold War context" (Roberts, 2014: 692). This is even more so in contrast to the Ogaden War in which one of the two superpowers took to active battle, but also akin to it in that it was erupted by a bilateral, territorial issue. To be sure, both countries had allies as prior to the outbreak of the war, with Uganda aligned with the USSR, Sudan, Libya and the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. Tanzania, on the other hand, had in 1976 formed an alliance consisting of frontline states such as Angola, Mozambique and Zambia against Apartheid South Africa (Valeriano, 2011: 210). But none of these, with the exception of Libya, came into direct play beyond tacit support and approvals.

George Roberts also observes that "the war demonstrated the shortcomings of the OAU in resolving African conflicts" (Roberts, 2014: 692). Julius Nyerere indeed displayed no interest in settling the war through the OAU, once his country had had to turn the tide of the Ugandan

invasion and attempted annexation of the Kagera; indeed, all he had received, on November 10th of 1978, was a request by his fellow African leaders to utilise his "his abundant wisdom" to terminate the conflict. Disgruntled, by such incapability on the part of the OAU, when a delegation from the OAU met him the following day, he told its delegation that he "[wanted] to know what the OAU will do about this. I expect condemnation from the OAU. Only after that can people talk to me about restraint" (Roberts, 2014: 697). Eager for a quick result, the OAU delegation, on its return from Tanzania, "claimed a sudden [diplomatic] breakthrough" which had no basis in reality (Roberts, 2014: 697). In turn, on the same day, Idi Amin declared he would carry out "an unconditional withdrawal and invited OAU observers to witness it" (Roberts, 2014: 697). Tanzania was quick to denounce this as "[a] complete lie" (Roberts, 2014: 697). Indeed, as late as November 20th, it was established in a meeting of European representatives in Dar es Salaam, that there were still Ugandan troops present in Tanzania (Roberts, 2014: 698). The OAU, eager to lay claim to a diplomatic victory, was inclined to state that the Ugandan Army was entirely out of Tanzania (Roberts, 2014: 697). However, these troops were only repelled out of the country through the efforts of the TPDF. Moreover, after the war, the process of Ugandan reconstruction fell on Tanzania itself, without much assistance from the OAU (Tumusiime and Bichachi, 2012: 205).

This chapter conducts an analysis of two conventional theories of interstate conflict through the prism of the Uganda-Tanzania War. The war, which lasted from October 1978 and concluded in June 1979, displayed some aspects of relevance to the theories. In terms of the democratic peace thesis, we noted the difficult relationship between the two leaders of Uganda and Tanzania as obviating some relevance of the democratic peace thesis. Regime heterogeneity, for one seems to explain the root causes of the war as internal dynamics within Uganda both encouraged and allowed a conflict to be initiated against Tanzania. While at the same time, regime difference also accounts for the manner in which the war was fought and embraced by the different populations and concluded with the demise of the Amin regime. It also appears to be consistent with the work of Weeks (2012), whose findings indicate a greater probability of power loss for an authoritarian regime upon losing a war. We can alter these results in the Uganda-Tanzania case by stating that the more authoritarian regime was at the same time more hastened to initiate a war, while also having its power retention more threatened by the loss of the war. In line with the arguments of the democratic peace thesis, the Tanzanian government sought to appeal to the populace by attributing undemocratic features of the adversary. If indeed the domestic situation in both countries was allowing for the war to

take place, it is deducible that no war has broken out between two countries since the 1970s due to regime changes which since took shape in the wake of Idi Amin's fall. On the other hand, Uganda's peacekeeping zeal since Museveni may – in accordance with the Henderson thesis – be having a legitimising effect on the government that prevents vulnerability from the outside because of its cooperative behaviour towards other states, unlike the behaviour observed under Amin.

In terms of the economic interdependence thesis, we found that trade between Tanzania and Uganda started to increase gradually soon after independence. The years following 1961 had seen two-way trade (both imports and exports) grow between the two states. This trade was further bolstered by the formation of the East African Community (post-1967). Following this, Tanzania's imports from Uganda were worth USS14.8-million in 1970 and its exports to Uganda were US$7.8 million. Noticeably, this was height of the trade, however. With trade growing but unsubstantial (with Tanzania taking up less than 1% of Uganda's exports at any given point), the relations were buoyed by political cordiality. The increase in trade between Tanzania and Uganda was also influenced by the improving relations between leaders Julius Nyerere and Milton Obote. After Idi Amin's coup, the political relations changed, which also impacted the trade between the two states; trade reached only US$3.8 million in 1971 and did not grow much thereafter. This Chapter also links the leading research carried out by Rugimbana, Carr, Balitho and Walkom (2000) who found Tanzanians to be disinclined towards products sourced from the East African region. This Chapter therefore makes the theoretical amendment that this may at least indicate a synergy/overlap between the democratic peace thesis and the economic interdependence thesis; the domestic audience in any of the prospective adversary states qua consumers also have a role in determining the degree to which a country will be interdependent with the given external state. This showcases a mediating role for the domestic population as it indicates that their preferential inclinations have an indirect but significant role that should be a factor as trade does not occur in a vacuum.

With regards to the formulation of a typology, this case study demonstrates a clear case wherein political relations (based on regime type) as well as popular preference can be an antecedent for growth in trade and economic interdependence (this has some similarity with the EU, which was a politically-motivated economic entity formed in the wake of WWII), the lack of which can in turn be an antecedent for a conflict between formerly cordial neighbours if there are territorial hang-ups to dispute over. This is thus the unique feature of the Uganda-Tanzania war when compared to the other two cases studied here.

The second session of the Chapter will give a historical background of the war, subsequent to which it will conduct a test of the democratic peace and the economic interdependence theses in turn in sections 5.3 and 5.4 respectively. The Chapter closes with a forward-looking conclusion that presents the potential relevance of the hegemonic stability thesis to war and peace in the relationship between two countries and the overall region, which is tested in Chapter 7.

5.2. Background and Onset

5.2.1. Political Background

From 1971 onwards, the Tanzania-Uganda relationship had been in a state of strain. At the root of this was the coup which saw Idi Amin rise to power in January of that year (Roberts, 2014: 693). Following Amin's coup, Julius Nyerere, the leader of neighbouring Tanzania, provided exile for the ousted president of Uganda, Milton Obote, who still had hopes of returning to his former position.

> "Nyerere had enjoyed close relations with deposed President Milton Obote, having backed his move to socialist policies. Nyerere refused to recognise the new regime in Kampala and offered Obote and many of his supporters in exile in Tanzania. Thus began a bitter rivalry between the two presidents" (Roberts, 2014: 693).

As early as 1972, there were early signs of conflict between the two states, though not in the full-fledged sense of a conventional war that would be seen in 1978 and 1979. In September of that year, some one thousand forces of Milton Obote's supporters made their way into southern Uganda, using north-western Tanzania and advanced to the Ugandan capital. It soon became clear that this had been with the backing of the Tanzanian government, no matter how tacitly (Roberts, 2014: 693). Recognising this, Idi Amin responded by bombing Tanzanian towns near the border.[28] In turn, Nyerere was encouraged by his generals to respond in kind; but he chose to settle the conflict through a non-confrontational means that were mediated by Siad Barre of Somalia. "On 5 October Tanzania and Uganda signed the five-point Mogadishu Agreement, in which both agreed to withdraw other's troops to 10 km behind the border and ceased to support forces hostile to the regime" (Roberts, 2014: 693). This agreement, however, would be insufficient for resolving the fundamental hostilities between the two leaders. It was, for example, Nyerere who "refused to share a platform with Amin" at the OAU summit that year. Furthermore, in 1975, he refused to attend an OAU summit in Kampala that was under Amin's

[28] Keesing's Record of World Events, "Armed Invasion of Uganda by Followers of Ex-President Obote. Resultant Conflict between Uganda and Tanzania. – Somali Mediation leads to Peaceful Settlement." Uganda, Page 25543.

chairmanship. This was because "In Uganda, several thousand people have lost their lives," explained his Foreign Minister, John Malecela (Roberts, 2014: 693). "For African heads of state to go there to a summit is tantamount to giving a blessing to these killings" (Roberts, 2014: 693).

Internally, Amin's internally ill-regarded and therefore hardly legitimate regime saw his rule constantly challenged. He launched "a massive purge of his enemies in Uganda" that led to an estimated thirty to fifty thousand Ugandans killed between 1971 and 1972, including former officials who had held offices under Obote.[29] Due to this, many went to join Obote in Tanzania. This did not go unnoticed in Kampala. The Tanzania-Uganda relationship further deteriorated, with tensions reaching new levels in 1978 as dissident troops attempting to ambush president Amin in October of that year crossed the border. This was in the context of a shrinking number of people the president could trust, with growing dissidence from within Uganda, and constant evasion of the apparatus he had created. Furthermore, the archives indicate a situation of economic downturn; with coffee and fuel merchants resorting to smuggling across the border, with major consequences if caught.[30] When Idi Amin's vice-president, Gen. Mustafa Adrisi was injured while in his car, troops that had been personally close to him resorted to mutiny. In turn, Idi Amin set his own troops against them. But as they had crossed over to Tanzania, the chase spilled over into Tanzanian territory. This was amid speculations of a pending invasion from Tanzania. In some ways, this was bolstered by Amin himself who thought he could use this to initiate a war with Tanzania to distract the Ugandans from the economically depreciating situation (Roberts, 2014: 693). This was the advice he was receiving from his "winning coalition", as numerous high-ranking military commanders in the Ugandan Army (UA) were either advocating for this stance, or not expressing dissent from it. There were, however, who thought that their country was not ready to undertake an external campaign. There were also territorial ambitions on the part of Uganda that sought strategic occupation of the Kagera salient in the northwest of Tanzania. "The territory in the Kagera area then became particularly important due to its strategic importance for rebels plotting attacks against Amin"

[29] Ugandan Broadcasting Corporation Archives. 1972. 'Benedicto, former Chief Minister of Uganda assassinated 22 September 1972'. UBC 1881-005.; see also Ugandan Broadcasting Corporation Archives. 1973. 'Sgt. executed at Tororo 27 June 1973.' UBC 3482-006. Staff sergeant Arukanjeru-Baru was the first soldier executed in public by President Amin's government.
Ugandan Broadcasting Corporation Archives. 1972. 'Alex Ojera, former Minister of Information, Tourism, and Broadcasting assassinated late September 1972.' UBC 2177-002.

[30] Ugandan Broadcasting Corporation Archives. April 1977. 'Coffee smugglers checked by Vice President Mustafa Adrisi at Bugolobi.' UBC 5561-002.; Ugandan Broadcasting Corporation Archives. 15 June 1978. 'Paraffin smugglers arrested at Uganda-Zaire border.' UBC 6533-026. The archive also indicates penalties of imprisonment and even execution for the transgressors.

(Valeriano, 2011: 213). By October 9th, it was clear that Amin had been convinced by the hardliner generals, whose sentiments he had already shared.

5.2.2. The War

"Ugandan troops made their first incursion into Tanzania when a motorised detachment moved into Kakunyu and set two houses on fire in the middle of the day on 9 October 1978. A Tanzanian observation post witnessed the event, and Tanzanian artillery retaliated" (Darnion, 1978, November 28). Two of their soldiers were killed and as the Ugandan artillery returned fire to the Tanzanians, they caused minor damage (Darnion, 1978, November 28). On that night, Radio Uganda reframed the narrative, reporting instead that "a Tanzanian invasion had been repulsed" (Darnion, 1978, November 28). Without obtaining authorisation from the president, General Butabika instructed an invasion of Tanzania on 30 October, ostensibly in response to Tanzanian aggression. "Butabika's forces easily overran the Tanzanian troops stationed at Mutukula and Minziro, whereupon he telephoned Amin, claiming that Tanzania had launched an attack and that he had responded with a counterattack" (Darnion, 1978, November 28). Amin, who had the option of calling off the operation and inquiring with his Tanzanian counterpart, "opted to allow the invasion to proceed. Reinforced by other Uganda Army detachments, Butabika subsequently occupied the entire Kagera salient (northern Kagera Region) until stopping at Kyaka Bridge, which was destroyed" (Darnion, 1978, November 28). It is reported that the "UA troops proceeded to celebrate while looting, raping and murdering in the occupied area" (Roberts, 2014). Idi Amin also pronounced an annexation of the Kagera Region.

In response, President Nyerere mobilised the Tanzania People's Defence Force (TPDF) and initiated a counterattack. In a matter of a few weeks, the Tanzanian army was inflated from less than forty thousand troops to some 150, 000 men, including forty-thousand militiamen, police, and the civil servants. This was possible, as we will see, this was possible for reasons to do with the civil-military relations, that in turn offer a congruence with the democratic peace thesis-related concepts. Furthermore, the Tanzanian army had alongside itself the anti-Idi Amin groups that had been in Tanzania, and who had at the Moshi Conference (24-26 March 1979), formed a united front called the Uganda National Liberation Army (UNLA). In the evening of the 22nd of January of 1979, the TPDF went into Uganda through the town of Mutukula. Amin responded to this, in effect, counter invasion by referring the matter to the UNSC. In turn, Tanzania issued a denial of such an invasion, claiming that its troops were not "beyond the immediate border area" (Roberts, 2014: 699). Upon further questions, Tanzanian

diplomats tended to merely repeat their president's insistence that "Tanzania does not desire an inch of Ugandan territory," while avoiding more specific enquiries (Roberts, 2014: 699). Nyerere at this time came to espouse a "two war thesis" which required two distinct roles for the TPDF and the UNLA:

> Nyerere originally hoped that a combination of an invasion led by the Ugandan dissident forces and a *popular internal uprising* would be enough to finish off the Amin regime. He recognised that a Tanzanian counter-invasion would be diplomatically unacceptable to other African states (Roberts, 2014: 699).

The TPDF had in its possession the USSR-sourced Soviet rocket launchers, which they used to strike targets in Uganda, and which gave a decisive advantage for Tanzania.

> Furthermore, the use of multiple rocket launchers and other heavy weapons enabled the Tanzanian forces to make the Ugandan Army retreat steadily as it could not face up to the stronger and numerically superior TPDF that was now on the offensive against the demoralised Ugandan soldiers (Jaynes, 1979; December 20).

Libyan leader and Amin ally, Muammar Gaddafi, sent a force of two-thousand Libyans to assist Uganda. "The Libyans were flown into Entebbe starting in mid-February, though in early March the Libyan government officially repudiated an accusation from the United States that its forces were being sent to Uganda" (Jaynes, 1979; December 20). The Libyans had been brought in initially with the aims of being a support force, with the UA taking the lead in the operations, meant only to intervene "if necessary in battles against Tanzania" (Jaynes, 1979; December 20). This was not to be the case as soon upon arriving in Uganda, as Gadaffi's forces found that they were doing the main front-line fighting against Tanzania. The war was characterised by plunder: "while the Libyans were fighting and dying in the fight to protect their ally's country, many of the Uganda Army's units were using their own supply trucks to carry their newly acquired wealth taken from Tanzania back away from the front line" (Lupogo, 2001: 77).

> The Tanzanians, joined by UNLA dissidents, moved north for Kampala but halted at the vast deep-water swamp north of Lukaya. Between 10–12 March the Battle of Lukaya occurred between the Tanzanian Army and the Libyan Army alongside some Ugandan units. However, a Tanzanian counterattack on the night of 11 March from two directions saw many Libyan units, including the militia, breaking and running away. Libyan casualties were reported at 200 plus another 200 allied Ugandans (Jaynes, 1979; December 20).

The TPDF-UNLA front encountered little resistance following the battle of Lukaya and went on east towards the capital; first capturing the strategically significant Entebbe airfield following the active fighting. Kampala was finally occupied on 11th April 1979, as the Ugandan and Libyan units incapable of giving "much resistance" (Jaynes, 1979; December 20). President Idi Amin had left a number of days ahead of the invasion. Soon after the invasion, Tanzania then went about establishing a government in Uganda. Professor Yusuf Lule, who had been Principal of Makerere University College, was elected as chairman of the UNLF's Executive Council, essentially an interim cabinet, on April 13th. This government gained immediate recognition, apart from Tanzania itself, by Zambia and Britain (Tumusiime and Bichachi, 2012: 205). "The fighting, however, continued: forces were scattered through Uganda, and it was not until 3 June that the TPDF reached the Sudanese border and the mopping-up task was complete" (Roberts, 2014: 700). Amin, alongside some of his closest aides, fled to Tripoli. After falling out with Gaddafi (Lupogo, 2001), he went to live in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, until his passing away in 2003 (Tumusiime and Bichachi, 2012: 205).

Exact numbers about the war's casualties are difficult to determine, but the most utilised estimate is 1,600, drawn from Avirgan and Honey (1982). Following the retreat of the Tanzanians, "Kampala collapsed into a state of near anarchy and internecine squabbling brought down Lule's Government after just 68 days in office" (Roberts, 2014: 705). Likewise, the president who followed him, Godfrey Binaisa, was deposed by May of 1980, as more Tanzanian military and police officers had been withdrawing from Uganda and being replaced by UNLA, "over whom President Binaisa had no control," and which was "openly hostile" towards him (Tumusiime and Bichachi, 2012: 291-292). He was overthrown and replaced by a Military Commission. Following an announcement by the Commission that there would be general elections held in December of 1980, Milton Obote returned "to a hero's welcome" (Tumusiime and Bichachi, 2012: 112). His UPC won that election amid accusations of the vote having been rigged. Nevertheless, Obote made history as the first formerly deposed head of state to return to power (Tumusiime and Bichachi, 2012: 115). The dissatisfaction over the vote set the stage for what would be a prolonged civil war, that eventually gave way to the current dispensation in Uganda. This is explored fully in section 5 of the Chapter. Meanwhile, across the border, Nyerere "basked in the glory of victory, embarking on a public tour of Tanzania" both to congratulate the country, which (as will be seen) had wholly embraced the war effort, and to be congratulated for his leadership during the course of the war (Roberts, 2014: 705).

Official Tanzanian casualties were less than those of Uganda but still considerable at 373 soldiers (with 96 having been killed in battle, and the remaining 297 having died in "accidents") (Roberts, 2014: 705).

The preceding section, as well as the literature review in the introduction, brought to the fore the lack of involvement by external players either in causing or ending the conflict (though Libya did play a role in attempting to repel the Tanzanian counter-invasion). It is therefore befitting to look at the conflict through the prism of domestic and bilateral determinants. The causal relevance of the lack of extraneous players will be looked at in greater depth in Chapter 7 of the dissertation when we examine the relevance of the of hegemonic stability thesis.

5.3. Case Study Analysis I: Democratic Peace Thesis

This section studies the relevance of the democratic peace thesis. It firstly outlines the methodology utilised and restates the hypotheses. It then accounts for the two regimes in Uganda and Tanzania. Finally, it assesses the role of regime type in determining the outbreak and course of the war.

5.3.1. Methodology

This section gives a descriptive overview of the methodology applied in this subsection of the chapter intended on testing the validity of the democratic peace thesis to the Uganda-Tanzania War. As in the previous chapter, it is a necessary caveat to acknowledge that at the time of the outbreak of the war, the two states could not be considered liberal democracies. But the theory can be modulated to the case study through extracting the relevant variables it proposes in the mechanism it proposes them to operate to bring about certain outcomes. Given the causal claims made by the democratic peace thesis, we can expect that the authoritarian state should be the one to initiate the attack given that there should be less of a domestic audience cost for such a policy towards the other regime. Within this, we are interested in corroborating the extent to which there was a role for domestic institutions in either inhibiting or accelerating the adoption of the policy of war. Further, we are interested in the extent to which this follows the pathways proposed by the literature. Even in the incident that neither of the cases could be considered as classic democracies, we could nonetheless gain some important insights we otherwise would not if we were to not apply the theory to this case study.

The relationship being examined in this case analysis are the scores of the two countries in terms of the Polity IV typology of authority. In addition to assessing the outcome of the numerical variables, the section will extensively corroborate this data with a historical and

narrative review and with insights from archives and 4 expert interviews. The purpose of this is to assess the workings of the variables beyond the numerical data, as well as to determine the relevance of these variables since the two countries have since not been to war to assess whether – by their absence or despite their presence – these two countries have maintained a peace because of them.

5.3.2. Data Analysis

This section analyses the data on the respective regimes of the two states in question. It does so by firstly assessing the domestic institutions of Uganda and then that of Tanzania prior to and since the war of 1978-1979. It then seeks to identify whether there was a correlation their respective scores since the war to identify whether the respective governances of these countries could accurately be deemed to have played a role in the war. This is flanked by reviews of the political-military relations in the two countries.

5.3.2.1.Ugandan State-Society Relations

During British colonial rule, Uganda was governed through British district commissioners. In this system, the local chiefs nonetheless "held control over taxes, courts, local councils and general law and order" (Green, 2015: 492). This was not without its complications, however, as in the east and north of the colony, that did not have a heritage of kingships or chieftaincy, "the imposition of chiefs was alien and, while ruling under "customary" law, chiefs in such areas were actually closer to modern civil servants than traditional pre-colonial rulers" (Green, 2015: 492). This was different in the five kingdoms of Ankole, Buganda, Busaga, Bunyoro and Toro, as these areas "had a long pre-colonial history of political hierarchy, in some cases dating back centuries" (Green, 2015: 492). In Buganda, the British colonial rulers put in place a system of "indirect rule" through which the local government maintained some similarities with pre-colonial period (Green, 2015: 492). In the 1950s, the British government and the government of Buganda had clashes regarding "its degree of political independence and eventually requested to be granted a federal status in the country's future constitution" (Green, 2015: 492). Eager to avert a civil war in an independent Uganda, the British Commission which was tasked with forming the post-colonial government in Uganda, made a recommendation for "a semi-federal status for the other kingdoms and a unitary system for the rest of the country because they were not as rich or large as Buganda, thereby creating a highly unequal system of local governance upon independence" (Green, 2015: 492).

At its moment of independence, in 1962, the country withstood much the same problems that faced other post-colonial states in Africa. The country "had to operate within artificial boundaries which meant a heterogeneous state with a number of ethnic groups supplemented by religious divisions in society" (Hansen, 2013: 84). Indeed internal conflict within post-colonial Uganda "was a consequence of the confrontation between strong, ethnically divided local institutions and the post-colonial push for political centralisation, under the guise of nation building" (Laruni, 2015: 212). In other words, for one to bolster its strength, one counterpart had to let in. Furthermore, "self-governance meant that the stakes for political power sharpened at national and local levels, ensuring that ethnic antipathies became more pronounced" (Sejjaaka, 2004: 99). Locally successful and prominent political figures "were elevated to represent their various ethnic groups at the centre" (Sejjaaka, 2004: 99). But "these politicised ethnic demarcations were not…a product of the Ugandan post colonial state" (Sejjaaka, 2004: 99); instead, "they were a continuation of colonial political structures that had 'tribe' emphasised locality. These were the same power structures that were embedded within Ugandan politics at the eve of independence" (Sejjaaka, 2004: 99). Uganda, divided along "North" and "South", remained "regionally divided between the Bantu-speaking ethnic groups in the southern, central, eastern and western areas of Uganda dominate the 'South'. These include the Baganda, Basoga, Banyoro, Bagisu, Batoro and the Banyankole" (Sejjaaka, 2004: 99). Within Uganda, the people of Buganda, carried the label of colonial "collaborators" in (Sejjaaka, 2004: 99). These "political and ethnic divisions between the peoples of Northern and Southern Uganda…contributed to the country's contentious postcolonial history" (Hansen, 2013: 84).

The introduction of political parties filtered into this rather than override it: "these divisions made the multi-party system, the cardinal point in the new political dispensation, very vulnerable and hardly workable" (Hansen, 2013: 84). Additionally,

> the divisionary structures were cemented by the independence constitution that created a federation of unequal partners with different statuses and privileges: in the southern part the kingdom of Buganda and the three western kingdoms Bunyoro, Toro and Ankole plus the conglomerate of smaller principalities Busoga; and in the north-eastern part differently organized communities among which the big Nilotic group (Acholi and Langi) was a significant political factor already around independence and often labelled the North (Hansen, 2013: 84).

Of the post-colonial states in the African continent, "the Ugandan federation presented a rarely seen constitutional asymmetry within an ethnic dimension built into the system" (Hansen,

2013: 84). As the population tended to gravitate on ethnic grounds, "this complex situation constituted a tremendous challenge to the political leadership," that was put into the following terms by Milton Obote in 1967: "The tribe has served our people as a basic political unit very well in the past. But now the problem of people putting the tribe above national consciousness is a problem that we must face, and an issue we must destroy" (Hansen, 2013: 84). The economic situation made the North/South split worse as it served as a "useful tool for Acholi power brokers to negotiate for political and economic capital with the state, by utilising the politics of regional differentiation through the Northern 'identity'" (Laruni, 2015: 212).

Up to 1966, the country successfully sustained a semblance of stability. However, in that year, this changed as the Buganda kingdom "resolved to expel the Ugandan government from its soil" (Tumusiime and Bichachi, 2012). This "played into the hands of Obote, whose national government responded by sending soldiers," headed by Idi Amin, to the palace of the kabaka in order to "investigate" the presence of arms in the kingdom. These forces successfully drove the kabaka out of his palace and forced him into exile:

> Obote proceeded to suspend the constitution crafted for the independence of Uganda and declared himself executive president, head of state and government and commander-in-chief of the armed forces. Most of the officers and men used in this exploit were from the same ethnic group as Obote (Sejjaaka, 2004: 99).

By the latter half of the 1960s, President Obote undertook three initiatives through which he sought to remedy the situation in the country. Firstly, he sought to consolidate a one-party state (under the UPC] "in order to neutralize a multiparty system based on ethnic and religious affiliations" (Hansen, 2013: 84). As part of this, however, he "introduced and entrenched the military as coercive arbiter of conflict in Uganda" (Hansen, 2013: 84). Because of this new status quo, "Obote became *increasingly dictatorial*. To deal with dissent, he introduced draconian laws like the Emergency Powers (Detention) Regulations in 1966. He also used state security institutions to cow his political opponents; these included members of his cabinet, four of whom were arrested during a cabinet meeting" (Sejjaaka, 2004: 99; emphasis added). The new constitution, making this official, was duly ratified by Parliament in 1967, ensured the concentration of power in the Presidency (Sejjaaka, 2004: 99). Secondly, in 1968, he issued a manifesto titled 'The Common Man's Charter' which was widely seen as "a move to the left" (Hansen, 2013: 84). As this document put it, his intentions were to supplant the "ethnic consciousness with an ideology that would appeal to people outside the educated elite" (Hansen, 2013: 84). Thirdly, he made concerted efforts against what he saw as a feudalism-

guaranteeing federalism by ensuring that the new constitution stipulated the country as a unitary state. As article 19 of the Common Man's Charter stated:

> We do not consider that all aspects of the African traditional life are acceptable as socialistic now. We do not, for instance, accept that belonging to a tribe should make a citizen a tool to be exploited by and used for the benefit of tribal leaders. Similarly, we do not accept that feudalism, though not inherently something peculiar to Africa or to Uganda, is a way of life which must not be disturbed because it has been in practice for centuries (Obote, 1968: 3).[31]

Additionally, in the 1969 census in the country, the entry of "tribe" was removed (Hansen, 2013: 84).

Overall, despite these efforts, the president failed in his objectives. Hansen lays the causes of this to two main reasons. To begin with, he was consumed by the ethnic-based politics: "His fight against feudalism was primarily directed towards the southern kingdoms. Thereby he deepened the divide between North and South as he, being a northerner (a Langi), was considered to ally with the North" (Hansen, 2013: 84). The second reason is attributable to the fact that the anti-feudal campaign "became an outright fight against Buganda and its claims for a superior status within the republic," which variously even appeared to be on a secessionist campaign: "Amidst mounting tensions Obote took the fatal step of calling upon the army to suppress Buganda's obstinacies once and for all" (Hansen, 2013: 84). This culminated at "Battle of Mengo" taking place in May of 1966, with the central government forces under the command of Idi Amin, which was succeeded by the constitution being suspended along with the elimination of the kingdoms "which further cemented the North-South divide" (Hansen, 2013: 84). Essentially, this step led to a political climate in which the military, "hitherto [the] best functioning institution," was roped into political contestation (Hansen, 2013: 85):

> Almost at a stroke the army as an institution was transformed from being a politically neutral instrument for the civilian government in matters of security to an actor within the political arena. From now on civil-military relations became an issue of increasing importance (Hansen, 2013: 85).

Thus, Obote was transformed from a civilian to a military leader as "the army's entry into the political arena meant that it assumed the role as guarantor for the Obote regime and in a wider sense for regime survival. The new role included an ethnicization of the army" (Hansen, 2013:

[31] Obote, Milton. 1968. *Common Man's Charter*. Available at: https://web.archive.org/web/20110727195757/http://www.radiorhino.org/htm_material/archiv/text/press/monitor/THE%20COMMON%20MAN%20CHARTER%20By%20DrAMO.htm (Last accessed: October 5 2019).

84). “Seen from outside, the army had already become an ethnic instrument in support of a northern based and biased government. From inside, the rank and file became conscious of the northern composition of the army, a result of the colonial practice of recruitment from the North mainly from the Nilotics (Acholi and Langi)” (Hansen, 2013: 85). This “was an army with a strong northern dominance that Obote deliberately set out to gear to its new position as the guarantor of his regime” (Hansen, 2013: 84). He then went on changing the command structure. He side-lined the Etesot ethnic commander-in-chief and in his place put Idi Amin, partially as a reward for “his success at the Battle of Mengo” (Hansen, 2013: 85). Amin was from the West Nile by origin, reportedly of mixed Kakwa and Nubian background. Unlike many of his colleagues, he had not received overseas training, as a result of which “he was considered to be a “ranker’s man” with close contacts to privates and NCOs [non-commissioned officers]” (Hansen, 2013: 85). There was another appeal to Idi Amin which may have made him appear more trustworthy to Obote: “he was considered to be a soldier by heart and without any political ambitions”; but this would prove otherwise, as “right from the beginning Obote made the mistake of underestimating Idi Amin, and so did most diplomats in Kampala” (Hansen, 2013: 85). Obote then took to removing some officers, the majority of whom were Bantu. By the end, Uganda had a military that was “mainly consisting of people from three groups in the North” (viz. Acholi, Langi and West Nilers). This arrangement ran the risk of tension in that it “created a space for ethnic rivalry between the three northern groups and could soon develop into a fight for control of the army” (Hansen, 2013: 85). To keep control of his most important political instrument Obote took four precautionary measures. Firstly, the president inflated the intelligence service, known as the General Service Unit, that was staffed by his fellow ethnics from the Lango. Secondly, he also grew the paramilitary group, known as the ‘Special Force’, which “once again he filled it with people from Lango and made a cousin head of the unit” (Hansen, 2013: 85). Thirdly, Obote put Lango officers (along with some Acholi), overwhelmingly in charge of “strategically important posts” (Hansen, 2013: 85). Fourthly, he terminated Idi Amin from being commander-in-chief, and instead placed him in the barracks, as head of training (Hansen, 2013: 85; Tumusiime and Bichachi, 2012: 129).

Idi Amin interpreted this as attempts by Obote’s to side-line him, as well as his fellow ethnics. He moved quickly, and “sought to establish alliances with members of Obote’s government,” along with his leaders in the UPC. “He seems to have succeeded in a number of cases; one example being Obote’s own Minister of Defence, Felix Onama, who came from the Madi region” (Hansen, 2013: 86). “This was also an indication of a growing dissension within the

government which Amin skilfully exploited. With a similar shrewdness he started to send signals to the Baganda in an attempt to improve relations with the group "ostracized" by Obote. Their hatred of Obote brought many Baganda to see Amin as the lesser evil" (Hansen, 2013: 86). Against these moves by the president and Idi Amin, a clash seems inevitable in retrospect. "The army had become the major battlefield between the two, and the conflicts and alliances within the army *reflected* those in society at large" (Hansen, 2013: 86; italics added). Indeed the military lost its place as a removed institution that had been independent of political and ethnic manoeuvring. "It was just a question which of the *three dominant groups* in the army would move first" (Hansen, 2013: 85).

As it happened, the group of the West Nile "took the leading role; the main reason being that thanks to Amin's strategic skills" (Hansen, 2013: 86). The coup d'état took place on the 25th of January in 1971, with the army taking over the centre of power, whilst Amin forcefully took over Obote as the president of the country. In the advent of the coup, "new actors moved into the political arena, which in itself meant … the dawn of a new era with different forces at work" (Hansen, 2013: 86). Hansen points out two kinds of changes.

> First, the military take-over and the army's monopolization of power meant a change of style and of the way in which politics were made and carried out. The centre of power remained in the North, though with the significant change that it had moved from the Nilotic groups (the Acholi and Langi) to the more dispersed West Nile groups. But the symmetry between the ruling clique, now headed by Idi Amin, and the composition of the army was maintained (Hansen, 2013: 86).

The additional change, followed the first: "The political power was no longer with the independence elite…It was with a new stock of people who had worked their way through the ranks, and who were Swahili-speaking with strong roots in a Muslim tradition. The independence elite had not delivered as expected, and "the common man" – to use Obote's preferred phrase – *welcomed* Uganda's new leaders as "the differences in style and behaviour appealed to many Ugandans" (Hansen, 2013: 86; emphasis added). This factor accounts also "for the popularity in which Amin was held by many people beyond Uganda's borders" (Hansen, 2013: 86; Tumusiime and Bichachi, 2012). This was also based on his anti-imperialism rhetoric, which was the focal point of Ugandan state media under his regime.[32]

[32] Ugandan Broadcasting Corporation Archives. 29 September 1975. 'H.E. gives citizenship to British officials.' UBC 4938-012.

While his popularity came to wane in Uganda, due to the economic downturn that came in his wake, "those living far away from the events *kept* a certain admiration for him" (Hansen, 2013: 86). In many ways, the challenges which had faced the Obote government continued to persist into the new one. This is evident in that they themselves acknowledged this in the eighteen-point declaration that was put out in the wake of the coup, partly to justify it. Within this document, the new regime further justified its coup-based emergence due to the ethnocentrism of its predecessor, "the longest section contains an attack on Obote's blatant favouring of his own ethnic group, the Langi, alleging that this had fostered conflicts and produced ill effects on the other regions of the country" (Hansen, 2013: 87).

In terms of the state-society relations, and the embrace of the former by the latter, Idi Amin's regime is broadly divided between two periods, with 1973 seen as a distinct turning point which saw the "end of the honeymoon" (Tumusiime and Bichachi, 2012: 152). Regarding the democratic peace thesis, "during the first two years the regime was met with a good deal of optimism and hope for a new start after the Obote years" (Hansen, 2013: 87). Indeed, the were expectations that this new regime, led by the army, would be "more efficient than the previous administration" (Hansen, 2013: 87).[33] During this period, numerous "commissions of inquiry" were established in the first months following the coup. The most implicative was one commission to investigate "allegations of corruption in high places in Government Departments and other public bodies" (Tumusiime and Bichachi, 2012: 146).

> But not long into the period paradoxes and ambiguities became more prevalent and took over as the most characteristic features of the regime. The environment became less and less conducive for any sound policy, not least because increasingly violence became the accepted instrument influencing the values and behaviour of those in power (Hansen, 2013: 87).

Most telling of the long-term design and power pursuit of the new regime, political organisations and the parliament were not restored; "instead a new organ was introduced called the State Supreme Council with a dominant representation from the armed forces" (Hansen, 2013: 87). In some level of continuity with the Obote regime, Amin placed emphasis on "one strong Unitary Government" (Hansen, 2013: 87). Further, "the governing procedures were changed accordingly and ruling by decree became the standard practice. The local government was reorganized with new provinces and districts" (Hansen, 2013: 87); the traditional leaders

[33] To persuade public opinion, the government also encouraged its officials to participate in public community activities such as clean-ups. See, for example, Ugandan Broadcasting Corporation Archives. September 1973. 'Brig. Moses Ali clearing brush, Fort Portal.' UBC 3634-2-014.

would be replaced by new ones, "elected under supervision of the military" (Hansen, 2013: 87).

A number of steps were taken, with the aim of transforming the military into an institution that could be used to bring about national unity. Following the coup, as in pre-Ogaden War Somalia,

> it was announced that the army was to become more ethnically representative. Like the parallel move in relation to the cabinet, the objective was seemingly to avoid an ethnic concentration of power. As late as May 1972 Amin took the unusual step of publishing the ethnic affiliations of all officers (Hansen, 2013: 88).

However, this achieved the opposite goal by making the ethnic composition a more salient feature; "this move raised the wider question of the credibility of the regime's policy in view of the simultaneous ethnic cleansings in the army" (Hansen, 2013: 88). The second measure was "turn[ing] the army into an instrument of national integration was a programme of "mass mobilization" by stationing army units in every village for the purpose of rural development" (Hansen, 2013: 88). Given that the army was in control of local administration, the two preceding steps, in combination with each other, "had the function of strengthening the military structure of the regime by integrating civil and military administration and by making the military the main link between centre and periphery" (Hansen, 2013: 88). Indicating the features which would make the regime meet the criteria of a "terrorist state" (Boyle, 2017: 593), "such a distribution of army units met the needs for control and security which became of increasing importance as the regime grew older" (Hansen, 2013: 88; Tumusiime and Bichachi, 2012: 146).

Idi Amin's last notable policy was economically related, "which in Uganda like in many other countries was closely connected with issues of immigration and citizenship" (Hansen, 2013: 90). Under the populist guise of the 'Economic War', this saw the expulsion of some 70, 000 Indians in the end of 1972, with their assets being seized without compensation (Hundle, 2013: 164).[34] Globally, this marked "one of the most notorious events during the Amin regime" (Hansen, 2013: 90). This gained special international notoriety because it was characterised by abuse of the rights of the expelled Indians: "there were about 23,000 who had acquired Ugandan citizenship, but became stateless thereby initiating a practice which has been followed by other countries on the continent, the cancellation of citizenship as part of a struggle for

[34] Ugandan Broadcasting Corporation Archives. 20 November 1975. 'H.E. meets India delegation on compensation of Indian officials.' UBC 5026-010.

political and economic power" (Hansen, 2013: 90). Those Ugandan Indians who remained (as "bureaucratic exceptions" in Hundle's phrase) "responded to their racialization and ambivalent inclusion in Amin's Uganda with complex forms of collaboration, complicity, and social practices geared towards shoring up security" (Hundle, 2013: 164). Many went about forging "private enclaves of urban Indian space" (Hundle, 2013: 164). Nevertheless, their stories from fieldwork by Hundle (2013) were filled with narratives of "contingent, bureaucratic, and arbitrary nature of violence and governance in the dictatorial regime" (Hundle, 2013: 164). This move made the economic situation worse, and further exacerbated by the military budget which "soon amounted to almost a third of the budget" (Hansen, 2013: 90).

Apart from the economic consequences, the Indian expulsion gave indication to the policy making procedures of the Idi Amin government. While on the one hand, policy-formulation was rested on formal legal processes, "the expulsion of the Asian group amounted to expropriation, and the later disposal of their assets was certainly not in accordance with legal prescriptions" (Hansen, 2013: 90). The government proceeded with the expulsion, despite the skilled labour shortage, because, at least in part, its motivations laid in the regime's endgoal of maintaining its hold on legitimacy, in face of economic downturns:

> A safe card to play was the anti-Asian resentment and the expropriation of their assets and businesses. For the regime this gave room for manoeuvring and for appeasing the mainly urban trading communities who saw the Asian traders as strong rivals, especially the Baganda and the increasingly important Nubi-Muslim group with strongholds in the army and in the urban business communities. Eventually the latter group got the lion's share of the Asian spoils (Hansen, 2013: 90-91).

In addition to this, further steps were taken which indicated the relevance of the democratic peace thesis. The Amin regime underwent governance-related changes; becoming more dictatorial and limited any channels for any would-be popular inhibition of the regime declaring a war against another state. Thus, "many of the political initiatives were driven by the anxiety of not being in full control and by the fear of losing the regime's monopoly of power" (Tumusiime and Bichachi, 2012: 146).

> The banning of 12 sects in the middle of 1973 followed by restrictions on trade unions later the same year were clear symptoms, and so was an earlier authorization to *prohibit publication of newspapers* for an indefinite period. At the same time the army's mandate to exercise power was strengthened (Hansen, 2013: 91; emphasis added).

Citizens were incentivised to adhere to, and participate in the furtherance of, government authority. Most blatantly, immunity was given to individual civilians who since 1971 had acted "for the purpose of maintaining public order or public security in any part of Uganda" (Hansen, 2013: 91). Additionally, the military was given further authority "to arrest civilian offenders of public order, and military tribunals were authorized also to try civilians whose acts were calculated…to bring the Military Government under contempt or disrepute" (Hansen, 2013: 91). In this way, the "military character of the regime was strengthened, and regime survival became its absolute priority" (Hansen, 2013: 91).

Hansen (2013: 95) emphasises that "there existed no basis for politics in the ordinary sense." "It was a personal rule with abrupt decisions, and politics took place in an institutional vacuum as most institutions were run down" (Hansen, 2013: 91). The independence of the courts was also not spared as the regime sought to guarantee monopoly over all manner of coercion. Furthermore, "there was a militarization of the administration, and the army constituted the main governing structure" as a result of which "lack of discipline meant that its members practised a drawing right on the economic assets in society making the upper echelons better off and only just enabling the lower ranks to survive" (Hansen, 2013: 95).

This displayed two characteristics which gained momentum in this regime. On the first instance, "there developed an increasing centralization and personalization of power" (Hansen, 2013: 91). Secondly, "the increasing concern about control and regime survival meant a stronger focus on precautionary measures and an adjustment of the instruments for maintaining security" (Hansen, 2013: 91). These developments ushered in "harsher measures and a disrespect for judicial procedures" (Hansen, 2013: 91):

> The arbitrary use of force and a resort to violence at the expense of orderly procedures became increasingly the order of the day. A number of prominent people began to disappear without any trace, such as the Chief Justice and the Vice Chancellor of Makerere University, and the increasing lawlessness caused others, like former ministers, to go into exile. In general towards the end of the first period in power the indiscriminate use of violence became an accepted mode of keeping the regime in power which in the longer term meant a devaluation of norms and values in society at large (Hansen, 2013: 91).

Building on literature on "state terrorism," Emma Boyle's (2017: 593) study makes three suppositions that state-perpetrated violence ought to first meet in order to be regarded as state terrorism: "(a) that the violence is perpetrated by agents of the state, (b) that the violence is visible, and (c) that state terrorism focused against a state's own citizens will be carried out by

an autocratic, personalistic regime." Based on these criteria and on primary materials, her study concludes that indeed "Idi Amin's regime in Uganda from 1971 to 1979 did engage in state terrorism against its own citizens" (Boyle, 2017: 593). In many ways, this led to an outward-looking war-mongering practices in the form of diversionary tactics by the government. In addition to the militarisation of the society and civil service, "there was an element of anti-education which helps to explain the many moves" (Boyle, 2017: 593). Secondly, within the army, Amin rotated personnel around based on his preference for them and on his assessment for the risks they posed to his rule (Boyle, 2017: 593). Finally, "concern for security and growing suspicion and mistrust penetrated the system from top to bottom caused by mutinies in the army, failed coup attempts and real and imagined invasions from Tanzania" (Boyle, 2017: 593). As a consequence, greater numbers of dissidents were formed, and greater numbers of them moved to Tanzania to join Obote (Hansen, 2013: 95).

This was exacerbated by the regime's unwillingness to form a political basis nor an ideological grounding. There was a visage of religion being attempted as a rallying point, but it had no chance of succeeding, as "his claims to be an Islamic leader were directed towards a very small portion of the population: in 1971, Uganda's Muslim community accounted for only around 10% of the population" (Boyle, 2017: 601). On the other hand, overreliance on the army essentially exposed it as "both the primary perpetrators, and (especially in the early period) the primary victims of the violence" (Boyle, 2017: 601). In relevance to the work of democratic peace theorists encountered in Chapter 3, it may be observed that there was a lack of political parties in Uganda, which essentially paved the way for a non-peaceable removal of the government:

> Party creation fosters peaceful (as opposed to violent) mass mobilization because leaders who create parties are less dependent on the coercive apparatus to protect their power than are leaders who do not use a political party or co-opt a pre-existing one. Party creators have the least need to rely on repressive strategies to counterbalance their militaries and regime elite and therefore dedicate fewer resources to developing the capacity or elevating the political status of their security units (Frantz and Kendall-Taylor, 2017: 24).


Leaders who rule with the support of a political party framework, tend to "lack any institutional counterweight to the military or mechanism to co-opt elite support and therefore must invest in the capacity of paramilitary forces staffed by loyalists to monitor the activities of the military and other regime elites" (Frantz and Kendall-Taylor, 2017: 24): in particular, "Amin seized power in 1971 in a coup ousting Milton Obote and ruled until his own ouster in 1979 without

the support of a political party." Pushed into a corner by this situation, "Amin purged elements of the military assumed to be loyal to Obote, replaced them with his allies, and created paramilitary groups to counterbalance the military" (Frantz and Kendall-Taylor, 2017: 24). There were also "clear limits to expansion and the Nubian social category" which Amin had made continual reference to (Twaddle, 1979: 219).

Idi Amin's choice of external opponent was therefore not in a vacuum.

> The relationship between Uganda and Tanzania worsened even more when Julius Nyerere welcomed Obote to stay permanently in Tanzania and allowed him to work for a return to Uganda. This opened up hostilities between the two countries whenever convenient and gave Idi Amin an excuse to suppress any real or imagined opposition to his regime. The many Ugandans who over the years took refuge in Tanzania and not least an attempted invasion in September 1972 increased his suspicion of all and everybody and caused a downward slide into use of coercion and violence (Hansen, 2013: 92).

Figure 5.1. Uganda's Polity IV score, 1962-2013



The war is known in Tanzania as the Kagera War whereas in Uganda it is remembered as the 1979 "Liberation War" (Lwanga-Lunyiigo, 2015: 109). The movement in the Polity IV scores (see Figure 5.1) demonstrates such a shift over the years and may mark such a 'liberation'. Indeed, the Polity IV score reflects the regime change from 1969, with the authoritarian changes within the Obote regime moving the country from an initial positive 7 score, to a -6 in 1969 and then to -7 by 1970, which, as seen, gave way to the coup. There was then a lack of improvement under Amin, with the country remaining at -7. Following the fall of the Amin regime, after the war in 1979, the country's score improved to 4 due to the post-war elections,

before declining to -7 between 1987 and 1995, and subsequently improving to -4 until 2005, when it improved to 0.

5.3.2.2. Tanzanian State-Society Relations

The mainland of Tanzania attained its independence in 1961, with the Tanganyika African National Union (TANU) as the leading party. The Zanzibar island on the other hand got its own independence in 1963, and then went through a revolution in 1963 and underwent a revolution in January of 1964 under the Afro-Shiraz party that saw the removal of the sultanate (Speller, 2007). "This act reversed 200 years of Arab dominance of the political and economic life of Zanzibar and ensured that, contrary to British policy during colonial rule, the islands would be primarily African in nature rather than Arab" (Speller, 2007: 283). In that same year, the two independent states joined to become the United Republic of Tanzania. Due to the nature of the union – which guaranteed Zanzibari autonomy – these two political parties maintained their respective leadership over the two territories: Tanzania would go on to be a one-party state until 1990s, when it "obtained its second multiparty parliament in the era of independence from 1995" (Mukangara, 2005: 183). Nonetheless, the ruling party, "has remained the same for all practical purposes, since the successor to TANU and Afro-Shiraz — Chama Cha Mapinduzi (CCM) formed in 1977 — has won [the] general elections of the new multiparty era" (Mukangara, 2005: 183).[35] Unlike in Uganda, the country held regular elections for all of its post-independence era. And thus through the ballot box, "individuals participated in a national event, listened to campaigns in the national language, engaged with the symbols of nationalism and gained an impression that their votes made a difference" (Kelsall, 2003: 55). The impact of these elections was beyond the perceptive, "with around 40 per cent of incumbents, including some government ministers, being defeated in all post-independence polls" (Kelsall, 2003: 55). The contrast with Uganda goes further as there was also no major ethnic or religious-based violent clashes in the country, and "the army was uncommonly loyal" (Kelsall, 2003: 55). In its post-independence dispensation, the country has seen two peaceful constitutional revisions – in 1985 and 1995. In the former year, the country also had its first independence leader, Julius Nyerere, voluntarily relinquish the presidency, to be replaced by Ali Mwinyi; though Nyerere maintained influence by continuing to be the chairman of the CCP

[35] "Although the mainland is wholly unitary, the country becomes somewhat federal due to the existence of the autonomous government of Zanzibar. Although Tanzanians are sensitive to calling Zanzibar a state, which it was until 1964, it nevertheless fulfils all the conditions of a component state in a federation, with the traditional federal functions of foreign affairs, defence and home affairs reserved to the union government. On the mainland there is only one indivisible government, which allows limited functional autonomy to local authorities. At the apex is the national government, politically headed by a president who is assisted by a vice-president and a prime minister. The prime minister is charged with the day-to-day running of government" (Mukangara, 2005: 183).

(Ahluwalia and Zegeye, 2001: 39). “Liberalisation of the political system in 1992 was intended, ostensibly, to address the manifest decline in public morality while maintaining, perhaps indeed guaranteeing, the stability for which the country was renowned” (Kelsall, 2003: 56). There is also an international dimension to the transition in Tanzania. To begin with, at the time (as is the case presently), Tanzania has a dependency on foreign aid.

> Its net official development assistance for the year 1991, the year immediately preceding the transition, totalled US$1038 million, a sum that amounted to 37.1 per cent of its Gross National Product (GNP) for that year. In the preceding year, 1990, Tanzania received US$1155 million in official development assistance (ODA) which amounted to 48.2 per cent of that year's GNP, making its ODA, as a percentage of GNP, the second largest of any state in the world, trailing only Mozambique (Vener, 2000: 133).


Taking the above as a premise, Vener (2000) goes on to assess “the role played by the donor community in prompting Tanzania's democratic transition” (Vener, 2000: 134). Her findings “indicate no correlation between fluctuations in aid transfers and Tanzania's implementation of multi-party democracy. Rather, it was the perception among the Tanzanian leadership of a direct linkage between donor aid disbursements and political liberalization that prompted the political transition” (Vener, 2000: 133). Whilst the countries giving out ODA to Tanzania made it a condition of aid dispersal that the country adopt democracy, nonetheless,

> Tanzanian aid levels were not directly affected by such donor policy changes. Declining trends in aid were not characterized as punitive acts, nor were increases in aid designed to have greater influence upon Tanzania’s political system or to reward it for its democratic advancements prior to 1992 (Vener, 2000: 157).

Unaware of this, statements emanating from the country’s leaders (from across the political spectrum) and the opposition “suggest, almost unanimously, not only the existence of such international pressure but, to varying extents, its causal role in bringing about the country's 1992 multi-party transition” (Vener, 2000: 157). Therefore, “despite the lack of explicit action taken by donors to implement their new democratic aid conditionality, the mere existence of the policies and subsequent rhetoric in meetings with Tanzanian officials are seen to have exerted influence on Tanzania's democratization” (Vener, 2000: 157).

Perhaps because of this, the national commission on the party system (led by Chief Justice Francis Nyalali), which consulted the population, saw it best to ignore the 77% proportion "who expressed a desire to remain with a single party system" (Kelsall, 2003: 56). They recommended instead "a plural system accompanied by safeguards designed to protect, 'our national unity, the Union of our country, and the peace and concord amongst all Tanzanians regardless of tribe, creed, race, or [g]ender'" (Kelsall, 2003: 56). Thus, in February of 1992, the ruling party repealed the section of the constitution which provisioned for the one-party state, and thus "paved the way for parliament to pass the Political Parties Act in June, effectively allowing for a multiparty system" (Ahluwalia and Zegeye, 2001: 39). This new act mandated that new political organisations be registered, with at least 200 members from all the 10 regions "including Zanzibar and Pemba" (Ahluwalia and Zegeye, 2001: 39). Additionally, "parties had to satisfy the Registrar that they were not formed on an ethnic, regional, religious or sectarian basis" (Ahluwalia and Zegeye, 2001: 39). Finally, "the commission recommended that 40 pieces of repressive legislation should be repealed and a body established to oversee the transition. A constitutional commission was to be appointed and a programme of political education in democracy was to be instituted" (Ahluwalia and Zegeye, 2001: 39).

Figure 5.2. Tanzania's Polity IV score, 1961-2013



The country's Polity IV index (Figure 5.2) reflects the *change* in Tanzanian governance over these years. Noticeably, in the early 1990s the country saw an exponential jump in its ranking, from -6 to -4, and again in the early 2000s from -4 to 0. Because of the above measures, and subsequent developments in the country, post-referendum Tanzania is given the description of a "dominant party system" (Kelsall, 2003: 58):

> In 1994, CCM won 96.7 per cent of the seats in local elections. In the 1995 general elections its presidential candidate, Benjamin Mkapa, won 61.8 per cent of the vote and the party won

> 88 per cent of constituency seats. Its nearest challenger from 13 registered parties was the National Convention for Construction and Reform (NCCR-Mageuzi), a party led by Augustine Mrema, a former Minister for Home Affairs in the CCM government. In 2000, CCM increased its presidential poll to 71.7 per cent, as well as winning in 164 out of 178 mainland constituencies (Kelsall, 2003: 58).

Evidently, political parties in opposition have struggled to pose a challenge to the CCM. Kelsall advances two reasons for why this has been the case.

> To begin with, there has been an absence of ready-made social bases on which it could capitalise. Associational life in Tanzania is weak, a result of the colonisation of civil society by the party-state in the post-independence period. There is no significant trades union or co-operative or human rights movement with a history of independence from the state upon which opposition parties could easily have built (Kelsall, 2003: 60).

This is in contrast to Zambia, for example, where labour unions were at the forefront of the formation of the MMD. "The more obvious cleavages are of a religious or ethnic nature" (Kelsall, 2003: 58). However, these are denied life because of the illegality of organising along these lines in Tanzania. A second reason advanced by Kelsall is that "the electoral playing field has not been fair" (Kelsall, 2003: 60). Earlier work by Ahluwalia and Zegeye (2001) advances a similar argument, observing that

> During the one-party system, the state and the party had become inseparable, with the latter financially dependent upon the former. In the new environment, the CCM had to be financially self-sufficient. The party mounted a campaign to recruit new members in the light of declining numbers during the 1980s. The result of the campaign was that, in virtually all regions of the country, the [ruling CCP] party was able to increase its membership (Ahluwalia and Zegeye, 2001: 40).

Despite the reforms that have since taken place, there nonetheless remained some obstacles to executive oversight, as parliament has had difficulty, for example, today, "in challenging the inadequate disclosure of international financial commitments and in opening up standing committee deliberations to the public" (Mukangara, 2005: 184). Furthermore, "the government often does not publicise or deliver to Members of Parliament (MPs) bills and relevant session materials within the statutorily required time. This makes it difficult for parliamentarians and civil society to consult and prepare for National Assembly agendas" (Mukangara, 2005: 184).

Despite successfully averting the political problems of Uganda and other countries in the eastern African region, Tanzania has had open inter-ethnic rivalries (Ahluwalia and Zegeye, 2001: 35):

> Zanzibar politics has been marred by political conflicts that have culminated into political stand-offs, violence and lack of social and civic peace. At the core of these conflicts is the politicization of racial identity by leaders seeking the legitimacy to rule. Thus, unlike in Tanzania mainland, struggle for the control of the state in Zanzibar has been intense, deadly and zero-sum. Indeed, the distinctive character of the Zanzibar state itself makes it appealing for the political elites to politicize ethno-racial identities in order to claim legitimacy to rule (Ahluwalia and Zegeye, 2001: 35).

At the centre of this are issues to do with Zanzibar's identity (i.e., "whether it is an Arab or African state") as well as its relationship with the mainland (Killian, 2008: 99). While the CUF is mostly supported by the non-Africans and Pemba, the CCM draws from Ungunja and Africans voters. The historical legacy encountered in Chapter 2 (section 2.3.1) comes into play, as

> atrocities of slavery are usually recounted in many CCM campaign meetings, the common message being that "if you bring CUF to power you will once again turn yourself into a slave". It is this politicization of the memory of past racial relations that constitutes the main part of both formal and informal dialogue during campaigns, thereby promoting racial animosity between and among social groups (Killian, 2008: 114).

On the other hand, the CUF's own ambivalence towards 'Mainlanders' draws from its belief "that the Union government contributes to the manipulation of the election process by sending the military personnel during voter registration and voting" (Killian, 2008: 116). In the 2005 electoral season, for example, "registration of voters near military camps created a great deal of chaos and disharmony" as a result of CUF supporters reportedly preventing military staff from registering to vote (Killian, 2008: 116).

5.3.2.3. Uganda and Tanzania's Governance and Civil-Military Relations Under Nyerere and Amin Compared

As seen, the bilateral relationship between Kampala and Tanzania was defined by strain for a number of years ahead of the war erupting. This dissertation posits that at the root of these tensions were regime-related reasons; particularly the differences that took place after Idi Amin seized power in a military coup in 1971, the Tanzanian leader Julius Nyerere offered sanctuary to Uganda's ousted president, Milton Obote. This much may be related in the comparative

Polity IV movement as well, which in turn is reflected in the self-understanding of the war in Ugandan historiography where the war is also known as a 'Liberation War' (Tumusiime and Bichachi, 2012). It is worth examining the workings of this and how it came about. Doing so requires first an examination of civil-military relations under the two regimes.

With the exception of the revolution of 1964 in the island, along with a brief mutiny which will be discussed below, "Tanzania has remained peaceful despite the poverty among its 126 tribes" (Lupogo, 2001: 75).[36] Historically, the civil-military relations in the country have evolved over time beginning in the colonial era when the units when the British-commanded King's African Rifles were based in Tanganyika. At the time of independence, Tanganyika got a leader, in the person of Julius Nyerere, who did not like the army, "mainly because of its strong colonial tradition" (Lupogo, 2001: 76). Indeed, the military had not featured in any of his public orations between 1952 and 1962. The army had been geared towards maintaining "internal security as defined by the colonial masters by curbing labour movements and political activities. He was more interested in political and development issues" (Lupogo, 2001: 76). In the immediate post-independence period, "civil-military relations were unimportant as a national issue," and thereby obtained minimal attention from the politicians (Lupogo, 2001: 77). "The army was under the command of Brigadier Douglas and his fellow British officers. In reality, there was a national army with neither a defence nor a foreign policy…and the army ran its own affairs" (Lupogo, 2001: 77). This was also exacerbated by the lack of a working or personal relationship between Nyerere and Douglas. With the former stating that he "had no regular interaction with Brigadier Douglas and certainly had not discussed any high defence policy with him" (Lupogo, 2001: 77).

In the midst of this, "there was lively debate in the National Assembly concerning the army. There were those members of the house who were not in favour of a national army, including Nyerere, and others who wanted a better equipped army" (Lupogo, 2001: 77). On the one hand, the group opposed to the consolidation of a national army voiced fears about the "danger" that armies had posed to democracies. One MP even stated the following in October 1961: "While maintaining the military forces the government should be sure that they are not going to maintain the military forces to the extent of the military forces becoming so powerful that they

[36] "In Tanzania, for example, unit commanders wherever they are located, know their regional governors, local police commanders, prison officers and security personnel. Similarly, their subordinate personnel mix informally among themselves and with the local population. This is largely facilitated by the fact that many military personnel live outside the barracks, and the absence of social barriers in the country" (Lupogo, 2001: 76).

will try to maintain the government" (Lupogo, 2001: 77). This stands in stark contrast to the situation in Uganda both under Obote and Amin.

For the time, many MPs "skirted around the issue because they were ignorant and the army commander, Brigadier Douglas, did not reveal much to them" (Lupogo, 2001: 77). This status quo was transformed in early 1963, when in March of that year the nascent OAU set up the Liberation Committee and chose to have its headquarters based in Dar es Salaam. The Nyerere government therefore had to have a change of posture towards the military. If Tanganyika was to support the liberation movements in the south, then its foreign policy had to be matched with a military that could lend weight to its rhetoric (Lupogo, 2001: 77). This would also be accelerated by domestic developments. As it happened, in the following year, in January of 1964, soldiers openly agitated for promotions and for having the army command in African hands, both of which were blocked by the British commanders. "The Tanganyikan government, through the Minister for Foreign Affairs and Defence, was informed of the agitation," and thus the January 19th mutiny took place before anything could be done (Lupogo, 2001: 78). To be sure, "it has been convincingly argued that the mutiny was not a coup attempt. Most contemporaries emphasised that it was an industrial strike that focused on the soldier's grievances. At no time did they challenge the legitimacy of the political leadership, nor did they attempt to take over the government" (Lupogo, 2001: 78). Nyerere also acknowledged that the "soldiers had genuine grievances and the demands presented a perfectly reasonable case." He also recognised that "the mutiny raised questions about the place of the military in the newly independent Tanganyika – a military under a foreign command and not integrated into the country's system" (Lupogo, 2001: 78). In the wake of this mutiny, the military was disbanded "and fresh recruits were sought," with TANU's youth base being a principal supplier and target of this recruiting. Members of the army, as well as other public officials, were also encouraged to become members of TANU, albeit "in a *de facto* one-party state" (Lupogo, 2001: 78). Indeed, membership in TANU was a condition for enlisting in the army. The first batch of recruits were announced on the first of September in 1964 as the TPDF. Due to the party-army nexus, positions of 'Political Commissars' were made part of the army. Soon "battalion-size units became party branches and every commander was party chairman in his command" (Lupogo, 2001: 78).

In effect, this meant that "from its inception, it was ingrained in the troops that they were a people's force under civilian control" (Lupogo, 2001: 79). Put differently, "they were being exhorted not to behave like the army that mutinied in January 1964" (Lupogo, 2001: 79).

Furthermore, "they were given a very clear mission, to defend Tanzania and everything Tanzanian, especially the people and their political ideology" (Lupogo, 2001: 79). Major steps were taken to imbue all with the same doctrinal outlook, while some 25% of total training time was designated for political affairs. As a consequence of these measures, "all the troops knew exactly where they stood in relation to the party, the government and the people" (Lupogo, 2001: 79).

The TPDF was of the view that it owed its existence to "to the president," but also to the government and the CCM which were not personalised as in Uganda under Idi Amin, and indeed Somalia and Ethiopia under Barre and the Derg respectively. "Each of these officers felt that they owed loyalty not only to the government and the presidency as an institution" (Lupogo, 2001: 80). The armed forces also had a connection with the populace. The military had never enjoyed popularity with the population under the British, when "it was seen as a force of oppression" (Lupogo, 2001: 80). Thus,

> To popularise the military, various methods were employed. The most prominent was the use of political ideology, training of the militia, national service and development projects. At an ideological level, people were made to understand that the defence of the nation was the duty of every citizen, that the armed forces were only the vanguard (Lupogo, 2001: 80).

The *Arusha Declaration*, put out in 1967, read: "The people should always be ready to defend their Nation when called upon to do so" (p. 25). To further realise this, in 1974, the national service was incorporated into the TPDF (Lupogo, 2001: 81). The soldiers were likewise participants in the political process, and could run for office (Lupogo, 2001: 81). By the middle of the 1980s, some 25% of the district commissions were held by TPDF rank and file.[37] By the institutionalisation of multiparty elections in the 1990s, about a third of these offices were held by army officers who had ran for them. In similar fashion, cabinet positions were also obtainable by army officers, given they were elected to be MPs or by executive appointment. Because of this, "the armed forces did not feel left out of the action, as they were represented in the cabinet and in the regional and district offices" (Lupogo, 2001: 81). Furthermore, as retired Brigadier General Herman Lupogo of the TPDF details in an essay for *African Security Review*:

> military units were dispersed evenly throughout the country. The senior commander co-ordinated with the district or regional commissioner in his operational area. The ease with which

[37] Tanzania is divided into 25 administrative regions, which are in turn divided into districts. The regional and district commissioners are 'heads of government' in their respective areas.

> military commanders interacted with commissioners was a measure of the acceptance of the armed forces by the civilian authorities. It also showed that the military recognised the supremacy of the civilian leadership.

This was most demonstrated in the campaign against Uganda, during which

> the commander of the southern zone arranged a consultative meeting in February 1979 at his headquarters in Songea. Without reference to his immediate commander, he asked the regional commissioners, regional police commanders and security officers to attend, which they did, without seeking permission from their respective bosses (Lupogo, 2001: 81).

Apart from the civil-military factor, the war with Uganda was also an economic undertaking by Tanzania. To be sure, Tanzania was at the time among the least economically developed countries in the world, and "the cost of keeping troops in Uganda since November 1978 must have caused immense strains upon the Tanzanian exchequer quite apart from the inevitable dislocations to production within Tanzania itself caused by this particular conflict" (Twaddle, 1979: 217). Contemporary writing at the time repeatedly dwelled on this, with Michael Twaddle of the *New York Times* adjudging that "Tanzania could not possibly have afforded to fight a more technological war," adding that "the real wonder is that it was prepared to fight any war at all" (Twaddle, 1979: 217). The answer lay in the civil-military relations within Tanzania and gives relevance for the democratic peace thesis. "In a few weeks, the national army was expanded from less than 40 000 troops to over 100 000" (Lupogo, 2001: 83). All sectors of the civil service played a part:


> The police, prison services, national service and the militia lived up to their classification as being part of the armed forces. They all contributed to the war efforts in terms of personnel and material. Trained militia flocked in their thousands to recruitment centres (Lupogo, 2001: 83-84).

Indeed, it was reported that "recruiting officers had problems limiting the numbers selected" (Darnion, 1978; November 28). This may have been due to the fact that "criterion for a militia member was simply that if he is willing, he must be enlisted" (Lupogo, 2001: 83-84). Private organisations also made major contributions of vehicles, as well as other materials as needed. The only drawback was that there was "no time to camouflage the equipment" (Lupogo, 2001: 83). The Wasukuma people of the Shinyanga district in the northwest of Tanzania spontaneously led herds their cattle "into the camp at Old Shinyanga to feed the Tanzanian soldiers" (Lupogo, 2001: 83-84). As seen, Uganda, at the same time, was a military state that was also described as a terrorist state (Boyle, 2017: 593). This served to ensure multiple

mutinies by Ugandan forces, which required Libyan forces to do much of the fighting for them during the counter-invasion. This necessitates a thorough examination of the war through the democratic peace thesis.

5.3.2.4. Using Democratic Peace Thesis to Explain the Uganda-Tanzania War

Figure 5.3. Polity IV Scores of Uganda and Tanzania, 1961-2014



Causally speaking, many scholars have tended to place the roots of enmity and conflict between these two countries at the leader-to-leader relationship at the time. "Nyerere of Tanzania had established a close bond with the deposed leader of Uganda, Milton Obote, and consequently opposed Amin on these grounds. The persistent rivalry between the two states led to increased threat perceptions and decreasing confidence levels, which led to spiralling hostilities and eventually war" (Valeriano, 2011: 212-213). Roberts (2014: 692) adds that the conflict was "rooted in a deep rivalry between Amin and Nyerere" (Roberts, 2014: 692). For the majority of his regime, Idi Amin had made it clear that he had territorial ambitions involving Tanzania. He wanted to "fulfil his dream of seizing a belt of land through northern Tanzania to the port of Tanga, thus providing Uganda with its own access to the sea" (Valeriano, 2011: 210). Nyerere is, on the other hand, quoted as saying that "there will never be peace in East Africa until Amin goes" (Valeriano, 2011: 213). In response, "Amin challenged Nyerere to a boxing match to resolve the conflict" (Roberts, 2014: 701). This encapsulates the level of personalisation of the interstate rivalry. Yet at the same time, and indeed as indicated in statements such as these and in the difficult relationship between the two leaders, there lie some points of congruence and relevance for the democratic peace thesis. Regime heterogeneity, for one, seems to explain the root causes of the war as lying in the internal dynamics within Uganda both encouraged and allowed a conflict to be initiated against Tanzania. While, at the same time, regime difference also accounts for the manner in which the war was fought and embraced

by the different populations – strongly by the Tanzanians and weakly by the Ugandans – and concluded with the demise of the Amin regime. It also appears to be consistent with the work of Weeks (2002), whose findings indicate a greater probability of power loss for an authoritarian regime upon losing a war. We can alter these results in the Uganda-Tanzania case by stating that the more authoritarian regime was at the same time more hastened to initiate a war, while also having its power retention more threatened by the loss of the war.

The Obote regime and the Amin regime seem to have been equally illegitimate; both were overthrown in military fashion; twice in the case of the Obote regime. Our regime of discussion is the Amin regime as it was the one that went to war with Tanzania. In the subsequent years after coming to power, Idi Amin survived numerous assassination plots, which led him to being more untrusting, which was manifested in his repeated purging of the senior ranks of the Ugandan military. On the other hand, the situation was different in Tanziania: "if the 1964 mutiny was the shame of Tanganyika, then the war against Idi Amin of Uganda was the pinnacle of Tanzania's achievements. It demonstrated the maturity of its leadership, its political readiness to defend the country and its ability to mobilise rapidly for war" (Lupogo, 2001: 83). In line with the arguments of the democratic peace thesis as espoused by Owen (1994), the Tanzanian government sought to appeal to the populace by attributing undemocratic features to the adversary. "The president and other politicians preached to the population about the enemies of Tanzania, in whose ranks Idi Amin appeared prominently. Army commanders and political commissars did not tire of stressing their opposition to Amin to the soldiers and all who would listen" (Lupogo, 2001: 83). Among the most utilised mottos in the army was "Amini haini" (i.e., "Amin the traitor") (Lupogo, 2001: 83). Those in the minority who sought to make the case for accommodation with Amin "were drowned in the general condemnation of the man and his military regime" (Lupogo, 2001: 83). Thus, "when Amin attacked Tanzania in October 1978, he proved to be a bogeyman that became real" (Lupogo, 2001: 83); but, just as well, he found a country that was prepared to take him on. When in a November 22nd speech, Nyerere said that "the war effort was not for the army alone…but for the entire population," the country reacted favourably (Lupogo, 2001: 83). Amin's winning coalition, "deliberately kept narrow in order to secure loyalty," was diminishing "in the face of an economic collapse that dried up the vital patronage channels to the military" (Roberts, 2014: 695). In this way, assessing the conflict through the prism of the democratic peace thesis not only accounts for the onset of the war, but also for the outcome – in other words, it can account for the popular politics behind Uganda's loss in the war. This is explored below.

In line with Amin's militarisation of the Ugandan society and civil service as detailed above, by the year of the war, "64% of Cabinet portfolios were held by members of the police, army, or prison service" (Roberts, 2014: 694). Unlike in Tanzania, where there was an ideological base, Uganda lacked this and was also underlined by patronage, as the "spoils" of the "Economic War" against Asian Ugandans were given to high-ranking military and political elites, who were soon known as "mafuta mingi" in Swahili – literally "dripping in cooking oil," which was "a rare and expensive commodity amid the economic chaos" (Roberts, 2014: 694; Lwanga-Lunyiigo, 2015: 106). Those who were beneficiaries of Amin's policies, largely mirrored his ethnic and religious associations:

> The army recruited heavily from the president's own West Nile region, together with large numbers of Muslim southern Sudanese and Nubian troops. Shortly after the coup, he carried out the first of several bloody purges of Acholi and Langi soldiers, who were believed to have been favoured by Obote (Roberts, 2014: 694).

Thus, "Amin effectively turned Uganda's predominantly Christian and Bantu society upside-down" (Roberts, 2014: 694). This had the consequence of "creating a ruling elite that had *no local base* and owed its position and loyalty only to Amin himself" (Roberts, 2014: 694). As seen, even this was constantly shrinking as his mistrust grew. Further change in the country's domestic politics was then brought about by the counter-invasion by Tanzania, in whose advent Idi Amin fled into exile and elections taking place thereafter. This has led to historians appraising this as the goal of the Tanzanian strategy as soon as Uganda initiated the conflict. At least one historian dissents:

> This is to go beyond presently available evidence, however, which strongly suggests surprise on the Tanzanian side at the almost complete absence of opposition to Tanzanian and exiled Ugandan incursions into Uganda after the Tanzanian re-occupation of the Kagera triangle, and considerable hesitation too about overextending themselves militarily before the formation of the UNLF towards the end of March 1979 (Twaddle, 1979: 219).

Indeed, prior to the Moshi meeting of March 1979 being held, contemporaneous indications "[were] that the Tanzanians were preparing themselves for a quite lengthy war of attrition against Idi Amin, and that one of their reasons for calling that conference was to make appropriate arrangements for the possibly somewhat lengthy interim administration of the 3 million or so Ugandans living in the already liberated zones of Masaka, Mbarara, and Kigezi" (Twaddle, 1979: 219). But with the benefit of archival evidence, recent studies have found that indeed Nyerere aimed at removing Amin from October 1978. This came from two factors:

> A combination of Nyerere's personal vendetta against Amin and a realisation that the shared border would not be secure until he was removed from power appears to have resolved the Tanzanian Government on its course of action, despite the war's crippling economic impact (Roberts, 2014: 702).

Indeed, a British diplomatic official in Tanzania also observed that "[Tanzania] would not mind if mediation attempts came to nothing [as] any mediation which ended the fighting and which left Amin intact would not be in Tanzania's interest" (Roberts, 2014: 702). In light of this, Roberts' archival work further reveals that (much like Ethiopia was doing at the same time with regards to Somalia as discussed in Chapter 4 of this dissertation) "Nyerere's insistence that the OAU condemn Uganda [when knowing that it would not] provided a stalling tactic that allowed military operations to continue while OAU leaders pursued a political solution to which Tanzania had no intention of committing" (Roberts, 2014: 702).

Roberts theorises that Nyerere may have sought to keep up appearances of not intending to remove Idi Amin precisely for the purposes of removing him: "Nyerere realised that both the legitimacy of the invasion and the stability of a new government in Kampala were dependent on maintaining a safe distance from Obote until the dust had settled" (Roberts, 2014: 702).

If indeed the domestic situation in both countries was allowing for the war to take place, it is deducible that no war has broken out between two countries since the 1970s due to regime changes which since took shape in the wake of Idi Amin's fall. This is analysed below.

5.3.2.5. Conclusions

After the war, elections were arranged with Tanzanian observation, which was welcome and embraced in the war-torn and de facto stateless society that appears to have simultaneously needed an external guarantor though eager to downplay this (Tumusiime and Bichachi, 2012: 216). In the meantime Yusuf Lule, Godfrey Binaisa, and Paulo Muwanga, the latter of whom was a close associate of Milton Obote, served all briefly as interim presidents until the elections of 1980. These were won by Milton Obote's UPC. However, the elections were not without dispute. Leading the opposition in disputing the elections as having been rigged was Yoweri Museveni's National Resistance Army (formed by Museveni's PRA[38] merged with Lule's Uganda Freedom Fighters, create the National Resistance Army (NRA), with the National Resistance Movement as its political arm) which went into armed combat with the government.

[38] When Museveni returned to Uganda, he had also done so with his supporters and acquired further support in southern and south-western parts of the country and formed the Popular Resistance Army (PRA).

The government was also faced with opposition from Amin supporters in the form of the Fortmer Uganda National Army (FUNA) in the West-Nile region. This Bush War, as it came to be known, was ultimately ended when Obote, once again, was overthrown in 1985. The leaders of this coup were Brigadier Bazilio Olara-Okello and General Tito Okello. Obote went into exile once again; though this time to Kenya and ultimately to Zambia (Lwanga-Lunyiigo, 2015: 108). Whilst Museveni engaged in peace talks with the new Okello junta in late 1985, his forces were still advancing towards Kampala, the Ugandan capital. As guerrila forces were advancing towards closer in January 1986, the military deserted their posts. Museveni was sworn into office on January 29th , 1986. He has been in power ever since.

> In his 2001 election manifesto, Museveni stated several times that he was standing for another term for the last time. Yet he decided to stand again in 2006 after cajoling parliament to lift the presidential term limits as laid down in the 1995 Ugandan constitution. In fact, removal of term limits created the prospect of Museveni clinging to power indefinitely (Tangri and Mwenda, 2010: 31-32).

He similarly ran and won in 2011 and 2016 and intends to run once again 2021.

The section below proceeds from a comparative analysis conducted in this section and appreoached the determinants of the conflict on a more direct basis, measuring the economic bilateral relationship between the two countries; in particular, the role of the trade trajectory as it evolved from the early 1970s when Idi Amin came to power, to the late 1970s, when the war broke out.

5.4. Case Study Analysis II: Economic Interdependence and Peace

5.4.1. Methodology

5.4.1.1. Variables

The dependent variable is operationalised as the initiation of conflict by one state on one another which yields at least 1000 battle-related deaths (as per the Correlates of War typology). Thus, it is a marked event in a horizontal timeframe resultant in a transformation from a peaceful state of affairs to a state of affairs of conflict. The question is what has brought about this outcome; in other words, the independent variable. The independent variable is operationalised as the share of the initiating belligerent's in the retaliating adversary's total imports (as measured in monetary terms, in US dollars throughout this dissertation).

The method of inquiry used in this dissertation is 'before/after' in that it will make use of antebellum conditions across the political and economic configurations within the countries and the region in terms of hegemonic stability theory to understand what led to the war.

Causality can be drawn from a lack of export markets or, when markets did exist, the continuously declining export markets in the adversary in the years leading up to the conflict which could be explained by a declining opportunity cost of initiating a conflict against them.

This necessary data was sourced from various repositories including the World Bank, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology's Observatory of Economic Complexity, the Economic Policy Research Centre in Makerere University, archival data, as well as four interviews with experts and role players on the economy of Uganda and the broader East Africa. Further data was obtained in a survey conducted by Rugimbana, Carr, Bolitho and Walkom (2000).

5.4.1.2. Hypothesis

Since economic interdependence is argued to be a deterrent from war by creating incentives for maintenance of a status quo, we should expect that interstate conflict should be initiated by the state with the lesser export market in its counterpart. Thus the hypothesis is:

> H2: The interstate conflict between Uganda and Tanzania was initiated by the state which had an export market lower than the targeted adversary in that adversary's market.

5.4.2. Data analysis: Uganda-Tanzania Trade in Historical Perspective (1962-1978)

Ugandan president Yoweri Museveni is aware of the long arch of economic history; as he stated in his book *Sowing the Mustard Seed*, "what interested me most in history was the formation of states in Europe…I was also fascinated by the French Revolution, and bourgeois opposition to taxes imposed by the feudal order because it interfered with trade – which was also the reason that the Prussian Junkers wanted a unified government" (Museveni, 1997: 14). Uganda's own historical economic development and its role in its military entanglement with Tanzania is in turn explored in this section of the dissertation. This section will assess the export profiles of the two countries and assess their trade in the broader regional (EAC) context. Subsequent to this, we will review the trade trends between the two adversaries in the lead-up to the war.

5.4.2.1.Uganda's export profile

At independence, "Uganda had one of the most vigorous and promising economies in Sub-Saharan Africa, and the years following independence had amply demonstrated this economic potential" (World Bank, 1993).

> The country was self-sufficient in food, and the agricultural sector earned ample foreign exchange through the export of coffee, cotton and cocoa, despite traditional methods of production. A vibrant manufacturing sector supplied basic inputs and consumer goods. Mining in the south supplied copper and cobalt for export, and the country enjoyed a positive balance of trade. Fiscal and monetary management was sound, and the domestic savings rate averaged about 15 per cent of GDP. There was a strong local administrative system that provided effective supervision of economic activity by disciplining all those who were not productive. The locals needed little coercion to produce, since consumption was predicated on what they produced (Sejjaaka, 2004: 99).

This was owed to the nationalisation of the Obote regime. Furthermore, before Idi Amin's 'Economic War' pursued under Amin, this "precipitated the flight of capital because there were no indigenous managers to run the nationalized companies" (Sejjaaka, 2004: 100). The environment was becoming "increasingly volatile" (Sejjaaka, 2004: 100). Secondly, it led to a lot of indebtedness as the country took up loans for public works on facilities and infrastructure (Sejjaaka, 2004: 100). Thirdly, there was the corruption and ineptitude of the Uganda Development Corporation (UDC), which was managing the nationalised companies (Sejjaaka, 2004: 100). "The UDC had been created in 1952 as a vehicle for investment, not for nationalization of existing business firms. The new parastatals were given monopolies over the marketing of export, produce and commodities, but proved inept and corrupt" (Sejjaaka, 2004: 100). Finally, the cooperatives and trade unions, "which had been strong up to that point," were disempowered by the introduction of the Cooperative Act (1970) (Sejjaaka, 2004: 100). Overall, then, the government's initiatives did not fulfil the goal of forming a local business-owning class.

> In effect, Obote's policies disenfranchised the non-citizens who ran the economy without empowering the African natives who, hitherto, had not been allowed to par ticipate in commerce, industry and large-scale agriculture. The experiments in socialism, the enlargement of the bureaucracy and the ambitious investment in infrastructure without regard to budgetary or economic fundamentals began to eat away at the economy (Sejjaaka, 2004: 100).

This was not in a political vacuum. As seen in the preceding section, this slowdown in economic growth all took place in a context wherein the government was seen as corrupt, which was accompanied by increasing violence (Sejjaaka, 2004: 100). This therefore gave way to Idi Amin's coup, which in turn paved the way "for economic decay, which he oversaw until his overthrow eight years later" (Sejjaaka, 2004: 100).[39] "Increased defence spending, financed by bank borrowing, made the national budget untenable. Annual inflation rates shot to double digits" (Sejjaaka, 2004: 101). In 1972 he declared an 'Economic War' against 'imperialist' forces and the large Asian community in Uganda:

> Like Obote, Amin believed that it was important to address the social inequality that prevailed in the country by economically empowering Ugandans. At this time, Uganda's Asian population had extensive control over the economy as artisans, shopkeepers, industrialists and professionals. In particular, they controlled local and international trade. Amin expelled the Asians, and in this way continued the wave of nationalizations that Obote had begun. Increased insecurity and persecution of white-collar workers resulted in an additional mass exodus of professional managers of all nationalities and persuasions. The vacuum that was created by his actions marked the beginning of Uganda's economic collapse (Sejjaaka, 2004: 101).

Furthermore, the new regime maintained much of the restrictive apparatus of its predecessor. As a consequence of his policies, even the process of making transactions and ownership of assets was put in jeopardy, and made basic commodities scarce to obtain. This was also rooted in the "wide disparity between official prices and actual market prices" (Sejjaaka, 2004: 102). "The black market prospered, to the benefit not only of smugglers, but public officials, who through personal influence could obtain (and re-sell) 'allocation chits' for sugar, beer, salt and even foreign exchange" (Sejjaaka, 2004: 102). In this arbitrary environment the establishment of an "anti-smuggling unit," meant that, for some, getting caught could mean torture or even execution. "The net effect was to further emaciate the economy, as the biggest culprits were influential public officials who were not punished" (Sejjaaka, 2004: 102).

As a consequence of its human rights record and as much of the world had little to gain from doing business with Uganda, the country obtained pariahdom as it became the subject of international embargoes, primarily from the US. After the EAC fell, this further led to isolation for Uganda. "Key industries relocated to Kenya. Services such as air transport and telecommunications, which had benefited from the existence of the EAC, also suffered. The

[39] Interview 8, Intervew 9, Interview 10. See also Ugandan Broadcasting Corporation Archives. April 1977. 'Coffee smugglers checked by Vice President Mustafa Adrisi at Bugolobi.' UBC 5561-002.; Ugandan Broadcasting Corporation Archives. 15 June 1978. 'Paraffin smugglers arrested at Uganda-Zaire border.' UBC 6533-026.

rail transport system collapsed, and this further increased the costs of inputs" (Sejjaaka, 2004: 102):

> With the military as the prime mover, the economy had developed into a magendo economy where grabbing of all available assets, confiscation of agricultural products and smuggling to neighbouring Kenya had become the order of the day carried out in an atmosphere of lawlessness and disrespect for moral values and with the use of coercive means (Hansen, 2013: 98).

Between 1971 and 1986, the country's constant-price GDP fell by 13% (World Bank, 2019). In effect, "the economy declined by 1 per cent per year, even as Uganda's population was growing rapidly. Many factories collapsed due to lack of inputs, which were imported, and due to the absence of vertical or horizontal linkages between economic sectors. All sectors, with the possible exception of subsistence agriculture, suffered from the lack of imported inputs" (World Bank, 2019). In pre-war Uganda, between 1971 and 1979, the country's income per capita declined from US$255 to a mere US$148. Furthermore, the country's debt to export ratio increased from 51.1% to 142.2%, while "agriculture's share of GDP rose from 48.5 per cent to 70.5 per cent as the manufacturing sector collapsed" (Sejjaaka, 2004: 102). Before the outbreak of the conflict with Tanzania, there was a global downturn in the price of coffee, the country's principal export (Sejjaaka, 2004: 102). The price declined from an all-time high of US$3.34 in early April 1977 to US$1.17 by June of 1978 (see Appendix C).

In assessing Ugandan exports from 1971-1977, the dissertation found that the UK, the US (notwithstanding the official embargo), Japan, and Kenya were Uganda's principal export partners (Table 5.1). Within the region, Kenya was the country's principal export partner.

Table 5.1. Uganda's major trading partners, 1971-1976

	1971		**1972**		**1973**		**1974**		**1975**		**1976**	
Ranking	Country	Share in Ugandan exports (in %)	Country	Share in Ugandan exports (in %)	Country	Share in Ugandan exports (in %)	Country	Share in Ugandan exports (in %)	Country	Share in Ugandan exports (in %)	Country	Share in Ugandan exports (in %)
1	United Kingdom	21	US	22	US	20	US	21	US	23	US	29
2	United States	21	UK	17	UK	16	UK	15	UK	16	UK	15

3	Japan	11	Japan	10	Japan	8.7	Japan	8.1	Japan	9.4	Japan	6.3
4	East Germany	7.5	East Germany	6.7	East Germany	7.8	East Germany	7.3	East Germany	6.9	East Germany	6.1
5	West Germany	7.4	West Germany	6.7	West Germany	7.8	West Germany	3.5	West Germany	6.9	West Germany	6.1
6	Australia	2.7	Poland	4.3	France	4.5	Italy	3.5	France	3.8	France	6.1
7	Canada	2.6	France	4	Hong Kong	3.2	France	3.5	Italy	3.8	Italy	5.3
8	Sweden	2.5	China	2.5	Taiwan	3.1	Yugoslavia	3.1	Yugoslavia	3.4	Spain	3.6
9	India	2.2	Hong Kong	2.5	Italy	2.7	Spain	2.9	Spain	3	Poland	2.8
10	Hong Kong	2.1	Australia	2.2	Sudan	2.1	Hong Kong	2.7	Australia	2.8	Yugoslavia	2.3

Source: MIT Observatory of Economic Complexity.

In turn, of its exports (see Table 5.2), coffee composed a growing composition of total exports, starting at 40.8% in 1960, and culminating at 92.9% by the eve of the war in 1977. Cotton, the second-highest product of export, which had been at 35.9% share of exports dipped to 2.6% in 1977.

Table 5.2. Uganda's production and trade, 1960-1981.

	1960	*1965*	*1971*	*1977*	*1981*
Coffee					
Production *(thousands of tons)*	113	218	191	156	128
Percent of total exports	40.8	42.0	50.7	92.9	98.0
Cotton					
Production *(thousands of tons)*	210	243	75	14	4
Percent of total exports	35.9	23.1	17.6	2.6	0.9
Copper					
Production *(tons)*	14,515	16,870	16,900	2,500	nil
Percent of total exports	8.9	11.0	8.3	0.0	0.0
Sugar *(percent of exports)*	3.6	1.2	1.0	0.0	0.0
Tea *(percent of exports)*	3.5	3.3	4.7	2.1	0.1
Total Exports *(percent of GDP)*	27.4	3.3	1.8	1.0	4.6
Total Imports *(percent of GDP)*	17.1	25.7	17.2	4.1	nil

Sources: IBRD (1962); World Bank (1993); IMF (1995).

Thus, Uganda's problems were worsened by a decline in the global price of coffee (Hansen, 2013: 98). Another structural change soon followed developed:

> People developed a number of coping mechanisms. The peasants scaled down the production of cash crops and turned to growing food stuffs simply in order to maximize their food security and secure a livelihood. At the same time, we saw a considerable expansion of urban farming (urban agriculture). It helped to mitigate the rapid deterioration of the urban economy following the expulsion of the Asians. Some economists have argued that real wage income dropped by nearly 80% (Hansen, 2013: 98).

In light of this, and the popular dissatisfaction it raised, "Amin tried to use Tanzania as a scapegoat to divert attention from his internal troubles and to cover up the massacre of dissident troops" (Valeriano, 2011: 210). Prior to assessing the role of economic relationship between the two countries played itself out and lent itself to the deterioration of the relationship, it is worth briefly examining the import profile of the country it went to war with, instead of having an opportunity-cost creating trade relationship with.

5.4.2.2. Tanzania's import profile

Prior to the war, by the middle of the 1970s, Tanzania's economy "began to falter rapidly" (Ahluwalia and Zegeye, 2001: 38).

> The economy hit crisis point by the end of the decade when it found it increasingly difficult to meet its debt obligations. In light of these difficulties, the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank urged the Tanzanian government to abandon its socialist policies and adopt a structural adjustment programme (SAP). President Nyerere, undaunted, refused to accede to these demands (Ahluwalia and Zegeye, 2001: 38).

Things were made worse by the decrease in Tanzania's exports as well as "Tanzania's inability to import even the most basic commodities" (Ahluwalia and Zegeye, 2001: 38). Overall, the government's flagship economic programme – the villagization programme – came to be appraised as inadequate to foster the growth needed, "as it became evident that peasant farmers were not producing as effectively on a co-operative basis, leading to an overall decrease in agricultural production" (Ahluwalia and Zegeye, 2001: 38). Furthermore, "the economy was affected adversely by the oil shocks of the 1970s [and] by drought" (Ahluwalia and Zegeye, 2001: 38), in a country were some 80% lived off subsistence farming (Read and Parton, 2009: 571). Yet despite these, he never sought to initiate a war of deflection; this is at least partially structural, as there was also no international issue which could be used for this as Tanzania's had no territorial claims with its neighbours.

As we are interested in the role of trade relations between Tanzania and Uganda as part of a causal account for the outbreak of the war in 1978, it is necessary to briefly review the

consumption patterns of Tanzania. Leading research in this regard has been carried out by Rugimbana, Carr, Balitho and Walkom (2000) who carried out research among adults and young adults in Dar es Salaam. The research identifies a "consumer cringe". Overwhelmingly, "Tanzanians preferred products originating from the "West" over those produced in Tanzania; and preferred Tanzanian made products over those originating from say Kenya or Uganda" (Rugimbana, Carr, Bolitho and Walkom, 2000: 91). The authors of this study rightly ponder the implications of the existence of this consumer cringe "about the *prospects* of the planned regional integration" (Rugimbana, Carr, Bolitho and Walkom, 2000: 91-92; emphasis added). However, in this dissertation, such a consumer cringe is interesting for historical reasons, especially given the lack of trade between Amin-ran Uganda and Tanzania. This may at least indicate a synergy/overlap between the democratic peace thesis and the economic interdependence thesis; the domestic audience in any of the prospective adversary states qua consumers also have a role in determining the degree to which a country will be interdependent with the given external state. This showcases a mediating role for the domestic population as it indicates that their preferential inclinations have an indirect but significant role that should be a factor as trade does not occur in a vacuum.

The section below explores the history of regional integration in East Africa regional scheme, and Uganda-Tanzania trade relations within it in particular. It then identifies the role of trade asymmetry and the lack of a threshold-meeting trade interdependence between Uganda and Tanzania (despite the presence of trade even post-1971) in limiting the domestic and external opportunity cost for going to war with Tanzania. Additionally, this section makes further use of Kenya-Uganda trade relations to explain not only Kenyan neutrality during the war, but also how these trade relations were earlier used to Kenya's advantage (through opportunity cost demonstration) in curbing Idi Amin's aggression towards its own territory.

5.4.2.3.Uganda-Tanzania trade relations from independence to 1978

The establishment of concerted regional integration in East Africa can be dated as early 1917, with the establishment of an FTA between Kenya and Uganda – with Tanganyika still under German colonialism (Legum, 1967). In the post-WWI context, in 1922, Tanganyika was transferred to British mandate, and it thereafter joined the East African FTA (Lodompui, 2010: 32). Before their respective dates of independence, Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda were regarded and referred to as "East Africa", sharing a common colonial metropole in Britain (Read and Parton, 2009: 567). Following decolonisation of the region the East African Community was established in 1967 when these three countries recognised that "the East African High

Commission (EAHC) 1948-1967, was not able to facilitate the national development of each of the three states" (Lodompui, 2010: x). This was aided, in Lodompui's assessment, by "a common colonial bond," as well as a shared economic aspirations among the three states (Lodompui, 2010: x). Our particular interest is on Tanzania and Uganda.

Overall, Tanzania is argued to have aimed at achieving two "national interest objectives" in the first EAC (Lodompui, 2010: x). Firstly, "Tanzania's aim was to use trade to maximize the gains from the region while developing close relations with the two partner states of Uganda and Kenya" (Lodompui, 2010: x). Secondly, Dar es Salaam sought to "campaign against colonialism in Southern Africa region" (Lodompui, 2010: x). These twin objectives are arguably rooted in Julius Nyerere's conviction "that increased trade would facilitate Tanzania's pursuit of her anti-colonial policies in Southern Africa" (in Lodompui, 2010: x). However, matters changed in 1971, following Uganda's coup, which "severed Tanzania-Uganda relations which negatively affected Tanzania's national interest by ending trade and other bilateral relations between the two friendly states" (Lodompui, 2010: xi). The political tensions between the two countries and the diminishing trade had a mutually reinforcing effect that in the end curtailed any prospects of an opportunity cost being incurred as the political relationship deteriorated further: "When the trade was severed between Uganda and Tanzania, Tanzania reacted by shifting southwards for better trade relations. When Tanzania's trade became costly and unworthy in East Africa then the collapse of EAC became inevitable in 1977" (Lodompui, 2010: x). The path to war was further compelled by domestic economic downturns in Uganda, which necessitated a diversionary war aimed at Tanzania, where anti-Amin rebels had shelter, though not active training or aid (at least since 1975).

The idea of regional unity in the post-colonial setting was pushed most vigorously from Tanzania. Originally, the country's leaders had sought outright federation with the other two countries, with a single state being the end goal. However, "Tanzania had a great challenge in the federation debate from Uganda, because the Uganda federal constitution recognized the autonomous kingdom of Buganda which opposed the federation of the East African States" (Lodompui, 2010: 40). This was compounded onto by the fact that Uganda's independence had been gained with Mutasa and Obote as president and prime minister, respectively. This produced a preoccupation with the domestic political front on the part of Uganda, which produced a general reluctance for regional schemes. The future destiny of the EAC would, between 1967 and 1977, be determined by "Uganda's internal dynamics and political

developments" (Lodompui, 2010: 40), and, we may add, the responses they elicited from within Tanzania.

Tanganyika's leaders "emphasized [the] need to accelerate the formation of the federation," despite friction encountered from the other countries (Lodompui, 2010: 42). This reached its most exemplary point during a May 7th 1964 meeting among the parliamentary working committees of Kenya and Tanganyika, during which Nyerere expressed that "The government of the Republic of Tanganyika and myself are fully committed to entering immediately into a federation with Kenya and Uganda or with Kenya or Uganda alone" (in Lodompui, 2010: 42). With consensus on federation not materialising, the countries settled on what was seen as a temporary solution and "signed a treaty in 1967, dealing mainly with the issues of economic co-opcration in the region" (Lodompui, 2010: 42). This was what became the EAC.

Table 5.3. Tanzania's trade with Kenya in EAC, 1969-1980 (in millions of US$).

Period	**1969**	**1970**	**1971**	**1972**	**1973**	**1974**	**1975**	**1976**	**1977**	**1978**	**1979**	**1980**
Exports	11	16	22	16	21	27	22	30	3.3	0.1	0.5	0.2
Imports	36	41	41	45	46	53	54	79	21	2	11	10

Source: MIT Observatory of Economic Complexity (2019).

Tanzania may have been the most eager force behind regional integration, but Kenya would prove the most visible gainer, at least in terms of exports. Indeed "Tanzania and Uganda were mainly net importers of Kenya's goods" (Lodompui, 2010: 64). As Table 5.3 demonstrates, in the 1969-1976 period, Tanzania-Kenya trade saw growth not only in total volumes, but also "[in] value despite the ideological differences" (Lodompui, 2010: 53). This would change only following the downfall of the EAC in the year 1977, which was followed by the Uganda-Tanzania war and saw "the closure of Tanzania's border with Kenya," due to differences over Uganda, with whom Kenya was still cordial (Lodompui, 2010: 53-54). With such minimal, but growing, trade, the relationships, at least at this stage, required (much like Europe in the early years of the erstwhile European Community) political prodding (Taylor 1979: 17). The main method of doing this (i.e., constant communication by the leaders) was disrupted by the events of 1971 as "the East African presidents never met since Amin came into power in Uganda" (Lodompui, 2010: 54):

> This deteriorating political climate made it practically difficult not only to solve the problems which existed in EAC, but also prevented the leaders from meeting and reviewing the

> functioning of the EAC. As Tanzania closed her borders with Kenya and Nyerere refusing to recognize the Amin's regime, then the whole idea of EAC was duly shelved and forgotten (Lodompui, 2010: 54).

Nevertheless, the pattern in Tanzania-Kenya was repeated for the EAC overall, as the years between 1967 and 1976, saw gradual growth in Tanzania's trade within the EAC (Lodompui, 2010: 61). With regards to its future war adversary, Tanzania's trade with Uganda was characterised by a growth in overall imports and exports. Starting from a base of US$5.6-million, Tanzania's exports to Uganda would grow to US$7.8-million by 1970, before moving to decline for the remainder of the pre-war period to a final low of US$0.2 million before the outbreak of the war (see Table 5.4).

Table 5.4. Tanzania's trade with Uganda, 1968-1980 (in millions of US$)

Years	**1968**	**1969**	**1970**	**1971**	**1972**	**1973**	**1974**	**1975**	**1976**	**1977**	**1978**	**1979**	**1980**
Imports	12.5	14	14.8	3.8	0.8	0.3	0	0	0	0	0	0.2	2.1
Exports	5.6	7.1	7.8	3.0	2.1	2.0	2.1	0.7	0.6	0.2	0.2	13.2	15.1
Total	18.1	12.1	22.6	6.8	2.9	2.3	2.1	0.7	0.6	0.2	0.2	13.4	17.2

Source: MIT Observatory of Economic Complexity (2019).

Table 5.4 also demonstrates a growth in Uganda's exports into Tanzania from 1968 to 1970 from US$12.5 to US$14.8, and then a decline thereafter from 1971 (US$3.8-million) until reaching US$0.3-million in 1973, and eventually reaching no exports for the remainder of the Amin period. The period of initial growth, occurring exclusively under Obote and Nyerere as the leaders of their respective countries is due to the fact that "Uganda particularly after 1969, was significantly influenced by the fact that Uganda was moving towards socialism. The increase in trade between Tanzania and Uganda was also influenced by the improving relations between Nyerere and Obote" (Lodompui, 2010: 63). Thus the exponential decline in trade "was as a result of Amin's coup in Uganda in 1971, which disrupted Trade between the two friendly countries and severed bilateral relations" (Lodompui, 2010: 64). Lodompui's assertion is given further weight by the fact that once more after Amin was removed, from 1979 we see an increase in Tanzania-Uganda trade relations after the latter was by then under a different regime that was more favourably oriented towards Tanzania.

It is, however, critical to discern that "though Tanzania thought that Kenya would support her to overthrow the Amin's regime, Kenya did not give any such support to Tanzania because

Kenya did not want to interfere with the internal affairs of Uganda," nevertheless Tanzania "continued to trade with Kenya because she was gaining in terms of trade" (Lodompui, 2010: 65). Another reason was at play: "Tanzania also increased trade with Kenya because of Tanzania's initiative to develop her Northern corridor tourist circuit around Mount Kilimanjaro and Serengeti areas Ngunyi and Adar" (Lodompui, 2010: 64). This unique arrangement ensured that Kenya-bound tourists could make use of Tanzania's northern corridor and visit its National Parks. Therefore, "Tanzania's exports to Kenya reached [their] lowest level after the collapse of EAC and the closure of Tanzania-Kenya border in 1977" (Lodompui, 2010: 67).

For some time, there existed cordial relations between Tanzania and Uganda. "It was such a state of affairs that introduced tension between Kenya and Uganda after 1969," however (Lodompui, 2010: 71). The sparing of Tanzanians during Obote's expulsion of non-skilled workers which affected Kenyans was an indicator of this. "This concretized the growing fears amongst Kenya's foreign policy makers that connivance was in the making between Kampala and Dar es Salaam to isolate Kenya in East Africa" (Lodompui, 2010: 71). In turn, "Kenya's reaction to the January 1971 coup in Uganda was cold and its treatment of President Obote thereafter, seems to confirm Kenya's dislike for the policy of the UPC government" (Lodompui, 2010: 71).

Figure 5.4. Growth/decline in Uganda and Tanzania's mutual shares of export markets, 1961-2015




Figure 5.4 above, along with the preceding Table 5.1, demonstrate the lack of opportunity cost from the Ugandan perspective for initiating a conflict with Tanzania. Representing the lack of significant, interdependence-creating trade between the two, they show both Uganda and Tanzania's external reliance which would have made it expensive for one to fight the other by

disrupting a mutually beneficial status quo in which the other's population was the other's market. In retrospect, we know that this is perhaps owed to a "cringe factor," which made Tanzanian consumers more inclined towards, respectively, western, Tanzanian and, lastly, regionally sourced goods (Rugimbana, Carr, Bolitho and Walkom, 2000: 91)

The significance of trade as a war-averting factor is presented by the presence and resolution of a territorial dispute between Kenya and Uganda. As with Tanzania, Kenya's Tanzania-sourced imports saw an increase – with the exception of 1972 – that persisted even after the Asian expulsion, during which "most factories were closed" (Lodompui, 2010: 69). For the time period, "Kenya-Uganda trade increased in volume and value despite the challenges brought about by Amin's regime" (Lodompui, 2010: 69). To the point of this subsection of the Chapter, these trade relations survived even Idi Amin's "claims of Western Kenya as part of Uganda" (Lodompui, 2010: 71; italics added). This was a claim around "a large segment of western Kenya had been transferred from Uganda in 1902 and by rights still belonged to Uganda" (Twaddle, 1979: 217). But "this particular claim was soon dropped when Kenya effectively sealed off the Uganda/Kenya border to Ugandan trade" (Twaddle, 1979: 217). Dar es Salaam, in contrast, posed much less of a challenge, and had even fewer revenues through which to make Uganda contain itself.

The lack of trade was once again a factor in Tanzania's subsequent foreign policy in the 1980s, as the lowering of intra-EAC trade: "Tanzania's national interest broadened southwards, providing Tanzania with an opportunity to trade with friendly southern African nations such as Zambia and Mozambique" (Lodompui, 2010: 75). Thus political asylum was given to freedom fighting movements from Southern Africa, which was further aided by the formation of the Tazara Rail, which allowed these countries to formulate the frontline states and successfully avert needing the ports of apartheid South Africa (Khadiagala, 1993: 226).

5.5. Conclusion

To conclude, economic variables explain the war throughout; from a lack of opportunity cost for Idi Amin in initiating war with Tanzania, but also was not enough to restrain itself from counter-invading Uganda in order to overthrow the Amin regime. At the same time, this is given further credence by the contrasting – or *falsifying* instance of Kenya-Uganda relations – which demonstrated the role of economic interdependence in diminishing the salience of territorial disputes as a factor to be fought over when Kenya used its Amin-unaffected trade to persuade Uganda away from instigating a 1902-era territorial hangover. This was made an

impossibility in the Tanzania-Uganda case, which was made all the more likely to end in war with Tanzania because Uganda was facing growing dissent due to economic imperatives, while having both territorial and political differences, underlined by Tanzania's sheltering of anti-Amin rebels.

Perhaps the surest indicator of the diminishing economic interdependence between the two countries, and thus the region as a whole, was the closure of East African Airways. Founded in 1945 by the British, the airline was subsequently managed by the three governments of the EAC following independence. Experiencing operational and financial difficulties in the early years, it became profitable it 1949. In 1952 it became the first non-British airline to carry a ruling monarch in the person of Queen Elizabeth II, and had a sprawling and growing network of profitable flights. Upon independence, the countries inherited the airline – with headquarters in Kenya - while it was in a phase of decline that began in to show in 1962, characterised by issues around delivery of orders. This was compounded by the closure of the partnership with SAA over apartheid. The last flight to Johannesburg was in October of 1963. Still, records of the time show that the airline operated profitable domestic routes in all three countries as well as continentally and internationally. The destinations included Aden, Addis Ababa, Athens, Blantyre, Bombay, Bujumbura, Cairo, Copenhagen, Frankfurt, Karachi, Kigali, Kinshasa, London, Lourenço Marques, Lusaka, Mauritius, Mogadishu, Rome, Seychelles, Tananarive, and Zurich.[40] At the close of the decade, however, the seat load factor fell from 47.2% to 41.5% between 1968 and 1969. These factors were compounded by increases in domestic fares and rates introduced in 1968, and culminated in a "disappointing financial result" in 1969 (East African Airways online archive, 2018). However, increasingly unlucrative operations necessitated involvement of an Irish firm to manage the operations in 1976. In the same year, both Tanzania and Uganda failed to pay their existing debts for the operations of the airline, requiring Kenya to bankroll the operation as a result; totalling some US$500-million in 2019. Consequently, the airline was closed in February of 1977. By this time, Uganda had already formed its own Uganda Airways (in 1976), and Kenya soon followed suit in February. Tanzania launched its own airline in April 1977. Ironically, the regional airline was perceived by the Ugandans and Tanzanians as being imbalanced and profiting only Kenya despite their ostensibly equal share in the partnership (and by 1994 the two would join with South African

[40] East African Airways online archive, 'Timetable 1 April 1975,' URL https://eastafricanairways.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/ec75.pdf (last accessed 7 August 2020). See history of the airline here: East African Airways online archive. 2020. 'East African Airways Early Days,' URL: https://eastafricanairways.com/history/eaa/ (last accessed 7 August 2020).

Airways to form Alliance Air). In this way, we can partially note how the last major remaining source of interdependence among the countries was diminished in the immediate pre-war period. Continued profitability of the airline, we may estimate, would have given the countries continued interest in one another's prosperity as it would have occasioned a shared prosperity. Moreover, we note, in this brief history, Kenya's relative (economic) preponderance as well as its limits.

Thus, domestic political factors worked in conjunction with bilateral economic ones to either accelerate the path to war or make it less possible for it to be averted. Nevertheless, conventional war was avoided earlier in 1972 "due to international condemnation of the proposed invasion," and in particular due to Somali efforts that had been "able to negotiate a truce between Tanzania and Uganda on October 7, 1972" (Valeriano, 2011: 212). This indicates that there may be a causal role to be considered regarding the external world. This is explored further – in tandem with the rest of the region (Eastern Africa) – in Chapter 7, which delves into the role of the international and regional systemic determinants of the war in terms of the hegemonic stability theory.

CHAPTER 6

Case Study 3: Eritrea-Ethiopia War, 1998-2000

6.1. Introduction

The Eritrea-Ethiopia occurred between the two countries in a space of a little over two years, from May of 1998 and June of 2000. Following the end of the war, the *status quo antebellum* was restored, with Badme under Ethiopian control. Following the war, the two adversaries went on to be in a state of a truce, in the midst of which the UN-established authorised Boundary Commission awarded the territory to Eritrea, whilst the Claims Commission determined that Eritrea was liable for costs associated with the war. The first steps towards a permanent instrument of peace were only agreed to by the two countries, at Ethiopian initiation, in 2018.

For many scholars, the war came as a surprise because it had been held by many as an assumption that "because the leadership of the two countries is dominated by the Tigrayan ethnic group and due to the fact that cordial relations between them seemed very deep, any disagreement, even if it arose, would be solved in a fraternal manner" (Milkias, 2004: 58). Upon occurring, others wrote that it was outside the fold of rational explaining (Steves, 2003: 119): "The escalation of a local border dispute in 1998 to full-scale war between Ethiopia and Eritrea was 'senseless', 'appalling', and 'completely unexpected' for most observers" (Steves, 2003: 119). Furthermore, Steves asserts that the war "is particularly difficult to understand using traditional 'cause of war' idioms" (Steves, 2003: 119-120). Still others cast it within the broader logic of state-making by the new and comparatively smaller state which required a central point for consolidation for "reinforcing Eritrea's autonomy and sovereignty and projecting clear signals about Eritrean power" (Steves, 2003: 122). Lyons further asserts that "the classic imperatives of state- and nation-building drove both regimes to set forth unconditional goals and refuse compromise on the vital issues of territoriality, legitimacy and identity" (Lyons, 2009: 168). In this way, "the control of this small desolate town became linked directly to the political fortunes – even survival – of both regimes" (Lyons, 2009: 168). In the views of others, the "war has most of the characteristics of a civil war between one [Tigray] people spread out in two countries" (Lata, 2003: 374).

This chapter investigates the causes of the Eritrea-Ethiopia war through the prism of the two theories previously used to assess the Ogaden and Uganda-Tanzania wars; namely the democratic peace thesis and economic interdependence. This chapter of the thesis has found

relevance for both the democratic peace thesis, despite the undemocratic nature of both countries, as well as the economic interdependence thesis. This allows us to formulate a typology accounting for both these variables. In 1997, there was were prospects of the opposition gaining channels through which to challenge the Isaias regime. The constitution had been completed by the Constitutional Commission of Eritrea, and elections were pending within a matter of months. At this same time, the living standards of the population were declining (from a previous GDP per capita growth rate of 7.972% to 1.254%). So were exports (from a value of US$25.5 million to US$23.3 million). The new currency, the Nakfa, made trade with Ethiopia impossible. Further, the currency made the border, hitherto managed and handled at the level of the local governments, salient. At the same time, Isaias appraised the domestic context in Ethiopia to be favourable for attack. The hypothetical information privilege that Eritrea ought to have had was diminished by a misperception of Ethiopia; the regime in Asmara incorrectly assumed that the rest of the country would mutiny and not back the Tigray-led government. Anti-Eritrean sentiment however was widely spread in Ethiopia. The diversion of exports away from Massawa and Assab further made retaliation against Eritrea less costly.

Firstly, we turn to a historical and chronological overview of the conflict between Eritrea and Ethiopia. In the third section, the methodology applied in this chapter will be described. In the fourth and fifth section, we conduct the two respective tests.

6.2. Background and Onset of the Eritrea-Ethiopia War, 1998-2000

6.2.1. Political Background

"With kidnappings, major hostilities and violence the world is beginning to learn smoldering conflict in the Horn of Africa" (Lobban, 1976: 335). This was describing, two years before the Ogaden War, another conflict involving Ethiopia. And one which sowed the seeds of a future conflict some twenty years later. This was the civil war waged by the Eritrean independence movement in the northeast of Ethiopia. Upon Ethiopia successfully casting off the Italian occupation in November 1941, the Eritrean issues (whose long-term, colonially-derived origins were introduced in Chapter 2 in section 2.3.1 of this dissertation) came to their immediate post-colonial crescendo. Initially, the territory was placed under temporary British Military Administration, with the United Nations being entrusted with determining the future course of the land and its people, with it eventually being decided that it should join with Ethiopia in a federal arrangement (Butcher and Maru, 2018: 74).

The especially established 'United Nations Commission of Inquiry for Eritrea', of the five states of Guatemala, Pakistan, Burma, South Africa and Norway, had as its mandate "to ascertain more fully the wishes and the best means of promoting the welfare of the inhabitants of Eritrea, to examine the question of the disposal of Eritrea and to report for the General Assembly, together with such proposals as it may deem appropriate for the solution of the problem with Eritrea" (Haile, 1987: 11). This was encapsulated in a UNGA Resolution (289-A(IV)) issued on the 21st of November in 1949. The representatives of the Commission and its staff had made a single visit to Eritrea, running from February 14th to April 6th in 1950, "a period subsequently regarded as far too short to come to any well-founded conclusions" (Haile, 1987: 11).

> In determining the views of Eritreans, the Commission conducted its inquiry against a background of violence in Eritrea between those seeking independence and those seeking union with Ethiopia. The members made different conclusions as to what should be the political future of Eritrea. The Guatemala-Pakistan memorandum indicated that Eritrea should be an independent and sovereign state after a period of United Nations trusteeship. Burma and South Africa proposed the federation of Eritrea with Ethiopia, and Norway proposed the union of Eritrea and Ethiopia (Haile, 1987: 11).

In the end, then, the Commission unanimously elected for union instead of partition. The Burmese-South African-Norwegian scheme won out. Its rationale concluded that "both the pro-Unionist and pro- Independence groups, who together make up a large majority of the population, rejected the partition of Eritrea in principle" (in Haile, 1987: 11). This was similarly echoed by the Guatemala-Pakistan memorandum as well, which stated that "all observations lead to the conclusion that it is necessary to maintain the unity of the territory. The solution to the problem of the disposal of Eritrea must therefore be a single one and must apply to the whole country" (in Haile, 1987: 11). UNGA Resolution 390-A (V) therefore gave rise to a federation of Eritrea and Ethiopia. Within this scheme, provision was made for a separation of powers and duties between the two Addis Ababa and Asmara-based governments, with the former being the seat of the federation as a whole. The third section of the UN Resolution, along with the Federal Act in the Ethiopian statute books, stipulated "that the Federal Government shall have full jurisdiction the following matters: defense, foreign affairs, currency and finance, foreign and interstate commerce and external interstate communication, including ports" (in Haile, 1987: 12). The provisions of the Resolution likewise made it clear that the

Eritrean government would have right to those powers which were not otherwise given to the Federal Government. In its first two sections, the UN Resolution codified that:

> 1) "Eritrea shall constitute an autonomous unit federated with Ethiopia under the sovereignty of the Ethiopian Crown"; and
>
> 2) "The Eritrean Government shall possess legislative, executive and judicial powers in the field of domestic affairs."

As a result, the "Ethiopian Crown" would be "the sole sovereign of the Federation or the sole head of the Federal Government which will exercise its federal functions in both Ethiopia and Eritrea alike" (Haile, 1987: 12). Remaining powers resided with the respective Ethiopian/Eritrean governments in the two territories. "By this test neither the Ethiopian nor the Eritrean Government was competent to exercise any federal functions. Only the Federal Government headed by the federal government "Crown" was competent to exercise federal powers" (Haile, 1987: 12).

In their understanding of these documents, the Eritrean elites and the Eritrean population read the establishment of the Federation to mean a bifurcation of political authority such that "the governments of Ethiopia and Eritrea would be free [to] define their general domestic policy within their own spheres of activity" (Haile, 1987: 12). Considering the measures allowed for by the 1950 UNGA conclusion "and the certainty of being on equal footing with Ethiopians," Eritrea's leaders were of the view that they would be free to "question, discuss and defend" all matters concerning Eritrea as they deemed appropriate, within the ambit of the known laws (Haile, 1987: 12). "With this understanding, the United Nations Resolution 390-A(V) was accepted in good faith by the Eritreans" (Haile, 1987: 12). In practice, however, this did not materialise:

> Emperor Haile Selassie denied Eritreans their basic democratic and human rights by undermining the autonomy of the Eritrean government, curtailing the freedom of the press, prohibiting popular organizations demonstrations, persecuting and imprisoning Eritrean patriots, suppressing Eritrean languages and culture imposing the Amharic (Ethiopian) language upon an unwilling population. Finally, the imperial government able to dissolve the Federal arrangement in 1962 in violation of the United Nations Resolution and in defiance of the will of the interational community (Haile, 1987: 15).

As Lobban further observed "for those who have probed history of the region, it should be clear that Eritrea has probably never been integrated into Ethiopia proper" (Lobban, 1976: 335). The

coming apart of this "federation" and the outright annexation of Eritrea by Ethiopia in that year gave rise to, and for some consolidated, the phenomenon of "Eritrean nationalism" (Haile, 1987: 12). This was a time in which the former no longer pinned their hopes on the UN asserting the 1950 UNGA Resolution, and reached the conclusion that any peaceable approach for achieving this goal would encounter crafty resistance in the UN's chambers from Ethiopia itself along with its litany of high-powered allies. It was at this point that the nationalists among them "decided to wage armed struggle to drive the Ethiopian army of occupation" (Haile, 1987: 15).

Thus, the Eritrean Liberation Front (ELF) came to be, and readily "took up arms in an attempt to resist the repressive government" (Lobban, 1976: 335). Not as united as it would later seem (Iyob, 1995), the ELF would undergo a schism in the early part of the 1970s, which brought about the formation of the Eritrean People's Liberation Front (EPLF), which began fighting not only the Ethiopian government, but also the ELF itself (Butcher and Maru, 2018: 74). They were not alone in their dissatisfaction with Addis Ababa as "other groups were discontented with the Emperor" (Butcher and Maru, 2018: 74). This led to the developments of August 1974 we already saw in Chapter 4, in which a coup took place, and the Derg emerged and expunged the institution of monarchy in that country (Butcher and Maru, 2018: 74).

> The removal of Emperor Haile Selassie on 12 September 1974 initially raised hopes that the new regime in Addis Ababa, with its pretended Marxism, would seek a political settlement to the new rulers of Ethiopia, the Derg, chose to perpetuate the Emperor's policy and intensified the struggle with bigger guns, better war planes and greatly reinforced armies (Haile, 1987: 15-16).

The "repressive tactics employed by the Ethiopian military regime" gave rise to "a series of armed struggles within the rest of Ethiopia," leading to the formation of the Tigray People's Liberation Front (TPLF) in 1975, aimed at challenging the Ethiopian government for the liberation of the north of the country (Butcher and Maru, 2018: 74).[41] In the early years, "the TPLF and the EPLF worked cooperatively with one another" (Butcher and Maru, 2018: 75). But there was something of a hierarchy as "the more experienced EPLF provided military training to the TPLF and the TPLF supported the EPLF in the war against the ELF, which was finally defeated in 1981" (Butcher and Maru, 2018: 75). These EPLF-TPLF efforts – carried out by two partners who were never wholly united and who maintained differences and separate

[41] Interview 6, Interview 7, and Interview 12.

command structures (Butcher and Maru, 2018: 75) – led to the eventual defeat of the Derg in 1991. This was partially owed to the fact that the EPLF were intent on independence from Ethiopia. The TPLF therefore had a close working relationship with other groups in the rest of Ethiopia with much less secessionist aims in the form of the Ethiopian People's Revolutionary Democratic Front (EPRDF). They successfully put in place a transitional government. "The Derg government had been weakened by their loss of support due to the fall of communism in Eastern Europe" (*Strategic Comments*, 2000: 1). This was compounded onto by Ethiopia's clandestine, and expensive and time-consuming, activities aimed at undermining Somalia through sponsorship of the anti-Siad Barre forces.

The year 1991 also saw, "as part of the United Nations-facilitated transition of power to the transitional government," an agreement that the EPLF ought to establish "an autonomous transitional government in Eritrea and that a referendum would be held in Eritrea to find out if Eritreans wanted to secede from Ethiopia" (*Strategic Comments,* 2000: 1). Following the result of the referendum, which "was overwhelmingly in favour of independence," in April of 1993, the aim of Eritrean statehood came to fruition, gaining near immediate UN membership on May 28th of that year.

This, seemingly amicable separation, however, was the beginning of a difficult interstate relationship between Ethiopia and its newly formed neighbour:

> Earlier, in 1991, the EPLF-backed transitional government of Eritrea and the TPLF-backed transitional government of Ethiopia had agreed to set up a commission to look into any problems that arose between the two former wartime allies over the foreseen independence of Eritrea. This commission was not successful, and during the following years relations between the governments of the two sovereign states deteriorated (*Strategic Comments*, 2000: 1).

Coming to an agreement over the exact border area proved a major difficulty. In November of 1997, the two countries agreed to set up a border committee, whose goal it was "to try to resolve that specific dispute" (Strategic Comments, 2000: 1). Following the federal agreement in 1950, where the Eritrean territory began had only been "a demarcation line between federated provinces," and thus the two governments came to the agreement that the status quo before Eritrea achieved independence (*Strategic Comments*, 2000: 1). However, upon independence the border became an international frontier, "and the two governments could not agree on the line that the border should take along its entire length, and they looked back to the colonial period treaties between Italy and Ethiopia for a basis in international law for the precise line of

the frontier between the states" (*Strategic Comments*, 2000: 1). However, interpreting and reaching consensus on the meaning of those treaties was impossible; a factor worsened by the lack of clarity on the binding nature of colonial treaties under international law.

6.2.2. The War

The first occurrence of conflict between the two states broke out on May 6th in 1998. In an interview with myself, Ambassador Legwaila Legwaila who served as Special Representative of the UN Secretary-General informed me that the war had no basis on any resources as "the only firm structure in the area was a church." Rather, the source of the fighting seems to have been sparked when Ethiopian soldiers sought to extract taxes from the local villagers in Badme (*Strategic Comments*, 2000: 1). In response, the Eritrean troops stationed there "confronted Ethiopian militiamen," and in the process "several Eritreans were killed in the ensuing battle" (*Strategic Comments*, 2000: 1).

> "Angered by the incident, and possibly hoping to extract Ethiopian concessions in the on-going economic disputes, Eritrea moved into Badme on 12 May. Caught offguard, Meles responded with an ultimatum demanding Eritrean withdrawal from the area. The result was full-scale war, heralded by an exchange of air raids in early June that killed numerous civilians" (*Strategic Comments*, 2000: 1).

Incidentally, during the initial actions by the Eritreans, "the joint Ethio–Eritrean Border Commission was having a meeting in Addis Ababa" (Butcher and Maru, 2018: 75). Indeed the Ethiopian government sought to use this platform to inform their Eritrean counterparts of the happenings at the border, to which they agreed "to address the issue peacefully" (Butcher and Maru, 2018: 75). Despite this, escalation continued as the tensions flared further (Butcher and Maru, 2018: 75). Indeed, the Eritreans appeared more determined to forcefully take the area (Murphy, 2016: 1):

> On the morning of May 12, Eritrean armed forces consisting of soldiers, tanks, and artillery attacked the town of Badme, crossed through the Badme plain to higher ground in the east, and attacked several other areas in Ethiopia's Tahtay Adiabo Wereda, as well as places in the neighboring Laelay Adiabo Wereda (Murphy, 2016: 2).

All the areas affected by the events of May 12th, the UN Claims Commission established, "were all either within undisputed Ethiopian territory or within territory that was peacefully administered by Ethiopia" (Murphy, 2016: 2). For its part, the OAU's Ministerial Committee "found that Badme and its environs were under Ethiopian administration prior to May 1998

and hence demanded that Eritrea withdraw its forces from the area" (Murphy, 2016: 2). Indeed, even "Eritrea accepted that the Badme area had been continuously under Ethiopian authority for a considerable period of time, both before and after independence in 1993," but its government persisted in their claim that "colonial treaties concluded between Italy and Ethiopia established that Badme was part of Eritrea" (Murphy, 2016: 2).

In the beginning, much as the Derg regime had done vis-à-vis the Somalian invasion of 1977, "Ethiopian resistance to the invasion was minimal, mostly involving Ethiopian militia and police equipped solely with small arms" (Murphy, 2016: 2). This would change, however, in June, as Ethiopia "moved quickly" in its deployment of its army to the affected region, eagerly fortifying its country to halt any further Eritrean advances into Ethiopian territory (Murphy, 2016: 2).

> Consequently, by June the two armies had assumed positions along a western front, with Eritrea in possession of Ethiopian territory (or at least Ethiopian-administered territory) in Kafta Humera Wereda, Tahtay Adiabo Wereda, and Laelay Adiabo Wereda. Shortly after their incursion in the west, Eritrean military forces invaded and occupied areas controlled by Ethiopia along the central part of the border in Mereb Lekhe Wereda by crossing the Mereb River at a number of places (Murphy, 2016: 2).

Despite some resistance being offered by the Ethiopian militia and police placed there, they "quickly fled along with local civilians," and as a result the Ethiopian army had to be deployed there (Murphy, 2016: 2-3).

Much like in the western front, the Ethiopian army eventually arrived, upon which they "assumed defensive positions, creating a central front," but Eritrea's forces would sustain their occupation of Mereb Lekhe for another two years until 2000 (Murphy, 2016: 3). In June 1998, "Eritrean forces also invaded Gulomakheda Wereda on the central front, the location of an important border town named Zalambessa" (Murphy, 2016: 3). The latter town was a critical link between Addis Ababa and Asmara and served as a key communications and transport link for Ethiopia (Murphy, 2016: 3). The claims commission would later establish that

> Eritrean forces moved into areas administered prior to the conflict by Ethiopia, occupied territory, and established field fortifications and trench lines, sometimes permanently and sometimes only for a brief period before returning to adjacent territory administered prior to the conflict by Eritrea. In all cases, they carried out intermittent operations that extended beyond the occupied areas. These operations included artillery fire, intermittent ground patrols, and the placement of defensive fields of mines (in Murphy, 2016: 3).

The course of the war would be changed by the climate: "with the advent of the rainy season (mid-June to mid-September), fighting between the two countries largely subsided," and the two sides went on to form defensive positions in their respective trenches (a factor which garners a lot of comparison with WWI), "and Eritrean forces in control of portions of Ethiopian (or Ethiopian-administered) territory" (Murphy, 2016: 3). Activity in this time mainly consisted of some shelling, as the two sides "focused on the deployment and position of their forces and increasing their armaments and aircraft" (Murphy, 2016: 3). This changed in February of the following year, as "Ethiopia launched a meticulously prepared offensive to recapture Badme" (*Strategic Comments*, 2000: 1). This was codenamed "Operation Sunset" – a name drawn from Isaias Afwerki's statement that Eritrean withdrawal "was as likely as the sun not rising," (*Strategic Comments*, 2000: 1). As it would happen, the Ethiopian force successfully repelled the Eritreans from the Badme Region between the 23rd and 26th of February (*Strategic Comments*, 2000: 1).

By March, "extensive fighting broke out on the central front, at Zalambessa, but Eritrea continued to hold the town and adjacent areas" (Murphy, 2016: 4). Further fighting continued, as it did on the eastern front, "but neither side gained a decisive advantage by the time the rainy season returned in June 1999" (Murphy, 2016: 4).

> But sensing a greater victory within its grasp, Ethiopia struck again at Tsorona on 13 March [2000]. With troops forced to advance across a 1,000 metrewide minefield, under the concentrated fire of dozens of Eritrean artillery pieces, the attack was a disaster. Three days of fighting cost Ethiopia 57 tanks and thousands of lives (*Strategic Comments*, 2000: 2).

By May 12th, the Ethiopians launched an attack in Badme, "followed thereafter by a thrust at Zalambessa on the central front" (Murphy, 2016: 4-5):

> Ethiopian forces in the west outflanked and broke through the Eritrean lines and then penetrated into Eritrean territory, seizing several Eritrean towns (Barentu, Bimbina, Bishuka, Mailem, Molki, Shambuko, and Tokombia). From there, some Ethiopian forces moved east in Eritrea toward Mai Dima and Mendefera, others traveled west toward Alighidir, Gogne, Haykota, and Teseney, while still others returned to Ethiopia. Of particular importance, Ethiopian troops were within striking distance of Adi Quala, which lay only about 100 kilometers by a good road from the Eritrean capital of Asmara (Murphy, 2016: 5).

The Ethiopian forces that got to Teseney met resistance from the Eritreans that forced them to retreat southwards to Ethiopia through the Setit River. "After being reinforced, those forces returned to Eritrea and recaptured Alighidir, Guluj, and Teseney on June 12-14" (Murphy,

2016: 4). Following these victories, "Ethiopia turned its attention to the central front, launching a major offensive on May 23 during which it recaptured Zalambessa and captured the Eritrean border town of Tserona," which marked the successful throwing off of the Eritreans in Ethiopia (Murphy, 2016: 5). The next phase of the war was characterised by an Ethiopian counter-invasion of Eritrea; the first step of which was the capture of Senafe, Tserona, and Senafe Sub-Zobas, upon which they "assumed defensive positions along the north of Senafe" where they stopped making any further advances (Murphy, 2016: 5).

Overall, the conflict cost approximately some thirty (Aboagye, 2001: 20) to one-hundred thousand lives (Lyons, 2009: 168), as well as US$700-million worth of arms imports (Aboagye, 2001: 20) Another one million were "and a generation of development opportunities was squandered" (Lyons, 2009: 168). Furthermore, "the humanitarian situation in parts of Ethiopia was exacerbated by the severe drought, which led to the emergence of a major food crisis that affected almost eight million people" (Aboagye, 2001: 20).

6.2.3. Peace Settlement

Alongside the fighting detailed in the preceding sub-section, there was active diplomatic engagement to bring it to an end (Aboagye, 2001: 19). The UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan got into immediate contact with the leaders of the two countries "urging restraint and offering assistance in resolving the conflict peacefully" (Aboagye, 2001: 19). Annan made a request that Ambassador Mohamed Sahnoun of Algeria (Special Envoy to Africa), lead the mediation process of the OAU (Aboagye, 2001: 19). Some two days following the Eritrean offensive, OAU Secretary-General Salim Salim made an offer to assist in reaching a settlement, making appeals to the two leaders to avert any escalation (Aboagye, 2001: 19-20). By late May, American and Rwandan diplomats made joint recommendations and presented these to the two countries. "The four-point plan involved a withdrawal of Ethiopian and Eritrean troops from the disputed territory, the deployment of a neutral observer force, the return of civilian administration to disputed areas, and an investigation into the origins of the conflict" (Aboagye, 2001: 20).

It was clear to all, however, that there was no rapid settlement to be had as by the middle of June, "it was clear that these peace-making initiatives had not borne fruit, as the hostilities escalated into full-scale fighting along the common border" (Aboagye, 2001: 20). To be sure, Ethiopia was more welcoming of the mediators, Eritrea was less inclined to an agreement because it would require it to give up on the Badme region, its raison d'être for initiating the

war in the first place. Meanwhile, "as the conflict dragged along, the US-Rwanda early proposals were incorporated in late 1998 by the OAU into a proposed framework agreement, a step again accepted by Ethiopia and supported by the Security Council, but not by Eritrea" (Murphy, 2016: 5).

Eritrea's posture would be transformed by imminent defeat. "After Ethiopia's breakthrough on the western front in February 1999, Eritrean President Isaias Afwerki informed the Security Council that Eritrea formally accepted the framework agreement" (Murphy, 2016: 6). As Eritrea still held large sections of Ethiopia, the latter put forth that, despite its claims of accepting this agreement, "Eritrea did not really accept the framework agreement" (Murphy, 2016: 6). This led to continued fighting.

> When Ethiopia launched its counter-offensive in May 2000, the Security Council condemned the renewal of hostilities and then declared an arms embargo on both countries. Intense diplomacy was again pursued to end the conflict, but now Ethiopia had the upper hand in the fighting and was content to push Eritrean forces out of Ethiopia, to try to destroy Eritrea's fighting capacity, and to gain the advantage by seizing Eritrean territory along the border. Eritrea's army, however, remained intact, and after lines solidified between the armies on the Eritrean side of the border, Ethiopia declared on June 1 that the war was finished, and on June 18 both countries agreed to a cease-fire (Murphy, 2016: 6).

Between May 29th and June 10th 2000, the two countries' leaders engaged in "proximity talks" within the framework of the OAU in Algiers. By June 18th, their foreign ministers, alongside President Bouteflika of Algeria, had signed a "cessation of hostilities agreement," through which they mutually committed to "a cease-fire and Ethiopia agreed to the redeployment of its forces back to areas under Ethiopian administration prior to May 1998" (Murphy, 2016: 6). Furthermore,

> they agreed to the deployment of a UN peacekeeping force of some 4,200 troops—later called the UN Mission to Ethiopia and Eritrea (UNMEE)—within a twenty-five-kilometre-wide zone just inside Eritrea along the Eritrean-Ethiopian border as it existed prior to May 1998. Further, Eritrean forces would remain outside this "temporary security zone," though Eritrean police and local militia could return (in Murphy, 2016: 7).

On the 13th of April 2002, the boundary commission, formed under the auspices of the Algiers Agreement, agreed on a "final and binding verdict" on the matter (Kebebew, 2018: 9). The ruling awarded some territory to each side, but Badme (the flash point of the conflict) was

awarded to Eritrea to Ethiopian dissatisfaction, who requested a new commission, upon which Eritrea refused (Kebebew, 2018: 9).

By 15th of December in 2005, the UN started withdrawing its peacekeepers from Eritrea by decree of a UN resolution passed on the 14th. Seven days later, on the 21st of December, the Permanent Court of Arbitration reached a verdict that the Eritreans had broken international law by attacking Ethiopia in Badme in 1998. This precipitated remobilisation by both countries, once again around the border. The anticipated return to open warfare did not materialise, however (Kebebew, 2018: 9). But by November of the following year, both decided to abstain from a Boundary Commission meeting scheduled to take place at The Hague; Ethiopia disagreed with the Court's earlier findings, while Eritrea sought more concrete action other than just a demarcation on a map (Kebebew, 2018: 9).

Further dispute occurred on the 12th of June in 2016, wherein the two countries' armies engaged in a conflict in the Eritrean town of Tsorona. The Ethiopians, who had invaded Tsorona, were forced back. The facts of this incident remain a matter of dispute between the two countries. However, in July of 2018, under a new prime minister, Ethiopia approached Eritrea with a commitment to The Hague's findings which awarded Eritrea the disputed territory. However, as Ethiopian troops were withdrawing, local population was reported to have stood in the way of the soldiers, indicating a mistrust of the Eritrean side (Kebebew, 2018: 9), as well as the difficulty ahead if the conflict is to be resolved. It also indicated the role of domestic audiences.

The section which follows seeks to determine how the causes of the conflict interact with the literature on the democratic peace thesis. This is done through a comparative analysis of the two countries' state-society relations and how each lent itself to the causes of the war.

6.3. Case Study Analysis I: Democratic Peace Thesis

This section studies the relevance of the democratic peace thesis. It firstly outlines the methodology utilised and restates the hypotheses. It then accounts for the two regimes in Uganda and Tanzania. Finally, it assesses the role of regime type in determining the outbreak and course of the war.

6.3.1. Methodology

This section gives a descriptive overview of the methodology applied in this subsection of the chapter intended on testing the validity of the democratic peace thesis to the Eritrea-Ethiopia War. As in the previous chapter, it is a necessary caveat to acknowledge that at the time of the outbreak of the war, the two states could not be considered liberal democracies. But the theory

can be modulated to the case study through extracting the relevant variables it proposes in the mechanism it proposes them to operate to bring about certain outcomes. As the democratic peace thesis literature asserts that democracies tend to avert war with each other, and at the same time they go to war with non-democracies, we can expect the comparatively more open state to be less inhibited to initiate the war at a critical point, and for legitimacy-based reasons. Given the causal claims made by the democratic peace thesis, we can expect that the closed society should be the one to initiate the attack given that there should be less of a domestic audience cost for such a policy towards the authoritarian regime. Within this, we are interested in corroborating the extent to which there was a role for domestic institutions in either inhibiting or accelerating the adoption of the policy of war. Further, we are interested in the extent to which this follows the pathways proposed by the literature. Even in the incident that neither of the cases could be considered as classic democracies, we could nonetheless gain some important insights we otherwise would not if we were to not apply the theory to this case study. We can gain insights as to the institutional determinants or inhibitors of conflict in the case study in Eritrea and Ethiopia. Further, we can gain insights regarding the theory by extracting if there are any necessary mutations needed to the theory in order for it to be considered valid.

The relationship being examined in this case analysis are the scores of the two countries in terms of the Polity IV typology of authority. Upon assessing the outcome on the numerical variables, the section will extensively corroborate this data with a historical and narrative review and insights from interviews in order to determine in narrative and historical form the routes to the conflict and the manner in which it manifested itself and the results that took place in their wake. The purpose of this is to assess the workings of the variables beyond the numerical data, as well as to determine the relevance of these variables since the two countries took to war to assess whether – by their absence or despite their presence – these two countries have maintained a relative peace because of them.

6.3.2. Data Analysis

This section analyses the data on the respective regimes of the two states in question. It does so by firstly assessing the domestic institutions of Eritrea and then that of Ethiopia prior to and since the war of 1978-1979. It then seeks to identify whether there was a correlation their respective scores since the war to identify whether the respective governances of these countries could accurately be deemed to have played a role in the war. This is flanked by reviews of the political-military relations in the two countries.

6.3.3. Findings

6.3.3.1. The Eritrean regime

At the London talks in 1991, in whose auspices the assumption of power by the EPRDF was made official, the leaders of the EPLF "made it very clear that they would not participate in any interim government in Ethiopia" (Gilkes, 1991: 623). As one stated: "we didn't fight for 30 years just to get a couple of ministries" (in Gilkes, 1991: 623). The state of Eritrea would go on to not only have to deal with demobilisation of about one hundred thousand fighters from the liberation army but also "a basic political dilemma: how to provide a decent life for those who gave so much?" (Woldegabriel, 1993: 134). A contemporary report from the time states that

> Since many of the fighters had continued their education in the field during the war, they were given jobs all over Eritrea – in administration, construction, education (university and secondary school), television, radio etc. (Woldegabriel, 1993: 134).

According to Gebretensae Tewolde, then Head of Demobilisation Affairs, the process was executed in phases, starting with the soldiers who had joined the army the latest: "They have full energy and can work to support themselves; some can go back to school. Most are single and so not have major family responsibilities. Many also come from rural areas and are expected to return to farming" (in Woldegabriel, 1993: 134). In this first phase "25,000 combatants, 16 per cent of them women, are being demobilised. Depending on their length of service each fighter will receive a lump sum of between 1,000 and 5,000 Birr plus food assistance for six months" (Woldegabriel, 1993: 134). Special aid was intended for women and children. Former fighters, on the other hand, were all "promised vocational training, priority in employment and credit facilities" (Woldegabriel, 1993: 134). Additionally, "a special loan fund of £600,000 has been set up to assist in their reassimilation into civilian life and loans will also be provided to those who wish to set up in business" (Woldegabriel, 1993: 134).

By some accounts, "Eritrea achieved de facto independence in 1991 as a 'revolutionary society', independent statehood being the outcome of a 30-year-long liberation war against its occupying power, Ethiopia, combined with a social revolution" (Müller, 2008: 112). The Eritrean revolution has been described as "developmental-national" because it was characterised by the "establishment of political control over social and economic affairs, the obliteration of distinctions between state and society, and the conception of state power as something to be mobilised at will for the purpose changing societal relations" (Hermassi, 1976: 221). The EPLF had "primarily [been] established to create an independent nation state through

military means" (Pool: 2001: 16). It therefore created a state that was, in the early years, a "closely-knit society based on centralised control in which any dissent was dealt with swiftly" (Müller, 2008: 112). In its aim of garnering "sole authority," the leaders of the ruling EPLF, which had been renamed to the People's Front for Democracy and Justice (PFDJ), made use of "selective narratives and invented new sets of traditions based on strong notions of inclusion or exclusion as key factors in shaping national as well as personal identities" (Müller, 2008: 113). This rested on "on rituals that make the nation and the state appear as one" (Müller, 2008: 114). Thus it did not behave as a typical ruling party, but instead sought to be an instrument for the socialising of the Eritreans into "its version of social progress" (Müller, 2008: 114).

> Important mobilisation drives over the years include the early food for work and later cash for work programmes, the developmental activities in the context of summer work programmes and the national service campaign, and most recently the Warsay-Yekealo Development Campaign (Müller, 2008: 114).

Simultaneously, the Party is argued to be "deeply mistrust" for ""the people's" capacity to make the "right" decisions"; thus, "participation and individual engagement are tolerated only if they comply with the blueprint of the political leadership" (Müller, 2008: 114). Also akin to other newly independent African states, at face value at least, "the promise of development was deployed as a "legitimising strategy" for the EPLF" (Müller, 2008: 112).

> It was in this climate that it was renamed to the People's Front for Democracy in I994. Up to 1998, when renewed war with Ethiopia erupted - the fighting phase of which ended with a number of international agreements in 2000, but the root causes of which are still not resolved - post-independence Eritrea can be described as a developmental state. A developmental state is defined here as having two components: one ideological, one structural (Castells 1992: 55).

Structurally, the PFDJ "establishe[d] as its principle of legitimacy its ability to promote and sustain development" (Castells 1992: 55). Ideologically-speaking, those in the ruling class "must be able to establish an "ideological hegemony," so that its developmental project becomes… a "hegemonic" project to which key actors in the nation adhere voluntarily" (Müller, 2008: 113). Although labour unions were there, "they did not consolidate their strength in terms of activities" (Mehary, Rao, Pardhasaradhi and Tesfay, 1999: 316). Moreover, "they were playing a constructive role which matched the national policy. Even the grievance redressal procedure was nominal" (Mehary, Rao, Pardhasaradhi and Tesfay, 1999: 316). In a survey with employees at the time, Mehary, Rao, Pardhasaradhi and Tesfay, (1999: 316) noted that "almost all the employees and employers felt that the employee-employer relations were

highly cordial." Furthermore, "almost all the employers and employees expressed that they were committed to the reconstruction of the industry and reorient their business. They worked like a family striving for improving economic and social levels of the employers and employees" (Mehary, Rao, Pardhasaradhi and Tesfay, 1999: 316).

In this respect, the country registered some milestones in terms of modernisation and development: "perhaps most crucially notable improvements in the provision of social services to the wider population, in particular in the areas of basic health and education" (Connell 1995). At the root of this, lay "mobilisation endeavours demanding personal sacrifices" by the average Eritrean citizen (Müller, 2008: 113). A country-wide "national service campaign" was therefore established in 1995 for the purpose of disseminating the so-called war of independence-derived "Nakfa principles" (Reid 2005: 479; Connell, 1997: 93-94) to the younger section of the population:

> This social engineering project requires all women and men between 18 and 40 years of age to undergo 6 months of military training followed by 12 months civilian reconstruction activities as a citizenship obligation. At the core of the campaign is the military element, together with values struggle and sacrifice (Müller, 2008: 114).

Dissent is not tolerated, and compromise has not been demonstrated either. "The most prominent examples are members of Jehovah's Witnesses, who made themselves available for national service on the condition that they were not required to undergo any weapon training. Some have by now been detained for ten years for their refusal of armed military service, while more generally no stipulations exist to accommodate conscientious objectors" (Müller, 2008: 114).

Notably, as early as the year 1991, we note "[the] first cautious attempts" by various social forces seeking to politically participate and to "redefine the [public] space" (Müller, 2008: 116). For example, there was the short-lived Eritrean Development Centre as well as Bana, "a quasi war veterans' organisation" which issued the demands of some disenfranchised former EPLF foot soldiers (Müller, 2008: 116). However, these proved very short-lived, and the reaction from the government was always swift. From 1996, the legal process became more arbitrary with the rise of the Special Court (Müller, 2008: 116):

> On paper, the Court was to deal with cases of corruption and embezzlement. In practice, it acts as a tribunal with sweeping powers outside the normal juridical system. In a parallel move,

> between 1994 and 1997 new structures of regional and local government were put into place that cemented top-down leadership mechanisms (Müller, 2008: 116).

In this same timeframe, other aspects of life placed "under stricter biopolitical control" (Müller, 2008: 117). Some notable examples include the introduction of "new conditions to obtain exit visas or their outright refusal," as well as "an increasingly rigorous nation-wide campaign to identify those who did not fulfil their service obligations" (Müller, 2008: 117). Because of this the country has been seen by many observers as an omnipresent surveillance state, and "one of the strongest states on the African continent," due to its "exceptional oversight over the movements of Eritrean citizens" both within and outside of the borders of Eritrea (Müller, 2008: 125). Indeed this has been noted to persist such that, whereas, for example, the Ethiopian diaspora voluntarily fundraises for causes back home (Interview 15), Eritrean control over its own diaspora is noted by their being obligated to "pay a 20% tax on their income to the Eritrean government" (Müller, 2008: 125).

6.3.4. The Eritrea-Ethiopia War and the democratic peace thesis

As seen in the Background (section 6.2.), the two states were locked in a territorial dispute over Badme. "Eritrea claimed legal possession of the territory defined by the boundaries drawn by Italy when it occupied Eritrea in 1885. Ethiopian elites countered that the boundary rested on longstanding effective administration of the area and had been agreed between the two states when Eritrea became *de jure* independent in 1993" (Clapham, 2001, p. 132) (Steves, 2003: 121). On August 16th of 1997, Eritrea's president had written a letter to Ethiopia's prime minister, Meles Zenawi, concerning the border. In the letter, Isaias had expressed his wish that the border issue not be a "cause of concern and controversy in the future" (Butcher and Maru, 2018: 80). However, the letter went on to mention other bones of contention in other areas. He raised, for example, "the forcible occupation of Adi-Murug by your army in the past few days is truly saddening. There was no justification for resorting to force as it would not have been at all difficult to settle the matter amicably" (in Butcher and Maru, 2018: 80). On the 25th of the same month, he communicated another letter to Prime Minister Meles, urging that "the actions Ethiopia took in Adi-Murug were in Eritrean areas and that Ethiopia had expelled Eritrean officials and dismantled the existing administration" (Butcher and Maru, 2018: 80). Beyond decrying the how "unjustified" the actions of the Ethiopians, he made a proposal for "a joint commission to deal with border problem" (Butcher and Maru, 2018: 80).

Prime Minister Zenawi's response argued that the affected "areas in question were not within the disputed territories" and indicated that "it was his understanding that prior consultation was

required only in those areas that were disputed" (Butcher and Maru, 2018: 80). But, nonetheless, he found the idea of a border commission agreeable and it was soon established (Butcher and Maru, 2018: 80).

> These communications between the leaders of Ethiopia and Eritrea indicate that disagreements over the border demarcation were beginning in mid-1997. However, what is also apparent through these communications and other events is that the two sides were attempting to work out some type of agreement relating to their border dispute. In fact, the Border Commission met on 13 November 1997 to begin working on these issues. Despite the seeming success of this meeting at getting the parties to the table to talk, the next meeting did not take place until 8 May 1998 (Butcher and Maru, 2018: 81-82).

Indeed, "the Commission was meeting when the first major incident in Badme took place" (Butcher and Maru, 2018: 82). Divergence of approaches to governance is plausibly one of the key explanatory variables in the failure of the commission and the onset of the war. Such a conclusion for example is reached in a 2003 paper which argues that

> The leadership of both countries are a battle hardened lot in which military expedience dictates the order of things, and the concept of democracy is a rather new word in their vocabulary and its practice has yet to see the light of day (Lata, 2003: 375).

But this does not preclude the possibility that these regimes are undemocratic in nuanced ways. In other words, they can be susceptible to popular pressures outside of the formal structures of democracy stipulated by Owens (1994; see Chapter 3), but to the same sort of effect *as if* they were democracies because they still are states in which some semblance of legitimacy must be maintained. These may then play themselves out in different ways regarding the path to conflict. For example, Meles had to wage a war of attrition due to the fact that he was "disliked by many Ethiopians for his 'pro-Eritrean' policies prior to the war," and yet his "popularity rocketed because of his tough stand" once he took it (*Strategic Comments*, 2000: 1). The same is reflected in another contemporaneous article which judged that "Under pressure from hardliners to act, he [Meles] faces a dilemma: whether he should attack soon, risking international condemnation for the chance of decisive victory; or wait, hoping to cripple his opponent's economy and military readiness" (*Strategic Comments*, 2000: 1). For its part, "in the first years following Eritrea's 1991 victory in the protracted war for independence, the PFDJ government maintained strong popular legitimacy, albeit not backed by an electoral mandate" (Strategic Comments, 2000: 1). This "legitimacy" rested on two pillars: "Issayas's ability to maintain his strong support coalition among the Eritrean political and economic elites,

and the success of the PFDJ's nation-building programme, founded on an ethnic notion of Eritrean national identity" (Frank, 2015: 129). Against this setting, "Eritrea's initial escalation of the border clash was driven by a combination of the domestic tension within Eritrea which resulted from this nationalist policy, and Issayas's need to strengthen and consolidate his support among Eritrea's political and economic powerbrokers, who were becoming increasingly critical of the PFDJ" (Steves, 2003: 125). Therefore, in its post-independence period, "much of Eritrea's internal tension [was] externalised" (Frank, 2015: 113).


In Ethiopia, "the EPRDF promulgated a federal constitution based on Soviet-style, titular ethnic nationalities and instituted strong formal rights of ethnonational self-determination, 'up to and including secession'" (Steves, 2003: 126) for the nine regions or *kililoch*, with Addis Ababa and Dire Dawa as federal chartered cities despite being both within Oromia. This is due to their composition of more than one ethnicity (Interview 11, 2019). Eritrea on the other hand, "established a strongly centralised government" ran directly from Asmara, based on a supposed uniformity of identity among the Eritreans (Weldehaimanot and Kesete, 2012: 45). "However, the reality of Eritrea's multiethnic society and the differences in nationality policies between the two states heightened pressure within Eritrea, leading to a lingering insecurity on the part of the Eritrean leadership" (Steves, 2003: 126). Prior to the war, some threats to this were emerging, which made the path to war more likely in a manner akin to some insights made regarding the democratic peace thesis, if only in a negative (inverted) sense. In other words, popular considerations within Eritrea made the regime more likely to initiate a conflict. As Steves (2003: 123) suggests, "the principal cause of the escalation of the conflict to full-scale war lies in the structural opportunities and constraints established by the partial liberalisation and partial democratic institutionalisation that were achieved in both Ethiopia and Eritrea after the overthrow of the Derg regime" (Steves, 2003: 123). In partially democratic, and yet to be consolidated polities, the process of politics has higher than normal stakes:

> transitional regimes have fluctuating, unconsolidated rules, and the stakes are high because the winner of the game gets to write the (as yet unwritten) rules of the subsequent games to be played. This raises the anxiety level, increasing pressure on actors and creating strong incentives for elites to mobilise all available resources. One key available resource is foreign policy (Steves, 2003: 123).

At the time, neither Ethiopia nor Eritrea could match the description of a consolidated democracy, though Ethiopia was generally regarded as more democratic than Eritrea. This is also reflected in their respective rankings in the Typology IV index below, where after 1993

Ethiopia ascended to a ranking of '2', while Eritrea maintained only a score of '-6' (Figure 6.1.). Eritrea, indeed, had "barely begun the dual processes of democratisation and liberalisation" (Steves, 2003: 123). But in the period between 1991 and 1998, Ethiopia "made substantial progress toward electoral democracy and Eritrea significantly loosened restrictions on the media and allowed some participation by 'the people' in the process of governance, accepting some degree of accountability to the people in exchange for the domestic and international legitimacy conferred by at least partially democratic governance" (Steves, 2003: 123).

Figure 6.1. Ethiopia and Eritrea's Polity IV scores, 1993-2015



While, there was "actually little evidence of strong political opposition against the Eritrean regime," nevertheless, in the 1990s there were some "key elements that should be noted" (Butcher and Maru, 2018: 77). The now inactive Afar Liberation Democratic Movement of Eritrea (ALDME), for example, "opposed what they felt was the systematic suppressing of Afar culture in the name of 'false Eritrean unity'" (Butcher and Maru, 2018: 77). The PFDJ also endured some criticisms "from elites who demanded open participation in the political and economic arena" (Butcher and Maru, 2018: 77). Furthermore, some armed groups, most notably the Jihadi groups, carried out organised violence in Eritrea out of Sudan. In 1996, the head of the Eritrean Liberation Front (Ibrahim Mohamed Ali) scathingly spoke against the PFDJ, noting "economic decline, difficult living conditions, unemployment, and poor international relations" (in Butcher and Maru, 2018: 77-78).

In relation to the liberalising of the media space, "in November 1997, three new non-PFDJ radio stations were observed to be operating" (Butcher and Maru, 2018: 83). Among these, one, the Voice of Democratic Eritrea, was the official mouthpiece of the ELF. Another, Voice of Free Eritrea, was said to be operated by the Eritrean National Alliance, which was a coalition group including outlawed groups such as the ELF, the Eritrean Islamic Jihad and the Eritrean Liberation Front–National Council. All of these stations operated from Sudan. Butcher and Maru argue that "these opposition movements appear to be gaining some ground in the time period directly preceding the war" and further note that "this increased opposition toward the government could have increased incentives for President Afwerki to use diversionary tactics" (Butcher and Maru, 2018: 78). Compounded to this, Eritrea also had an election scheduled following twenty-seven straight months of drafting, the Constitutional Commission of Eritrea (CCE) had at last completed a draft of the Constitution in 1997. From this, it is deducible that the president, at this time, may have went to war so as to avert the Constitution which would have mandated a separation of powers, as well as curtailed the presidency's powers over budget and foreign affairs.[42] This 25-paged constitution has still not been implemented as of 2020, as the National Assembly has not met since 2002. At the time, the then upcoming Eritrean elections were to be held in summer 1998, but they were "indefinitely postponed" in the advent of the war with Ethiopia. The President stated that elections would have had "a destabilizing effect on the country and on national unity, particularly if ethnic and religious groups were permitted to form parties" (Butcher and Maru, 2018: 78). It is also worth noting that prior to this time, the territorial disagreement had also been mostly handled by local authorities, instead of from Asmara (Butcher and Maru, 2018: 83).

Thus the somewhat "liberalised and partially democratised political arena, in which domestic elites vie for popular *and* elite group support," fermented the conditions of "threat and counter-threat which fuelled the escalation of the border conflict to war" (Steves, 2003: 124). Still, war, under these circumstances would appear quite risky, and the level of opposition was quite low for the President to take such a gamble. These explanations alone are not particularly convincing (Butcher and Maru, 2018: 78). This necessitates an analysis also of the perception the Eritrean elite may have had of Ethiopia. In other words, how much of a "gamble" did this appear to be in the first place. The democratic peace thesis offers some insights here as well in the sense that one state assesses the domestic legitimacy of its targeted adversary precisely to

[42] Constitutional Commission of Eritrea, 1997. 'The Constitution of Eritrea'. Available at: http://confinder.richmond.edu/admin/docs/Eritrea1997English.pdf. This was ratified by the Constituent Assembly of Eritrea on May 23, 1997.

determine how much of a risk will be incurred by undertaking such a war. Indeed, as we have seen the conflict had begun as a surprise attack by the Eritreans while, in fact, the border commission was in a meeting. It is worth recalling that the EPLF and the EPDRF had been allies, and for this reason the Eritrean elite, unlike the Somali and Ugandan regimes had had a recent history of alignment with their targeted belligerent with a hypothetically reduced information asymmetry problem – which would have also been contributed to by perceptions and expectations about the new governing elite from years of alliance with them, as well as decades of being in an ethnically diverse Ethiopia. Firstly, the Ethiopian government was inadequately prepared for a conflict, and hardly expected one. This is lent further weight by the fact that it had "cut its defence budget by some 90% in five years, from US$1.31 billion in 1991 to US$124 million in 1996" (World Bank, 2019c). These cuts had also seen the government further reduce its military from about 550, 000 to fifty-thousand and "had gone to great trouble and expense to demobilise and reintegrate more than half a million soldiers into Ethiopian society" (Dercon and Ayalew, 1998; Biles, 2000). Two interview participants suggest that some of this information would have been perhaps known to the Eritrean elite.[43] In any case, there is evidence that "Ethiopia had drawn up defence plans for all possible contingencies; war with Eritrea was not one of them" (Steves, 2003: 124-125). There was also a state of easy communication between the former allies.[44] Indeed, "in a telephone call immediately after the border clash, Meles reputedly asked Issayas angrily why he had carried out violent unilateral action in the border area without speaking to him first" (Abbink, 1998).

Secondly, and in relation to the perception problem, the information advantage may have been deemed redundant by some misperception of the state of Ethiopia. The Eritrean Tigray elite may have appraised the situation in Ethiopia to be favourable to attack and Eritrean victory. Indeed, it has been asserted that "the war in essence is between the Tigreans who dominate Ethiopia and the rulers of Eritrea and emanates from their conflicting interests and aspirations" (Lata, 2003: 370). Further, "the Eritreans consider[ed] the TPLF-dominated Ethiopian regime immensely vulnerable because of the 'ethnic' federal policy it has instituted in Ethiopia" (Lata, 2003: 375). In essence, "[the] TPLF's contradictory espousal of democratic pluralism while in reality practicing a very narrowly based dictatorship is seen as a major source of weakness by the Eritreans" (Lata, 2003: 375). Given the above, we can assert that the newly independent Eritrea may have not learned the lesson of 1977-78 or forgot it; that despite its domestic

[43] Interview 4; Interview 5.

[44] Interview 5.

divisions, Ethiopia had a history of uniting when confronted by an external enemy; within a number of months, the Ethiopians had recruited enough troops to have an army of three-hundred thousand, in addition to "quadrupled defence expenditure" (Steves, 2003: 124-125).

If it had proven a success, the campaign would hypothetically "have been used to enhance his reputation and help maintain Eritrea's privileged economic relationship with Ethiopia" (*Strategic Comments*, 2000: 3). However, "because Badme was in the province of Tigray, the region from which many of the members of the Ethiopian government originated (including Meles Zenawi, the former Ethiopian prime minister), the Ethiopian government came under political pressure from within the EPRDF as well as from the wider Ethiopian public to meet force with force" (*Strategic Comments*, 2000: 1). In addition to remittances from diaspora, Ethiopia solicited funds from a December 1999 introduced 10% surtax on imported goods, as well as another on billboards in Addis Ababa. Notable was the popular support for the war effort as they responded overwhelmingly to fundraising events that had plates at US$1,250 each, held in Sheraton Hotel in Addis Ababa (Ofcansky, 2004: 4). In similar fashion, Eritrea saw hundreds of households participate in a £500 per household raffle, in addition to US$200-million per year earned from the diaspora to support the war effort.

In this sense, then, popular considerations explain not only the outbreak but also the intensity and longevity of the war: "Asmara and Addis Ababa could still have avoided war by showing greater restraint. But both regimes are based on former guerrilla movements and led by men who derive personal authority from their record as commanders" (*Strategic Comments*, 2000: 2). In a word, neither could afford appearing weak. Meles operared within the confines of a "collegial decision-making process" from which he was only a *primus inter pares* within a group that had anti-Eritrea views held by a sizeable section of the party (Weldehaimanot and Kesete, 2012: 47). "Moreover, [Meles] cannot afford to ignore the attitudes of the Amhara…who resent their partial displacement by the Tigrayans and criticised their initially warm relations with Eritrea. Meles, therefore, has little room for manoeuvre" (*Strategic Comments*, 2000: 2). Isaias may have wielded more *personal* power than Meles (*Strategic Comments*, 2000: 2; emphasis added), but this was his also his dilemma: "venerated as a father of Eritrean nationalism and a great military commander, […] to admit defeat – whatever the damage inflicted on the enemy – would harm his prestige and undermine the stability of his regime" (*Strategic Comments*, 2000: 2).

The preceding section has discussed the role of domestic institutions in accelerating the path to the war. In this process, there were allusions to economic situation in Eritrea. With some room for the role of economic considerations, it is therefore worth examining the role of opportunity cost. In other words, while the political explanations may explain the war by a presence of factors (misperception), the economic variable will explain through an absence of a key factor (i.e., trade independence between the two countries).

6.4. Case Study Analysis II: Economic interdependence

The war was economically very costly. In early 2000, Eritrea and Ethiopia both had some 250, 000 soldiers in their standing armies.[45] These approximately cost the countries around one-million dollars per day on war-related preparations. As will be seen, the war was characterised by economic factors which manifest themselves in numerous ways, including in the reduced trade between the two countries in the wake of the new currency in Eritrea, and the economic decline that preceded Eritrea's path to war, and thereby served as an antecedent for war declaration. Furthermore, post-war immediate economic decline points to war as a cause for slower growth in Eritrea, as the war has since shaped the relationship between the two countries, as well as Ethiopia's general economic relations in the region, especially towards Djibouti and Somaliland. The role of economic factors in the war is demonstrated in this section of the chapter, which proceeds with a description of the methodology utilised, upon which test is conducted and the findings presented.

6.4.1. Methodology

This section outlines the methodology utilised to test out the role of the presence or lack of economic interdependence between Eritrea and Ethiopia. It outlines the variables, the necessary data and the hypothesis.

The dependent variable is operationalised as the initiation of conflict by one state on one another which yields at least 1000 battle-related deaths (as per the Correlates of War typology). Thus, it is a marked event in a horizontal timeframe resultant in a transformation from a peaceful state of affairs to a state of affairs of conflict. The question is what has brought about this outcome; in other words, the independent variable. The independent variable is operationalised as the share of the initiating belligerent's in the retaliating adversary's total imports (as measured in monetary terms, in US dollars throughout this dissertation).

[45] Interview 1.

The method of inquiry used in this dissertation is 'before/after' in that it will make use of antebellum conditions across the political and economic configurations within the countries and their respective regions in terms of hegemonic stability theory.

Causality can be drawn from a lack of export markets or, when markets did exist, the continuously declining export markets in the adversary in the years leading up to the conflict which could be explained by a declining opportunity cost of initiating a conflict against them.

Since economic interdependence is argued to be a deterrent from war by creating incentives for maintenance of a status quo, we should expect that interstate conflict should be initiated by the state with the lesser export market in its counterpart. Thus, the hypothesis is:

> The interstate conflict between Eritrea and Ethiopia was initiated by the state which had an export market lower than the targeted adversary in that adversary's population.

This data will be sourced from various sources including the World Bank, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology's Observatory of Economic Complexity, the UN's TradeMap. Further corroboration has been obtained through 11 interviews and data obtained from the Ethiopian Investment Commission, as well as discussions with Ethiopian businesses in various industrial parks and the Industrial Parks Development Commission which is responsible for a large part of exports and deregulation of exports between Ethiopia and Djibouti, and possibly Eritrea, since the peace discussions initiated in 2018.

6.4.2. Eritrea's export profile

When it was federated with Ethiopia, Eritrea was tilted "relatively more oriented toward the development of a market-type, modern capitalist system, due primarily to European colonialism in Eritrea" (Tseggai, 1984: 86). On the other hand, Ethiopia "was very much a feudal economy with very little infrastructure to support a flourishing modern, market-type economy" (Tseggai, 1984: 86).

> "This historical economic imbalance was bound to arouse conflict between the two, and after a few years of federation the expected difficulties arose. To implement these goals, Ethiopia pursued an active policy of interference in internal Eritrean matters. With the active collaboration of bribed Eritrean officials, Ethiopia moved to acquire the Eritrean government's share of customs revenue. The immediate result was a serious budgetary crisis" (Tseggai, 1984: 86).

At the same time, Emperor Haile Selasie, in his capacity as the federal head, started "offering tax reprieves to Eritrean farmers, further crippling the government's tax revenues" (Tseggai, 1984: 86):

> It must be noted that this policy of "balanced growth" was to benefit Ethiopia right from the start. Not only was Ethiopia able effectively to control the Eritrean economy through the federal arrangement, but also the injection of Eritrean revenues into Ethiopia's economy greatly helped in diversifying the Ethiopian manufacturing sector. The export market expanded greatly. (Tseggai, 1984: 86).

Another claim that was used as a rationale for the fully-fledged annexation of Eritrea, was Eritrea's budget deficits. Thus, the federal government argued that union, if only through annexation, would improve this position. In reality, "Ethiopia had made the problem worse after federation by expropriating Eritrea's share of customs duties, which by 1958 were…nearly 40 percent of Eritrea's revenue" (Tseggai, 1984: 86). "Ethiopia also changed the tax laws of Eritrea…resulting in reduced revenues to the Eritrean government, further aggravating the problem" (Tseggai, 1984: 86).

By 1991, Eritrea's had been negatively impacted by the long-drawn independence conflict and began the process of gradually reconstructing the infrastructure network. In an assessment at the time, Woldegabriel (1993: 134) estimated that "all main roads and bridges need repairing; the factories, like the leather goods one in Asmara, is working at a fraction of its capacity due to a lack of raw materials; the 180-mile railway from Tessanai to Massawa was dismantled and the country is not yet self-sufficient in food, unlike its neighbours of Sudan and Ethiopia" (Woldegabriel, 1993: 135). But the conditions were improved by heavy rains that took place in the country's first two years of de facto independence. By the year 1993, Eritrea had the capacity to produce about half of the population's food requirements. This was for the first time in 25 years.[46] This was despite a large share of the arable soil being "cleared of mines" (Woldegabriel, 1993: 135).


At independence, Eritrea's exports were agricultural and consisted of "sorghum, millet, barley, wheat, legumes, vegetables, fruits, sesame, linseed, cattle, sheep, goats and camels" (MIT, 2019c). Notably, however, 80% of the Eritrean workforce are employed in agriculture but this only makes up some 11% of Eritrean GDP. The rest consist of industry (29.6%) and services

[46] This was at least partially by design as Derg policy, from 1975 onwards, was characterised by "scorched earth and the use of a food blockade as a weapon [against the Eritrean civilian population]" through, for example, crop burning (De Waal, 1991: 9).

(58.7%) (CIA World Factbook, 2019). The most recent exports are led by Zinc Ore which represent 74.9% [US$205-million] of the total exports of Eritrea, followed by Copper Ore, which account for 13.6%. Overall, however, exports only contribute 10.9% to GDP, with most production being for domestic consumption. As at independence, "Eritrea's substantial mineral deposits are largely unexplored.

In the first officially recorded year of exporting, 1993, Eritrean exports were exported to only three countries (Figure 6.2): the Czech Republic (taking up a lion's share of Eritrean exports at 56%), Japan and Saudi Arabia, across the Red Sea from Eritrea.


Figure 6.2. Eritrean export partners in 1993 by share of total exports (in %)



Source: MIT Observatory of Economic Complexity. 2019. 'Where does Eritrea export to?'. Calculations by author. (Unless otherwise stated, subsequent charts are drawn from the same source.)


By 1994, the number of export partners grew to 8 export partners (see Figure 6.3 below).

Figure 6.3. Eritrean export partners in 1994 by share of total exports (in %)




This number doubled to 16 export partner states in 1995, with France (9.9%), Japan (9%) and Saudi Arabia (8.1%) making up the top three export partners at a combined 27% share of Eritrean exports.

Figure 6.4. Eritrean export partners in 1995 by share of total exports (in %)




By 1996, the trade partners had grown to 20 countries. Again there was again a shift, with Germany forming a larger share of Eritrean exports at 69% (see Figure 6.5 below).

Figure 6.5. Eritrean export partners in 1996 by share of total exports (in %)



In 1997, one year prior to the initiation of the conflict with Ethiopia, Eritrea's export partners grew to 21. The top three partners were Japan (8%), Austria (6.5%), and the Netherlands (4.4%).

Figure 6.6. Eritrean export partners in 1997 by share of total exports (in %)




In the above charts on Eritrea's export partners (ostensibly, then, those countries with which it would be economically interdependent), Ethiopia is a constant absentee. This indicates a lack of opportunity cost for Eritrea in initiating a war with Ethiopia since Ethiopia, despite its still large population, was not a major market for Eritrea. Indeed, the only African country with which Eritrea did any significant trade was Egypt.

6.4.3. Trade Interdependence and the Eritrea-Ethiopia War

In 1991, "Eritrea had neither the money nor the currency notes to go it alone" (Lata, 2003: 377). Therefore, "money was transferred to the Eritrean banks from Ethiopia and at the time of the conflict 1998, they owed Ethiopia 1.2 billion birr" (Lata, 2003: 377). Moreover, Ethiopian citizenship, which had been granted to Eritrean businessmen, gave them unmatched access to loans from its banks. Further, Eritreans had the right to invest in Ethiopia, "a privilege not accorded to other foreigners" at the time (Lata, 2003: 377). Similarly, Ethiopian investors could expect the same from Eritrea. Ethiopia was also actively leasing and using an oil refinery in Assab that had been previously under its control, from the Eritrean government. For this they paid 58-million Birr per year (Abbay, 2001: 485).

Figure 6.7. Total Eritrean exports, 1993-2010 (in millions of US$)



However, there was not much direct exports from Eritrea to Ethiopia at this point. Further, by 1997, the country's exports were losing their growth trajectory. Not only were Eritrean exports declining between (from US$25.5 million in 1996 to US$23.3 million by 1997), but also, as

Figure 6.2 through to Figure 6.6 demonstrate, Eritrea's trade partners were increasing. This may have had a diversifying effect. Combined with a decrease in the total value of exports and their total contribution to the economy, may have had an opportunity cost-eliminating effect.

Figure 6.8. Pre-war movements in Eritrean economic indicators





Figure 6.9. Mutual exports between Ethiopia and Eritrea, 1993-2010



The lack of interdependence, and the opportunity cost rationale it may have otherwise inculcated, from the Eritrean perspective is also on official record. Interviewed by Voice of America (VOA) in late May 1998, President Isaias was asked if the new Nakfa could was a contributing factor to the disagreement between Ethiopia and his country. His response downplayed this. "He claimed that the Eritrean economy was independent of the Ethiopian

economy and that the reduced imports from Ethiopia did not cause a decline in the Eritrean economy" (Butchera and Maku, 2018: 69).

Before this, Eritrea had been making transactions in Ethiopian Birr. Agreements on the parity of the Nakfa with the Birr (with Asmara proposing 1:1 and Addis Ababa rejecting this) became impossible. This was both a symptom and a further cause of the lack of trust between the two states. "Introduction of the new currency resulted in more hurdles to trade and investment with Ethiopia than ever before" (Butcher and Maru, 2018: 79). There were also more problems related to border demarcation, and particularly with regards to cross border trade. "Border demarcation became necessary to determine the jurisdiction where each currency could be used" (Butcher and Maru, 2018: 79). Further, the economic harmonisation pact that had been in place between the two states became ineffective in the wake of the new currency. Hence, it became necessary and, paradoxically for this reason, difficult for the two states to work out an agreement on the specific trade-related and currency policy. In the interim, with the lack of a clear policy, interstate trade between them, was immediately under dispute (Butcher and Maru, 2018: 79). The Ethiopians insisted that cross-border trade must be carried out in US dollars. "As a result, the Eritreans were no longer able to sell their manufactured goods in Ethiopia, coming into direct competition with (Ethiopian) Tigrayan products for the first time and severely hampered by the foreign currency requirements imposed by Addis" (Steves, 2003: 126). In retaliation, Asmara issued expensive levies on Ethiopian-bought goods coming into the country; "this forced Ethiopia to divert shipping from the Eritrean ports of Massawa and Assab—where transhipment duties generated as much as 18% of the Eritrean government's annual revenue—to Djibouti and Mombassa" (Steves, 2003: 126). Somaliland would later be added to the list of Ethiopian export conduits.[47] The new currency therefore had two effects: it crystallised the border – thereby making the disputed border territory salient – and also made trade and movements of Ethiopian goods through Eritrea more difficult, thereby limiting any prospects realistic of economic interdependence as Ethiopia diversified away from Massawa and Assab and looked for ports elsewhere.

[47] Interview 1, Interview 2.

6.5. Conclusion

This chapter of the thesis has found relevance for both the democratic peace thesis, despite the undemocratic nature of both countries, as well as the economic interdependence thesis. This allows us to formulate a typology accounting for both these variables. In 1997, there was were prospects of the opposition gaining channels through which to challenge the Isaias regime. The constitution had been completed by the Constitutional Commission of Eritrea, and elections were pending within a matter of months. At this same time, the living standards of the population were declining (from a previous GDP per capita growth rate of 7.972% to 1.254%). So were exports (from a value of US$25.5 million to US$23.3 million). The new currency, the Nakfa, made trade with Ethiopia impossible. Further, the currency made the border, hitherto managed and handled at the level of the local governments, salient. At the same time, Isaias appraised the domestic context in Ethiopia to be favourable for attack. The hypothetical information privilege that Eritrea ought to have had was diminished by a misperception of Ethiopia; the regime in Asmara incorrectly assumed that the rest of the country would mutiny and not back the Tigray-led government. Anti-Eritrean sentiment however was widely spread in Ethiopia. The diversion of exports away from Massawa and Assab further made retaliation against Eritrea less costly.

6.5.1. Eritrea since the war

The regime in Eritrea remains intact, and without much challenge. The presidency is still under Isaias Afwerki and, as discussed in this chapter, the National Assembly has not met since 2002. Therefore, the constitution of the country has not been implemented. "While the government is obviously fragile, it is less clear what might replace it" (Lyons, 2009: 170).

Isaias' retention of power in such fashion is in stark contrast with the outcomes of the wars of the 1970s in which the war instigators, Barre and Amin, either were removed from power altogether or severely weakened by anti-governmental forces to their eventual demise. This perhaps speaks to the lack of strong internal opposition forces within the state of Eritrea, on the one hand, as well as a different international climate, with the regime not relying on external alliances, and with no major power being invested enough to want to see Eritrea's regime toppled due to the already existent instability in the Horn (Interview 6). On the other hand, the government's adeptness at making use of its internationally distributed and particularly Western-dormant diaspora has proven to be a unique instrument of regime survival. To be sure, Eritrea is currently one of the world's top refugee-producing nations, with this human movement increasing in earnest in the past twenty years, in spite of the dangers facing them –

"including a shoot-to-kill policy for those caught trying to escape, and more recently, the danger posed by human-trafficking networks targeting Eritrean refugees and asylum seekers" (Poole, 2013: 69). Eritrea, however, rather than being dismantled by the flight of its citizens, "has been sustained via new strategies of gatekeeping. Along these lines, the government of Eritrea has assumed the capacity, if not to manage this migration itself, to capture the material and symbolic capital of these projects of movement, both successful and unsuccessful" (Poole, 2013: 69).

> The flight of individuals from Eritrea often does not signal a definitive end point to their entanglement with the Eritrean state, and the financial and political pressures exerted by the Eritrean state on exiles have a long and dynamic history (Poole, 2013: 73).

Remittances by the diaspora constituted almost 33% of the country's total GDP, totalling at close to US$1.4 billion by World Bank estimations in 2007. These remittances are collected directly, in the form of a 2 % income tax as well as less directly through "taxes collected from rural households that depend upon remittances from family members residing abroad" (Poole, 2013: 74-75). This takes place within a context wherein these remittances are "technically voluntary" (Poole, 2013: 69):

> Refusal to pay this tax can have consequences for individuals abroad and their families in Eritrea. Some Eritreans living abroad have not had their passports renewed, or have been unable to purchase property in Eritrea for failing to pay the tax; others report that family members back in Eritrea have been punished through detention, fines, the denial of business licenses, or the confiscation of property (Poole, 2013: 75).

This kinship thesis perhaps also somewhat explains the lack of criticism from outside, which might be expected given that many left Eritrea for reasons to do with its political climate and economic stagnation. Furthermore, the ruling elite may sustain some legitimacy due to a perceived threat from outside: "the 1998–2000 war mobilised the diaspora to increase their support in order to counter what was perceived to be another threat to their liberated homeland" (Lyons, 2009: 171). "Given the history of the costly, prolonged war of national liberation and the legitimacy earned by the EPLF in leading this struggle, the diaspora has been reluctant to criticise Isaias" (Lyons, 2009: 170-171). However, during the last few years, diaspora support and the essential remittances have declined. Perhaps this, in combination with the overtures from Addis Ababa for resolving the border issue, may lead to some new, regime-impacting

developments within Eritrea. Without an external, monolithic enemy the regime may soon require new rationales for legitimacy. This may also bolster some opposition forces. But, just as well, the lack of a backer may weaken the anti-government forces who have historically relied on Ethiopia.

6.5.2. Ethiopia since the war

In Ethiopia, the EPRDF also remains the sole proprietor of state power, though it itself is a centre of multiple power centres. This governing coalition experienced some of its own domestic issues post-Algiers Agreement, as exemplified by the fact that the Central Committee of the TPLF (in retrospect, Prime Minister Meles' erstwhile winning coalition) got divided into two factions: "With his base in the Tigray heartland at risk, Meles took advantage of his central position within the broader EPRDF coalition to outmanoeuvre his rivals, sack and arrest a number of senior officials, and successfully weather the storm" (Lyons, 2009: 171).

The subsequent crisis that the EPRDF faced came in the wake of the 2005 legislative elections. These elections represented a different environment in Ethiopian history. In these elections, parties outside the EPRDF, unlike in 1995 and 2000, participated and did not boycott the elections. The campaign was a hard fought one in the densely populated regions in the country, though in some locations, they had not run candidates.[48] "Live televised debates on matters of public policy, opposition party access to state-owned media, and massive peaceful rallies in the final week of campaigning made it clear that these elections would represent a decisive moment in Ethiopia's political development" (Lyons, 2009: 171). This was not to be, however, as "a very chaotic vote counting process generated controversy and violent protests. According to official results, the EPRDF and allied parties won 367 (67 per cent) parliamentary seats, while the opposition took 172 seats (31 per cent), with 109 going to the Coalition for Unity and Democracy (CUD)" (Lyons, 2009: 172).

International reaction was vocal. The leader of the EU's monitoring team in residence in Ethiopia adjudged that the ballot "did not live up to international standards and to the aspirations of Ethiopians for democracy" and rejected the results as fraudulent (Lyons, 2009: 172). In spite of growth in its parliamentary seats (from 12 to 172), the opposition's leaders did not accept the result as well, reporting "irrefutable evidence that massive fraud had taken place" (Lyons, 2009: 172). Violence soon erupted. By the beginning of November, there were detentions of CUD leaders. "Ethiopian prosecutors formally charged some 131 opposition

[48] Interview 5, Interview 12, and Interview 13.

politicians, journalists and civil society leaders with crimes, including genocide and treason. By bringing these charges against its leading critics, the EPRDF effectively criminalised dissent and sent an unmistakable message that effective opposition would not be tolerated" (Lyons, 2009: 172).

The successful marginalisation of the opposition – both within and outside the legislature, which also elects the Prime Minister – the governing coalition was still confronted by some core challenges emanating "from a large constituency necessary for any successful government in Ethiopia; the Oromo wing, which constitute the single-largest group and is backed by its young" (Lyons, 2009: 172). To this end, in 2018, the Oromo youth reportedly played a role in the removal of power of Hailemariam Desalegn and the ascendance of Abiy Ahmed as Prime Minister. After a protracted period of violence known as the *kerro* led by the Oromo youth demanding an Oromo leader for the first time in the new government in a country where the Oromo make up a majority, the EPDRF top brass responded by forming a vote in which Abiy was selected as the new prime minister. A veteran of the anti-Derg and Eritrea-Ethiopia wars, the new prime minister was apparently also chosen for his peace-building credentials in the local Ethiopian context, typified by his organising of inter-faith dialogues and community-led mediations (Igunza, 2019; 11 October). Incidentally, this was also the subject of his study for his doctorate at Addis Ababa University. This has been the first government to actively pursue peace with Isaias, as well as in the entire region. For his efforts, he was awarded the 2019 Nobel Peace Prize (Burke and Henley, 2019; 11 October)

6.5.3. Relations since the war

The war has had an ambiguous status. One the one hand, the commission concluded in favour of Eritrea, determining that Badme belonged under its jurisdiction. Nonetheless, it still took punitive measures against Eritrea. It awarded to Ethiopia $87,260,520 million in compensation for Eritrea's violation of the principle of just war. The specific areas are detailed in the table below.

Table 6.1. War-related Eritrean obligations to Ethiopia per the Claims Commission.

Category	Amount (in millions of US$)
Human suffering and lost income from internal displacement	45.0
Civilian deaths and injuries	8.5
Damage to proterty	6
Damage to religious institutions	2.5
Destruction of Zalambessa	5.605
Deaths/injuries from landmines	1.5
Destruction of facilities in Adigrat	0.250
Destruction of other government facilities (central front)	0.162
Other government facilities	0.75
Relief Society of Tigray	0.125
Damage (Adi Goshu)	0.150
Damage (Sheraro)	0.625
Mekele Airport	0.65
Lost profit for Ethiopian Airlines	4
Legal obligations to Ethiopian Airlines (by Bank of Eritrea)	1.703
Damage to internally displaced persons	7.5
Total	87.260

Source: United Nations.

At the time of writing, these payments have not been made, however. In the meantime, border clashes occurred between these two states as recently as June 2016 (Butcher and Maru, 2018: 70). However, in 2018, under a new leader in Abiy Ahmed, the Ethiopian government sought to acknowledge the right of the Eritrean government to the Badme territory per the judgement of the Commission. The popular response, however, has been mixed. While embraced by some as a necessary step towards improved relations and economic cooperation for the now booming Ethiopian economy – at the behest of Chinese investment and trade (Interview 2) – which could use additional ports in Eritrea. Further, it is held that the discussions between Abiy and Isaias included the rehabilitation of roads from Addis Ababa to Massawa (Interview 3). On the other

hand, others, especially in Tigray, have been more sceptical. Some see it as a relinquishing of Tigray territory by a non-Tigray regime (Abiy is Oromo and is a leader of the Oromo Democratic Party, currently the largest in the EPDRF), while others see it is a balancing act by Abiy to contain Tigray dissenters from having an external source of reliance in potential opposition to him.[49] Indeed, this is not without plausibility, as both regimes have had a history of using proxies to undermine and counter one another. Armed Ethiopian insurgent groups such as the OLF, the ONLF, and the EPPF have "variously received support from Asmara" (Butcher and Maru, 2018: 70). Ethiopia, which has successfully made use of proxies since Mengistu (particularly against Somalia, see Chapter 4), also has supported anti-Isaias groups. Furthermore, "both Ethiopia and Eritrea compete against each other by supporting rival parties in neighbouring states" (Butcher and Maru, 2018: 70). Somalia, itself the product of Mengistu's post-1977 policy of sponsoring different insurgents and secessionists in order to prevent a strong Somalia from emerging and threatening Ethiopia, has been a particularly noteworthy theatre in this regard. While Addis Ababa was supportive towards Abdullahi Yusuf and the Transitional Federal Government in Somalia, Asmara gave aid to the Union of Islamic Courts which held much of southern Somalia (including Mogadishu) until being pushed out by a coalition led by the TFG and Ethiopia in December 2006, leading to many former members of the group forming what has morphed into Al-Shabaab. Eritrea also aided Ethiopian opposition groups based in Somalia such as the ONLF and OLF. An indication of the division over the Badme territory and Ethiopian mistrust of the Eritrean regime was made clear when, hearing of a pending withdrawal of soldiers at the border, the local population on the Ethiopian side stood in the way of the soldiers to prevent them from leaving the frontier.

On the other hand, in an interview with myself, a former employee of the UNMEE noted that after the border had been opened from the Ethiopian side, the Eritrean regime closed it from its side. This may be to prevent emigration, he said, with the country presently having among the highest emigration attempts in the world (Interview 19). This indicates the degree to which the preceding 18-year period of neither confrontational peace nor war with Ethiopia has generated its own logics and rationales vis-à-vis the Eritrean government's considerations of its population dynamics; indeed, it is to be noted that this state of affairs has existed for about four times as long as the country had itself existed up to the outbreak of the war.

[49] Interview 4.

CHAPTER 7

Case Study 4: Regional Hegemonic Stability in East Africa?

7.1. Introduction

As shown in Chapter 2, the phenomenon of interstate war in Africa is attributable to numerous reasons. This influenced the methodological stance of working towards typological theory, which could accommodate the various causal claims of various theories at various levels of analysis. Notably, also, the cases frequently indicated that there was role for external actors in these conflicts, with many seemingly seeking to play peace-making and even conflict outbreak prevention roles. Evidently, none did. There then appears to have been a lack of a regional power willing or capable of using means at its disposal to halt the bellicosity of the states which initiated the conflicts. Thus, Chapter 7 will seek to determine which of this was the case (i.e., a lack of willingness, or ability or both), and provides evidence for the claims that it makes. Having assessed the domestic and bilateral determinants of the wars, the dissertation now turns to the possibility of regional causes or at least the lack of inhibitors from the outside. The method of doing this is through determining the role, if any, of a would-be (theoretical) regional hegemon. In other words, it seeks to test whether the decline of the relative GDP of the largest regional economy, Kenya, correlated with an outbreak of a conflict among states within the East African region. Tests of the hegemonic stability theory found it to be of much relevance in the dissertation as well; however, this was in a manner hitherto untested and thus this chapter proposes to have made an original contribution to the academic literature.

To test out the relevance of hegemonic stability thesis, the dissertation plotted various economic indicators of Kenya – the largest state in terms of GDP in the region according to the available data (World Bank, 2018d) – including its military budget alongside that of the rest of the countries in the region, with the aim of determining whether comparative declines in Kenya's military budget (qua the conceptual regional hegemon in terms of the literature reviewed in Chapter 3 in section 3.3.2) would coincide with the outbreak of the three wars studied. That is, the aim was to see whether the Kenyan budget would be relatively less than the adversaries at least a year prior to each war outbreak (i.e., the years 1976; 1977; and 1997).

In this regard, the dissertation made some original observations and contributions. Firstly, within the dataset, Kenya's military budget has never been the largest in the region; it has

reached second-largest status on a number of periods: 1977 to 1979, 1987 to 1993, and once more between 2000 and 2003. The dissertation notes that from the onset of the dataset, Ethiopia had the highest military budget but was taken over by Uganda after 1971. Uganda in turn was superseded by Tanzania, whose military budget was the largest in the region between 1973 and 1979 (see Figure 7.4). Secondly, on the main, the data (as calculated and proved in Appendix A) observes an interesting pattern, from the 1960s to the 1970s, the entire region saw a growth in military budgets, which was then followed by a decline in the 1980s, with the sole exception of Ethiopia, which between 1980 and 1990 had the single-largest military budget. The year 1994 marked the beginning of another period of growth in military budgets across the countries, though Eritrea saw the sole dip in military spending in 1997, the year before the outbreak of the Badme conflict. By 1998, the year of the war, Ethiopia and Eritrea had the largest and second-largest military expenditures in the region, respectively. At the same time between 1998 and 2000, Kenya's military expenditure was actually on the decline, from US$263 million in 1998, to US$ US$165 million in 2000. Overall, then, the findings would appear to be consistent with the hypothesis; the comparative lowness of the Kenyan military budget compared with growths in those of belligerents in the region appear to be correlated with an interstate conflict outbreak. This also explains Kenya's lack of capacity to mitigate conflicts even after they have broken out. Indeed, Kenya's offers to mediate were turned down by Tanzania and Kenya could not compel Dar es Salaam to cease its counter-invasion of Uganda. Thus, though Tanzania and Uganda were comparatively poorer than Kenya, both these countries were able to divert considerable spending to military preparation as proportions of their total revenues. Further motives perhaps lay in differences of regimes as "weapons gathered by Amin were also meant to deter internal aggression" (Hansen, 2013: 92). With regard to the other close neighbour, Kenya, "the relations remained rather stable as Kenya took a patient and conciliatory stand in spite of various outburst from Idi Amin, for instance when he claimed that the Luos in western Kenya should belong to Uganda" (Hansen, 2013: 93). Further, Uganda, as a landlocked state depended more on Kenya than on Tanzania, with whom it also had regime differences that Tanzania appeared unwilling to accommodate and was actively working against (i.e., harbouring anti-Amin forces).

Secondly, the early years of the 1990s saw Kenyan growth in GDP per capita terms slowed down and then stagnate. Decline then occurred in the second half of the 1990s; with nominal GDP only growing by 2.1% in the entire 1995-2001 period, with true signs of recovery only showing in 2003 and then fully in 2005 (Read and Parton, 2009: 571). This means Kenya was

not keeping up with the regional average growth rates of Eritrea and Ethiopia. The latter two were also diverting much of their budgets disproportionally more to military spending. By condition of its economic slowdown, Kenya's government, which had also recently opened up for multiparty elections and therefore had some domestic audience considerations to bear, could scarcely afford doing so.

Thirdly, the conflict was made more likely by the end of the Cold War, as it led to a less ideologically inclined Russia that was willing to trade with any country; much of the equipment and personnel were acquired from Russia by both countries (unlike in 1977 when the USSR had refused these to the war instigator, and thus leading to a decisive war for Ethiopia – see Chapter 4, in section 4.2).

Fourth, with regards to Somalia, Kenya was a vested power with interests and its own rivalries with the region it ought to have ostensibly led. This also drew it closer with another state with a Somali rivalry; Ethiopia. This was signified in two stages; the 1964 treaty of friendship, and the 1979 mutual defence agreement. It is noticeable that the latter took shape between the US-aligned and the Soviet-leaning Derg, which indicates the importance of strategic interest across the ideological divide. This indicates at least a shared regional hegemony between Kenya and Ethiopia which is at once made inoperable due to overlapping interests and atavistic extra-continental alliances, the determinants of which are explored in Chapter 7. Because of Kenya's prodding, the US, however, limited its supplies to Somalia, as these could hypothetically have been redirected towards Kenya, with whom Somalia had irredentist claims. Thus we may refer to this as Kenya's client hegemony. Additionally, with regards to the Horn, Ethiopia – more than Kenya – has been widely viewed as the regional hegemon, or at least a regional hegemon in the northeast of Africa alongside Kenya in the south (Verhoeven, 2015; Le Gouriellec, 2018: 1059; Amusan and Oyewole, 2014: 21). This also demonstrates another important factor; the geography of necessity. As a littoral state, Kenya, unlike landlocked Ethiopia, may not have as much to gain from being as active in regional peace-making (and, where deemed necessary, war-making; as Ethiopia did with post-Ogaden War Somalia) beyond pacifying its northern border.

Finally among the original observations made from the findings in Chapter 7 is the assertion that – because of the manner in which the three wars played out – we can determine that there appears to be no revealed method for a would-be regional hegemon in East Africa to impose peace *between states* (i.e., excluding civil war contexts). At best, Kenya has been able to

prevent conflicts between itself and other states; with Uganda under Amin (before he turned his attention to Tanzania) and with Somalia. In the first instance, the country threatened Kampala with denial of imports and exports, and likewise curtailed US arms imports into Somalia, who at this time was also an ally of the US.

This chapter proceeds by laying out the methodology to be utilised in the second section. In the third section, the chapter assesses economic indicators of Kenya along those of the other states in the region. It then explores the prospect of the extent to which Kenya may not be a regional hegemon in the region by looking at other players within the region, and then the international context in which the wars took place. The chapter concludes with a brief link to Chapter 8.

7.2. Methodology

This chapter seeks to answer the following question: Does the decline of the relative GDP of the largest regional economy correlate with an outbreak of a conflict among states within the given region?

7.2.1. Variables

The independent variable is operationalised in terms of comparative GDP and military budget, as measured in monetary terms (in US dollars throughout this dissertation), of Kenya compared to the rest of the region. Causality can be drawn from the comparative movement in the relative GDP size of the identified hegemon and whether there is an outbreak of conflict in the region in the subsequent years after a decline in the relevant figures; this should be because the sustaining of peace through military expenditure is an expensive undertaking; conversely, years of higher economic growth may correlate with years of peace. The method of inquiry used in this dissertation is 'before/after' in that it will make use of antebellum conditions across the political and economic configurations within the countries and their respective regions in terms of hegemonic stability theory.

7.2.2. Data Requirements

This data will be sourced from various sources including the World Bank, archival materials from the countries under study (which include contemporary news coverage of the conflicts and mediation processes) along with other sources such as a total of 10 interviews with former mediators, government officials and some knowledgeable experts on the societies, economies, and militaries of the countries under study.

7.2.3. Hypothesis

The working hypothesis of this chapter is:

> H7: Sustained or increased relative economic relative size by the state with the largest comparative GDP in Eastern Africa (Kenya) does not coincide with an outbreak of an interstate conflict within the region.

Since we expect the hegemon to be the leading investor in peace, we should therefore expect the outbreak of conflict to coincide with periods wherein there is a decline in its economic strength and military budget. We should conversely expect periods of peace to be along those years when there is greater growth for the largest economy in the region.

7.3. A Test of Hegemonic Stability Theory in East Africa

Prior to analysing the inverse correlation between Kenyan GDP growth and military budget and outbreaks of conflict, it is worth briefly justifying the rationale for focusing on a single player in a continent that has had a continent-wide body focused on peace and security.

7.3.1. The Limits of Multilateral Institutions and the Necessity of State-Level Analysis

Evidently, as reports of the conflict reached various corners of the continent, the leaders made the call for an end to the hostilities. Subsequent to this, the OAU was tasked with negotiating the end of the Ogaden War and the Uganda-Tanzania war after that; which had to occur simultaneously, at least in late 1978 and early 1979.[50] Soon, however, the chief problem of the AOU revealed itself; the OAU depends on the cooperative behaviour of all implicated states. This is a paradox; were this possible, it would have rendered the OAU unnecessary, however. Although, for example, Idi Amin appeared to have initially not been willing to "accept any compromise," with these preliminary talks reportedly lasting only 2 minutes, he did eventually advance the notion that the UA would leave Tanzania, provided it was "guaranteed that he [Julius Nyerere] would neither invade Uganda nor support subversion against its government" (in Roberts, 2014: 697). Arriving in the Tanzanian capital, the OAU's negotiators "found Nyerere in an even more defiant mood," as he "refused to consider mediation until Amin

[50] IGAD, the multilateral organisation encompassing the majority of the East African countries who went to war, was formed in 1986 (i.e., after the two wars of the 1970s had already taken place), moreover, there was no noticeable response from it to the 1998-2000 war between Eritrea and Ethiopia, which was handled primarily by the UN (and the OAU within Africa), despite IGAD committing itself to resolving intra- and inter-state wars (Article 6A(c). Healy (2009) determines that the organisation was still in a state of formation and could thus not act in the 1998-2000 war, as well as a lack of effectiveness even in the 21st century period unless their interests converge. Overall, CEWARN, the early warning mechanism for war developed by the organisation, was only launched in 2002 (i.e., after the outbreak of all three wars under study here).


withdrew his forces from Tanzanian territory" (Roberts, 2014: 697). Because of this, the negotiation process reached a dead end (Roberts, 2014: 697).

Despite there being a clear aggressor in the first stage of the war (i.e., Uganda), the OAU maintained a posture of neutrality, which reflected the overall neutrality of other countries on the continent. Those who were not neutral were just as likely to have done so because of their pre-existing, left-leaning alignment with Tanzania, as well as proximity to Tanzania's neighbourhood. There was also a misreading of the situation. For example, these were Mengistu's words to the TPDF on the 13th of November in 1978: "[such] acts of aggression against Tanzania and other Front Line states deliberate attempts by imperialists to stifle the liberation struggle in southern Africa" (in Roberts, 2014: 699). Similar allegations were made by the Mozambican President, Samora Machel. Roberts also suggests that behind these statements were attempts at "closing of ranks to mask the embarrassment induced by a war that was caused and fought by Africans alone, and which Africans seemed incapable of ending" (Roberts, 2014: 699). Other states, especially those at a distance from the general southern and eastern parts of the continent, such as Guinea, Mali, and Senegal, "merely called for the end to hostilities and underlined their commitment to the Charter" (Roberts, 2014: 698). This official neutrality (to which, in any case, there was no realistic alternative as very few African states wanted an OAU capable enough to be a threat to their own regimes) therefore paved the way for atavistic and uncoordinated action. The same can be said of the EAC, which in any case was two-thirds composed of the two states who were at war. Neither of these organisations could prevent Tanzania's counter-invasion. Neither could the OAU prevent Mengistu from carrying out covert operations in Somalia, which severely weakened Siad Barre, ironically, to the point where he was willing to make major concessions on the AOU platform (Interview 19). On the other hand, the UNMEE was meant to liaison with the OAU, and indeed had a mandate to keep the OAU informed. However, Salim Salim only visited Eritrea once as the Eritreans deemed him as being under Ethiopian influence and being biased towards Ethiopia. This view hinged on the fact that the OAU's headquarters in Addis Ababa and thus the Eritreans stopped attending OAU meetings (Interview 19). Eritrea only accepted the cessation of hostilities agreement encompassed in the Algiers Agreement in 2000 once it had been defeated and weakened by the Ethiopian army. UNSC Resolution 1127, passed in order to ensure UN members refrained from suppling weapons to the combatants. This failed to halt the flow of arms, necessitating an arms embargo by a follow-up resolution, Resolution 1298. Neither state was deprived by these resolutions, as arms continued to flow from Eastern Europe (especially

the former Soviet sphere; Russia, Ukraine, and Romania) to both countries. Seeking to echo the failure of multilateralism in 1935, Ethiopia expressed intent to procure arms nonetheless as it labelled the UN of acting like the League of Nations during the Italian invasion; by "treating the victim of aggression the same as the aggressor" (Ofcansky, 2004: 4). This therefore necessitates a shift in the unit of analysis from the multilateral to the (hierarchical) state level, particularly of the largest economy in East Africa and the main state in the region to have not been directly engaged in the three wars studied in this dissertation.

7.3.2. Kenya's Projection in the Region


Figure 7.1. Kenya nominal GDP, 1963-2018



Data sourced from SIPRI. Chart by author.

In this, however, we find that Kenya's GDP has consistently grown. Moving from US$926-million in 1963 to US$87.9-billion by 2018. To the hypothesis, however, we are interested in the correlation of years of growth vis-à-vis the outbreak of conventional wars in the region.

Figure 7.2. Kenya's GDP growth, 1963-2017




Data sourced from World Bank.[51] Chart by author.

Thus it is necessary to plot Kenya's nominal GDP growth rate, with 1976-1978 and 1997-98 being our years of interest.

On the above, we find that the country's GDP growth was consistent between 1963 (at 8.8%) and 1969, declining only in 1970 (-4.7%). However, it rebounded once more in 1971 (at 22.2%, this was also the highest GDP growth on record), but continued to grow, albeit at a comparatively slower rate, for the remainder of the 1970s and the entire 1980s. It declined (at -0.8%) in 1992 and has continued to grow for the rest of the dataset. This therefore appears to disprove the working hypothesis, according to which we should expect the GDP of Kenya to decline within a two-year period prior to each war outbreak: 1976 and 1977 for the Ogaden War, and 1978 for the Uganda-Tanzania War, as well as 1996 and 1997 for the Eritrea-Ethiopia War (all shaded in red). Importantly, we are looking at a hypothetical decline in Kenya's economic size as an *antecedent* for the wars, and not for the wars as causes of a hypothetical decline in Kenya's economic size. One additional datatype is worth analysing, however: Kenya's military budget.


Figure 7.3. Kenya's military budget, 1963-2003



[51] Unless otherwise indicated, all subsequent data sourced from World Bank.

The above Figure 7.3 demonstrates an interesting development. For the years of interest – viz 1977 and 1978, as well as 1996 and 1997 – we find Kenya's military budget to be quite high. Noticeably, its levels in 1979, the height of the Uganda-Tanzania War, the budget was at its peak for the 1963-2003 dataset. This was despite official Kenyan neutrality in the war. This thereafter declined for the next five years between 1980 and 1984 from US$271.691 million to US$145.781 million. This was the first of two declines; after recovering from 1985 to 1987 (to US$250 million), the country saw another uninterrupted decline between 1989 and 1993 (reaching US$105.704 million), the year of Eritrean independence. Once again, however, the puzzle of the 1970s appears to arise as another war (Eritrea-Ethiopia) breaks out in 1997 despite the Kenyan military budget apparently growing from US$117.331 million in 1994 to

Figure 7.4. East African military budgets, 1963-2003



US$175.834 million. However, it is noticeable that in between 1997 and 1998, the year of the military outbreak in Badme, Kenya's military budget declined slightly to US$171.964 million. This would appear to technically confirm the hypothesis.

Source: World Bank, Uganda Ministry of Defence, Tanzania Ministry of Defence. Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI), Yearbook: Armaments, Disarmament and International Security.Coalesced by author.

At this point, it is worth positing that regional hegemony may be in a state of constant flux as well as relative; it may change from year to year, based on the status of Kenya vis-a-vis the rest of the countries in the region. Such a comparative analysis is conducted below, by plotting the military budgets of the other countries in the region side by side with their Kenyan counterpart and determining the extent to which Kenya could, despite its GDP size, be argued to be the largest military spender in the region.

From the onset of the dataset, Ethiopia had the highest military budget. However, it was taken over by Uganda after 1971. Uganda in turn was superseded by Tanzania, whose military budget was the largest in the region between 1973 and 1979. Within the dataset, Kenya's military budget has never been the largest in the region; it has reached second-largest status on a number of periods: 1977 to 1979, 1987 to 1993, and once more between 2000 and 2003. In Appendix A, I provide proof of this overall pattern in the region; on the main, the data observes an interesting pattern, from the 1960s to the 1970s, the entire region saw a growth in military budgets, which was then followed by a decline in the 1980s, with the sole exception of Ethiopia, which between 1980 and 1990 had the single-largest military budget. The year 1994 marked the beginning of another period of growth in military budgets, though Eritrea saw the sole dip in military spending in 1997, the year before the outbreak of the Badme conflict. By 1998, the year of the war, Ethiopia and Eritrea had the largest military expenditures in the region. At the same time between 1998 and 2000, Kenya's military expenditure was actually on the decline, from US$263 million in 1998, to US$ US$165 million in 2000. Overall, then, the findings would appear to be consistent with the hypothesis. The comparative lowness of the Kenyan military budget compared with that of belligerents in the region appear to be correlated. Indeed, Kenya's offers to mediate were turned down by Tanzania, and Kenya could not compel Dar es Salaam to do otherwise (Roberts, 2014: 697).

Before the outbreak of the conflict, "Uganda and Tanzania were racing to build up their respective militaries to deter the other from attacking" (Read and Parton, 2009: 571). Thus though they were poorer than Kenya, both these countries were able to divert considerable spending to military preparation as proportions of their total revenues. Further motives perhaps lay in differences of regimes as "weapons gathered by Amin were also meant to deter internal aggression" (Hansen, 2013: 92). Vis-à-vis its other neighbouring state, Kenya, "the relations remained rather stable as Kenya took a patient and conciliatory stand in spite of various outburst from Idi Amin, for instance when he claimed that the Luos in western Kenya should belong to Uganda" (Hansen, 2013: 93). Further, Uganda, as a landlocked state depended more

on Kenya than on Tanzania, with whom it also had regime differences that Tanzania appeared unwilling to accommodate and was actively working against (i.e., harbouring anti-Amin forces).

The early years of the 1990s saw Kenyan growth in GDP per capita terms slowed down and then stagnate. Decline then occurred in the second half of the 1990s; with nominal GDP only growing by 2.1% in the entire 1995-2001 period, with true signs of recovery only showing in 2003 and then fully in 2005 (Read and Parton, 2009: 571). This means Kenya was not keeping up with the individual growth averages of 3.8% and 5.3% for Eritrea and Ethiopia, respectively, and overall 4.6% between them both (World Bank, 2019). The latter two were also diverting much of their budgets disproportionally more to military spending. By condition of its economic slowdown, Kenya's government, which had also recently opened up for multiparty elections in the early 1990s and therefore had some domestic audience considerations to bear, could scarcely afford increasing its military expenditure to guarantee regional peace at the expense of social expenditure. This is in line with the opportunity cost implications highlighted by Carter (2017), who suggests an opportunity cost calculation by governments prior to taking up a war and finds that relatively open states (or those with a larger "winning coalition") may be persuaded away from increasing military expenditure (which may come through a tax increment) if the population stands to make no obvious gain.

7.3.3. Regional Hegemony Beyond Kenya?

Kenya, then, seems to have been held back by economic factors. At the same time, however, there are regional dimensions to consider in either the maintenance of peace or the outbreak of conflict in the region. According to some scholarship, the absence or presence of support from its neighbours is a key determinant in any would-be hegemon's success in regional leadership. For its part, "Tanzania supported Kenya in working for the revival of the EAC, and on the initial denial of membership to Rwanda and Burundi in 2000. Tanzania did not support the Protocol of Establishment and residence, which allowed equal property and settlement rights. Neither did Tanzania support the use of Identity Documents (ID) cards for cross-border travel and identification" (Magu, 2015: 391). However, "then, as now, Tanzania believed that the benefits of cooperation/integration were unfairly biased in favour of Kenya, which was the most industrially developed country in the region" (Magu, 2015: 389).

Furthermore, conflict has been prevented by external states in the region without Kenyan participation. In 1972, for example, President Siad Barre "was able to negotiate a truce between

Tanzania and Uganda on October 7, 1972" (Valeriano, 2011: 212). Yet, "after a brief lull, the rivalry flared up again" when, in 1975, Nyerere did not attend an OAU summit scheduled to take place in Kampala. Following this, Amin made public statements in which he made the false claim that "Tanzania had actually invaded Uganda in July 1974 and September 1975, and that an invasion was imminent in March 1973, August 1975, February 1977 and just prior to the 1978 OAU meeting in Khartoum" (Valeriano, 2011: 212). Rather than a regional hegemon intervening it appears that Tanzania seemed to have restrained itself from acting. The proof of this lies in the fact that in the initial invasion and annexation attempt by Uganda into Tanzania in 1978, "there were so few troops in the invaded area that Uganda quickly took the territory despite Amin's claims that there was a military buildup at the border" (Valeriano, 2011: 212).

As seen, Somalia had been active in bringing a temporary peace between Uganda and Tanzania in 1972. The country sought to take part in further integration attempts in East Africa. However, these overtures were blocked by Kenya (Makinda, 1982: 97). This was rooted in Kenya's disputes with Somalia. As late as 1981, "a Somali irredentist movement calling itself the NFD Liberation Front toured several Arab states soliciting for arms and money and later announced that it was determined to 'liberate' about 200,000 Somalis in Kenya" (Makinda, 1982: 97). Moreover, it was strongly held within Kenya that "government circles that Somalia is behind the insurgents" (Makinda, 1982: 97).

The above highlights another factor about Kenya's position; it was a vested power with interests and its own rivalries with the region it ought to have ostensibly led. While repelling its relations with Somalia, it also made it closer with another state with a Somali rivalry:

> The Somali belligerency in the Horn has drawn Kenya and Ethiopia together. The two states signed a friendship and cooperation treaty in 1964 and, in spite of the ideological differences now existing between the pro-American Kenya and pro-Soviet Ethiopia, the two states signed a mutual defence pact in 1979. That pact was signed shortly after Saudi Arabia, an American ally that has considerable influence in Somalia, had failed to unite Kenya and Somalia with a view to isolating Ethiopia (Makinda, 1982: 98).

This indicates at least a 'shared regional hegemony' between Kenya and Ethiopia which is at once made inoperable due to overlapping interests and atavistic extra-continental alliances, the determinants of which are explored below. Indeed, "an interesting feature of this situation is that when Ethiopian leader Mengistu Haile Mariam visited Kenya in December 1980, he issued a joint communiqué with Kenyan leader Daniel Arap Moi calling on Somalia to renounce 'in unequivocal terms all claims' on neighbouring states and denounced the American military

presence in Somalia" (Valeriano, 2011: 206). This was in spite of the fact that Kenya itself was hosting American military personnel, and that the Soviet Union had its own in Ethiopia. This was based on the fact that Kenya – a US military client – was "more frightened by the American arms in Somalia than it is by the Soviet arms in Ethiopia" (Makinda, 1982: 98). In the meantime, "[Kenya] allowed Ethiopia to receive arms shipments through Kenyan territory while at the same time denying Somalia access to its airspace" (Valeriano, 2011: 206).

Perhaps because of this Ethiopia – not Kenya – has been widely viewed as the regional hegemon in the Horn of Africa. In a typology of regional leaders, for example, Gebrewold (2014: 1) states that "Ethiopia has been the leading player in the fight against Islamist terrorism in the Horn of Africa since 1995. Nigeria was the leading actor in the Economic Community of West African States Monitoring Group (ECOMOG) interventions in Liberia and Sierra Leone in the 1990s. South Africa played a significant role through interventions in Lesotho (1998) and Burundi (2003)." This also demonstrates another important factor; the geography of necessity. As a littoral state, Kenya, unlike landlocked Ethiopia, may not have as much to gain from being as active in regional peace-making beyond pacifying its northern border. Yet even here, the necessity of action is more blatant for Ethiopia. The Somaliland dilemma demonstrates this. While both Kenya and Ethiopia are sympathetic to the Somaliland cause, Ethiopia has more to lose or gain:

> Ethiopia is in a delicate position: it has used its military power to impose the TFG in Mogadishu. Will it allow the TFG to impose itself over Hargeisa? If it does so, it will reopen the Pandora's box of Somali irredentism which will eventually consume Ethiopia's Somali Region (the Ogaden). If it recognises Somaliland too soon, it will alienate the TFG 'puppet' regime. In any case, the fate of Somaliland and Somalia is in Ethiopian hands. This is contained in the analysis provided. What is preventing a dialogue between the north and south is a clash of political cultures. Deriving inspiration from its traditional reconciliation practices, Somaliland has evolved a secular democratic political culture. Somalia, for almost 15 years, was suffocated by brutal warlord culture. For a brief period it experienced a radical Islamist, jihadi political culture, and is now confronted by authoritarianism and neo-Siyadism (Adam, 2009: 273).

As discussed in Chapter 6, the Somaliland issue is also a theatre of proxies between Ethiopia and another state, Eritrea. Simultaneously, however, it is a site for another rivalry. While Arab states such as Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Sudan are generally against the recognition of Somaliland, this is arguably due to Egypt's anti-Ethiopian politics over the Nile (Adam, 2009: 273).

In its contention with Saudi Arabia and the other Arab states, Ethiopia indicates a plausibility of hegemony on the continent being determined by factors both within as well as outside the continent. It is worth examining the pathways through which external powers have impacted interstate war and peace on the continent. This is further explored below, with the wars of the 1970s as a vantage point.

7.3.4. Hegemony Beyond the Continent

One of the major countries to firstly direct the course of peace was Britain when it attempted to intervene in the Uganda-Tanzania War. "When the Uganda-Tanzania War broke out in October 1978, the Callaghan government saw it as an opportunity to increase its global power by boosting its influence in Central East and Southern Africa" (Skaar, 2015: 10). Nevertheless, this appears reactionary in that it sought to imbue peace after the fact, whereas the primary pathways of hegemons are meant to be pre-emptive.

> As it was normally difficult for Britain to intervene in Africa without being accused of imperialist intervention in African affairs, the FCO officials saw the sudden outbreak of fighting between Tanzania and Uganda as an opening to increase British influence through support for Tanzania. This would allow Britain to demonstrate its support for Tanzania in the face of Ugandan aggression and contribute towards Uganda's military defeat, which the officials hoped would lead to Amin's overthrow. In this way Britain hoped to increase its influence in Central East Africa to the detriment of what it perceived as predominant communist influence in the region (Skaar, 2015: 10).

Thus, it appears Britain was being led by events and hoping to make use of them to gain legitimacy on the continent, or at least its eastern region. As Skaar (2015) recounts: "Due to economic and political constraints Britain's support for Tanzania had to be cheap, non-lethal and reactive" (Skaar, 2015: 10). Thus, "although Britain continued to support Tanzania after its invasion of Uganda, Britain's support became less tangible than…and was largely diplomatic in character" (Skaar, 2015: 10). If anything, this is a statement of a lack of hegemonic power rather than possession of it (at least in the performative sense proposed by the literature reviewed in Chapter 3). Further, it appears to have had no influence in the outbreak of the war, which would be perhaps the opposite effect of hegemonic power – which, by its malleable nature, can be utilised to either bring about or interrupt peace. In fact, no major outside power did, as all three wars appear to have been entirely dyadic wars set in motion by territorial disputes, regime differences, instrumentalisation of popular support by the belligerent regimes and a lack of economic interdependence among the states. Nevertheless,

the pathways of interdependence with other outside powers were a key contributing factor. Still it is worth noting that power conditions within the continent modulated these. Staying with the British case, Skaar finds that despite consensus in the FCO about acting in the war, there was nonetheless "some disagreement over conflicting British interests" in Tanzania, who was the one of the belligerents, and Kenya, who was a neutral regional power and who somewhat disapproved of Tanzanian counter-invasion in the war (Skaar, 2015: 11-12). This is made more evident in the assertion that the EAC's survival "depended on the interpersonal relationships of the presidents rather than institutional structures" (Magu, 2015: 390).

7.3.4.1. Outwardly-Derived Military Power, 1971-1980: Towards 'Client Regional Hegemony'?

Traditionally, "economically small states follow typical strategies of alliance-seeking or of siding with one or another hegemon" (Cornelissen, 2017: 550). How does this present itself in the issue of regional hegemony, particularly in East Africa? Building on existing legitimacy theories, Gebrewold's article recounts the traditional features of regional leadership: (i.e., "domestic legitimacy (economic and political performances), [and] regional legitimacy (recognition and compliance by regional states)" [Gebrewold, 2014: 1]). But he adds another important condition which appears quite relevant for our cases: international reliability, by which he means "whether their international alliances with various global powers support or counteract their regional leadership" (Gebrewold, 2014: 1). This was on display during the Somalia-Ethiopia war discussed in Chapter 4.

Before the outbreak of hostilities, there was an arms race in the region. "Somalia acquired weapons from Egypt, China, and the Soviet Union. This led to a tit for tat increase in weapons acquisitions by Ethiopia, which acquired advanced Northrop F-5 aircraft from Iran" (Valeriano, 2011: 206). Further, in 1974, Somalia successfully joined the Arab League and from this the country "was able to solicit resources and military supplies from its new Arab allies" (Valeriano, 2011: 206).

Table 7.1. Arms imports and military consumption in East Africa, 1971-1980

Country and Period		Arms Imports: as Per cent of Export Earnings	Arms Imports: as Per cent of Military Budget	Total Military Consumption: as Per cent of Total Non-Military Budget	Total Military Consumption: as Per cent GNP
Ethiopia	1971-75	6	24	26	3
	1976-80	130	189	143	10
Somalia	1971-75	75	177	43	10
	1976-80	140	236	65	17
Sudan	1971-75	3	8	22	4
	1976-80	20	55	22	4
Kenya	1971-75	2	30	8	2
	1976-80	3	19	17	4

Source: Calculated from figures in US Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, *World Military Expenditures and Arms Transfers*, 1971-1980.

The defining world powers of the era in question were the US and the Soviet Union. The role of these two is examined in turn below.

For the initial twenty or so years of the Cold War, "the superpowers were largely silent in Africa" (Heitz, 2016: 428). The USSR was not immediately reached out to by African independence movements, whereas American policymakers estimated that "Africa was of limited political and economic importance" (Heitz, 2016: 428). This shifted in the 1970s.

> Even then, its policy seemed somewhat confused. In colonial Angola, the US subsidised both the Portuguese and the insurgents. Additionally, many US theorists thought it was a mistake to apply the traditional Cold War rationale to the conflicts in Africa. Even the Soviets, who were active following their success in Angola, were wary of engaging in a surplus of 'limited interventions' in Africa (Heitz, 2016: 429).

At the outbreak of the Ogaden War, "the Soviet Union was caught between two client states and, just because she could not support the Somali claims on the Ogaden, she abandoned Somalia and opted for Ethiopia" (Makinda, 1982: 100). Ethiopia's military spending and its imports of arms equipment increased exponentially in the 1970s: "the value of the arms transferred in 1976-80 was well over two billion dollars — almost half that of the arms transferred to the entire continent of Africa in the preceding five years" (Luckham and Bekele, 1984: 16). These deliveries reached their peak in the years 1977 and 1978 as a result of Soviet air- and sealift of arms for Ethiopia during the Somalia-Ethiopia war over the Ogaden region. Importantly, however, they remained "well above the pre-1977 levels after the immediate crisis was over" (Luckham and Bekele, 1984: 16). Ethiopia was not the only recipient. However, "the growth in arms transfers to Somalia, Sudan and Kenya was less dramatic than to Ethiopia, but

still large by any other standard of comparison" (Luckham and Bekele, 1984: 16). The model of the arms transfers was a combination of subsidisation and payments:

> A quarter to a half of the weapons airlifted to Ethiopia in 1977-78 were outright gifts and a further $100 million-worth of arms were paid for by Libya. Nevertheless, this left Ethiopia with a cumulative hard currency debt to the Soviet Union of up to $2 billion by the end of 1982 (Luckham and Bekele, 1984: 17).

Reportedly, these payments were made through "direct barter deals for coffee and (according to some reports) gold" which covered only a portion of what was owed (Luckham and Bekele, 1984: 17).

> Following the revolution and the subsequent turn-around in regional alliances in 1977-78, US arms and assistance were before long redirected to the other countries of the region, Kenya, Sudan and Somalia. The share of the Horn in US arms transfers to Africa was 67 per cent in 1975-82 (Luckham and Bekele, 1984b: 7).

On the other hand, Somalia, Sudan and Kenya had their share of sizeable military debts to the US and owed even more to private suppliers in West European (Luckham and Bekele, 1984: 17). In the period between 1976 and 1979, total arms imports from Britain, France, Italy and West Germany into the region were triple those of imports from the US, "having been less than those of the latter throughout the 1960s and early 1970s" (Luckham and Bekele, 1984b: 10). This is explainable when we take into account that after the 1974 revolution the US was no longer able to supply arms as it had done under the Emperor, but also "partly in consequence of more aggressive arms sales by the Europeans, whose industries are more dependent upon exports and who were able to make use of post-colonial connections to develop their markets" (Luckham and Bekele, 1984b: 10). For example, Somalia was principally importing its arms from Italy following the Somali-Soviet split (Lewis, 1980). In Kenya, on the other hand, Britain, the US, and Switzerland were the principal suppliers (Luckham and Bekele, 1984b: 10-11).

> However, none of the European countries can afford to supply weapons on concessional terms. Thus the current US shift from foreign military sales to grant military assistance will almost certainly have the effect of tying Somalia, Sudan and Kenya into the US regional security framework more comprehensively than before — the more so because of their economic problems and the burden of their existing military debts (Luckham and Bekele, 1984b: 11).

Furthermore, the Ethio-Somali War in 1977 exemplified how, in the Cold War, the channels of influence could be bi-directional:

> The defeat of US-backed Somalia by the Soviet/Cuban-backed Ethiopians in 1978 was perceived by Washington as a serious setback, particularly as the USSR and Cuba were also massively intervening in the Angolan Civil War, started in 1975, in support of the Marxist-inspired government in Luanda (Gasbarri, 2018: 75).

The Ogaden War therefore staved off ratification of SALT II by the two superpowers (Gasbarri, 2018: 73). Thus not only were the global hegemons' policies in Africa modulated by the local conditions – notably the failure by Britain to successfully pre-emptively negotiate a truce between Uganda and Tanzania and in fact supporting Tanzania in the hopes of currying enough favour so as to *re-emerge* as a player in southern Africa, as well as the strained Kenya-Somali relations which were a major factor in the US cutting its arms exports to Somalia due to Somali pressure, whilst Kenya was still able to allow Soviet arms to be imported into Ethiopia – but also of the global impact of occurrences in the region.

The fall of the Berlin Wall, along with the dissolution of the USSR, indicated the conclusion of the salience of ideology in international affairs, at least for the time being between the US and the former Soviet Union succeeded by the Russian Federation in international affairs, whose economy would go on to decline by some 17% between 1989 and 1999 (Magu, 2015: 392; Huntington, 1993). In the wake of this, the US emerged the sole superpower in the region. "The very disappearance of the other superpower, however, also meant that Washington's policy in the Horn of Africa, with its focus on conflict resolution, had lost one of its main raisons d'être" (Gasbarri, 2018: 88). In this context, the Horn of Africa, and particularly the Somali civil war which ensued, could be considered as "one of the first tests for this new policy and for the United States as the only remaining superpower" (Gasbarri, 2018: 88). The contentious unilateral US involvement in Somalia, however, "showed…that humanitarian intervention and cooperation with the United Nations were very contradictory policies and, ultimately, they turned out to be insufficient to justify and support a coherent American military involvement in the region" (Gasbarri, 2018: 88). Put differently, there were not as much competition-driven rationale to be involved in the region (Gasbarri, 2018: 88).

This did not mean a disappearance of Russia, the political successor of the USSR. To the contrary, the lack of ideological leaning made the country more market- than alliance-driven. During the Eritrea-Ethiopia War, "both countries also spent enormous sums on ammunition,

and to train soldiers with the new weaponry, hired foreign mercenaries. Eritrea hired Russians to help it maintain its surface-to-air missile systems, while Ethiopia contracted with Sukhoi [a Russian company] for around 100 pilots and aircraft technicians" (*Strategic Comments*, 2000: 1). On the other hand, the US has formed a closer relationship with the US, despite the fact that "the people currently ruling both Ethiopia and Eritrea began their political career by denouncing the western powers as imperialists" (Lata, 2003: 370). By the time of the EPDRF took Addis Ababa, the US was greatly involved as an advisor. During this transitional period, the US had already established a working embassy, and formulated a "strong working relationship" with then Provisional President Meles (Gasbarri, 2018: 87). After 199, "Ethiopia became one of the principal recipients of US foreign assistance and relations with Washington strengthened during the Clinton administration" (Gasbarri, 2018: 87). Indeed, Ethiopia was seen as a core regional player, and "an 'inescapable factor' in the Horn of Africa," which has allowed it the place of a regional hegemon to be consulted and cooperated with by external players with East Africa-related policies: "One of the US objectives thus became to enlist Addis Ababa in its efforts to address problems in neighbouring countries" (Gasbarri, 2018: 87).

7.4. **Conclusion**

The preceding chapter has assessed the possibility of regional hegemonic stability thesis accounting for outbreaks of conflict and periods of peace in the East Africa from the 1970s through to 2000. Tests of the hegemonic stability theory found it to be of much relevance in the dissertation as well.

Within the dataset, Kenya's military budget has never been the largest in the region; it has reached second-largest status on a number of periods: 1977 to 1979, 1987 to 1993, and once more between 2000 and 2003. On the main, the data (as calculated and proved in Appendix A) observes an interesting pattern, from the 1960s to the 1970s, the entire region saw a growth in military budgets, which was then followed by a decline in the 1980s, with the sole exception of Ethiopia, which between 1980 and 1990 had the single-largest military budget. 1994 marked the beginning of another period of growth in military budgets across the countries, though Eritrea saw the sole dip in military spending in 1997, the year before the outbreak of the Badme conflict. By 1998, the year of the war, Ethiopia and Eritrea had the largest and second-largest military expenditures in the region, respectively. At the same time between 1998 and 2000, Kenya's military expenditure was actually on the decline, from US$263 million in 1998, to US$ US$165 million in 2000. Overall, then, the findings would appear to be consistent with

the hypothesis; the comparative lowness of the Kenyan military budget compared with growths in those of belligerents in the region appear to be correlated with an interstate conflict outbreak. This also explains Kenya's lack of capacity to mitigate conflicts even after they have broken out. Indeed, Kenya's offers to mediate were turned down by Tanzania and Kenya could not compel Dar es Salaam to cease its counter-invasion of Uganda. Thus, though Tanzania and Uganda were comparatively poorer than Kenya, both these countries were able to divert considerable spending to military preparation as proportions of their total revenues. Kenya also appears to have had a preferred outcome for the Ogaden War; that is, an Ethiopian victory. In this way, it campaigned for reduced assistance for Somalia by the US, despite Ethiopia being a self-declared socialist and Soviet-allied state. This was due to Kenya's own irredentist contest with Somalia for the Northern Frontier District of Kenya.

It would therefore appear that the regional (economic and strategic), bilateral (economic) and domestic (socio-economic and socio-political) contexts have interacted in determining the likelihood of a war outbreak or the maintenance of peace in the region. It is necessary, then, to coalesce these findings with the findings of the preceding chapters 4 to 6, which spoke to domestic and dyadic causes, and determine causal pathways that take into account each of the theories with respect to each other as stipulated in Chapter 1, at the onset of the dissertation.

CHAPTER 8

Conclusion: Towards A Typological Theory of East African Interstate War

8.1. Introduction

This chapter of the dissertation turns to assessing the findings made throughout Chapters 4 to 7. In other words, this part of the dissertation will assess and conclude on which among the variables and attendant hypotheses postulated by these theories proved consistently causally relevant throughout the case studies utilised herein. We do so with the purposes of determining the causal relevance of all three theories with regards to the case studies, as well to coalesce them together when more than one proves causally relevant. Those findings which validate some theories will be made to interact as the dissertation ascertains their individuated causal relevance with regards to one another, and how each theory could play a role in explaining either different *stages* or different modes of drivers of the conflict. This could take place through either of three mechanisms: competitive testing, subsumption, sequencing or domain demarcation. The dissertation adopts sequencing.

The chapter will then conclude with an overall assessment of the findings of the dissertation and the contributions they generate both for the theoretical as well as their policy landscapes.

8.2. A Methodology for Theory-to-Theory Interaction

This dissertation is primarily about three theories. It is concerned with testing them and finding their respective relevancies. This requires the identification of a method for theoretical dialogue and integration so that we may develop a 'typological theory'. Jupille, Caporaso and Checkel (2003: 19) propose that theories in political science and international relations have some degree of commensurability that can allow for "fruitful exchange to take place." There are "four distinct modes of theoretical conversation: competitive testing; additive approaches theory based on complementary domains of applications; sequencing of theories and incorporation (subsumption)" (Jupille, Caporaso and Checkel, 2003: 19). Of these, competitive theory testing (CTT) attempts to confirm and refute theories according to their causal relevance. Subsumption on the other hand is characterised by "more powerful theories" absorbing "less powerful ones, perhaps even by criteria established by the more powerful theories," and reproduce these "weaker" theories as being "derived special cases" (Jupille, Caporaso and Checkel, 2003: 20). Additive and sequential approaches on the other hand try

instead to build a "comprehensive composite in which the whole provides some gains over partial representations, all the while preserving the integrity of the contributions of the parts" (Jupille, Caporaso and Checkel, 2003: 19).

"Strong tests" are those tests within competitive theory testing which "set the bar of confirmation high – that is, make the confirmation more difficult" (Jupille, Caporaso and Checkel, 2003: 22). In other words, they are capable of explaining outcomes where other theories fall short. On the other hand, "weak tests share explanatory success with many other theories. Competitive testing means that we do not evaluate our claims only against the evidence but against other theories as well" (Jupille, Caporaso and Checkel, 2003: 21). A third approach to theoretical integration "is to show that one can be logically derived from another. For example, one theory may be a special case of another theory, and vice versa" (Jupille, Caporaso and Checkel, 2003: 21).

As discussed, domain demarcation this strives for a minimal synthesis in the sense that, although different theories may appeal to completely independent explanatory variables. "When combined they could increase our ability to explain the empirical world" (Jupille, Caporaso and Checkel, 2003: 21). This is based on the assumption that all theories have scope conditions; thus "the domain approach works identifying the respective turfs" and "home domains" of each theory, "by specifying how each theory, by specifying how each explanation works, and finally by bringing together each home turf to some larger picture" (Jupille, Caporaso and Checkel, 2003: 21). Methodologically, every theory is specified and the result, if successful, "is an additive theory that is more comprehensive than the separate theories" (Jupille, Caporaso and Checkel, 2003: 22). However, some problems arise with domain demarcation. "The key to the domain of application model is to properly specify the scope conditions of each theory, what its domain is, and how it relates to other theories. If one theory provides some valued added to the other, we can improve our efforts by this approach" (Jupille, Caporaso and Checkel, 2003: 22). However, "this works suitably when multiple theories explain similar phenomena, when explanatory variables have little overlap, and when these variables do not interact in their influence on outcomes" (Jupille, Caporaso and Checkel, 2003: 22). This dissertation's findings, however, have noted some overlap between the theories which will be explicated below in the typological framework.

As seen, the dissertation's findings point to multiple causal relevancies across the theories, though with some amendments required for each theory's postulated variables. For this reason,

then, the dissertation makes use of sequencing. By making use of qualitative content analysis, we are able to potentially accommodate for all the independent variables in causing the dependent variable (i.e., interstate war among African states in four case studies). For these reasons, this dissertation adopts sequencing. The central assumption of sequencing is that "each [theory] depends on the other to temporarily explain a given outcome" (Jupille, Caporaso and Checkel, 2003: 22). Whereas domain-of-application method "posits different empirical domains within one frame of time" (Jupille, Caporaso and Checkel, 2003: 22). Thus the sequencing approach suggests that variables from two or more approaches "work together over time to fully explain a given domain" (Jupille, Caporaso and Checkel, 2003: 22). This will be explicated in the section which follows (section 8.3).

8.3. Typology-Building

8.3.1. Democratic peace thesis

Ogaden War. The chapter's findings indicate that the theory of democratic peace thesis has an imperfect causal account with the conflict of 1977-78 between Somalia and Ethiopia, but still has some congruence with the path to war and may explain why there has been no war since 1978. What has been notable however is the manner in which these have been manifested in the actual conflict. Noticeably, Somalia, the initiator of the conflict, scored less than Ethiopia in the governance index on openness, which was as the hypothesis proposed. Nevertheless, some more insights were made. On the first instance, while relations were flawed from the onset, with Somalia having irredentist claims, a conventional conflict between Ethiopia and Somalia took place upon the two countries undergoing governmental transformations. Secondly, the democratic peace thesis also offers insights in that the war did not take place until Mengistu Hailemeriam, the more hard-line leader, took over from Teferi Bante, who was proposing a more cordial approach towards Somalia. This is significant in that it indicates a transition within Ethiopia being a prerequisite for the initiation of the war by Somalia's own regime (itself autocratic). Thirdly, that the war was initiated by the more autocratic Somalia is also indicative of a possibility that the Somali regime appraised the situation in Ethiopia to be 'ripe' for it to initiate the war without anticipating resistance from the apparently weaker Ethiopia. The present literature on the democratic peace thesis is presently not cognizant of the role of institutional legitimacy information asymmetry across regimes in leading up to an outbreak of conflict. This chapter therefore offers this original contribution. Barre used internal discord in Ethiopia as an opportunity to attack and claim a territory he felt was part of Somalia. Indeed, while Somalia was not a democracy, Barre had risen to power in 1969 after a coup and

maintained a dictatorship partially because of popular support for the irredentist cause he ostensibly sought to realise.

Uganda-Tanzania War. The difficult relationship between the two leaders of Uganda and Tanzania lay some points of relevance of the democratic peace thesis. Regime heterogeneity, for one seems to explain the root causes of the war as internal dynamics within Uganda both encouraged and allowed a conflict to be initiated against Tanzania. While at the same time, regime difference also accounts for the manner in which the war was fought and embraced by the different populations and concluded with the demise of the Amin regime. It also appears to be consistent with the work of Weeks (2012), whose findings indicate a greater probability of power loss for an authoritarian regime upon losing a war. We can alter these results in the Uganda-Tanzania case by stating that *the more authoritarian regime was at the same time more hastened to initiate a war, while also having its power retention more threatened by the loss of the war*.

The Obote regime and the Amin regime seem to have been equally illegitimate; both were overthrown in military fashion; twice in the case of the Obote regime. Our regime of discussion is the Amin regime as it was the one that went to war with Tanzania. In the next years after coming to power, Idi Amin survived numerous assassination plots, which led him to being more untrusting, which was manifested in his repeated purging of the senior ranks of the Ugandan military. On the other hand, the situation was different in Tanzania. As one source already discussed put it, the war with Uganda reversed what had essentially been Tanzania's "shame" in the form of the 1964 mutiny as the efforts against Idi Amin put on display "its political readiness to defend the country and its ability to mobilise rapidly for war" (Lupogo, 2001: 83). In line with the arguments of the democratic peace thesis, the Tanzanian government sought to appeal to the populace by attributing undemocratic features of the adversary. "The president and other politicians preached to the population about the enemies of Tanzania, in whose ranks Idi Amin appeared prominently. Army commanders and political commissars did not tire of stressing their opposition to Amin to the soldiers and all who would listen" (Lupogo, 2001: 83). Among the most utilised mottos in the army was "Amini haini" (i.e., "Amin the traitor") (Lupogo, 2001: 83). The small minority who advocated moderation vis-à-vis Idi Amin "were drowned in the general condemnation of the man and his military regime" (Lupogo, 2001: 83) Thus, "when Amin attacked Tanzania in October 1978, he proved to be a bogeyman that became real" (Lupogo, 2001: 83); but, just as well, he encountered Tanzania more than capable of retaliating.

Domestically, "Amin effectively turned Uganda's predominantly Christian and Bantu society upside-down" (Roberts, 2014: 694). This had the consequence of "creating a ruling elite that *had no local base* and owed its position and loyalty only to Amin himself" (Roberts, 2014: 694; emphasis added). If indeed the domestic situation in both countries was allowing for the war to take place, it is deducible that no war has broken out between two countries since the 1970s due to regime changes which since took shape in the wake of Idi Amin's fall. With regards to Henderson's (2008; 2014) thesis, this may be an indicator of the level of legitimacy it perceives itself to have. On the other hand, it may have had a legitimising effect on the government that prevents vulnerability from the outside because this is cooperative behaviour towards other states, unlike the behaviour observed under Amin.

Eritrea-Ethiopia War. This chapter of the thesis has found relevance for both the democratic peace thesis, despite the undemocratic nature of both countries, as well as the economic interdependence thesis. This allows us to formulate a typology accounting for both these variables. In 1997, there was were prospects of the opposition gaining channels through which to challenge the Isaias regime. The constitution had been completed by the Constitutional Commission of Eritrea, and elections were pending within a matter of months. The hypothetical information privilege that Eritrea ought to have had was diminished by a misperception of Ethiopia; the regime in Asmara incorrectly assumed that the rest of the country would mutiny and not back the Tigray-led government. Anti-Eritrean sentiment however was widely spread in Ethiopia.

The findings of the thesis overall contradict Henderson's assertion that "Dyads comprising domestically legitimate African states are more likely to experience international conflict" (Henderson, 2015: 239). Henderson's rationale stems from his earlier, large-N derived model that

> simply put, Africa's neopatrimonial regimes have varying levels of domestic legitimacy, and those African states that enjoy higher levels of domestic legitimacy – among them, African democracies – are less constrained by the fear of insurgency prevalent among autocratic leaders and, being less constrained from deploying their troops abroad, they are more likely to become involved in international conflict. Moreover, two relatively open African states – both similarly unconstrained by problems of illegitimacy – should be more likely (ceteris paribus) to become involved in MIDs as compared to two non-democratic states (Henderson, 2008: 34-35).

Thus, the present case studies, which have been looked at individually and collectively, would appear to be Henderson's 'outliers.' Indeed, the reason they undertook such military excursions

was because of their problematic legitimacy: Somalia and Uganda because of their economic stagnations, and Eritrea because of the completed work of the Constitutional Commission of Eritrea which would have curbed the powers of the executive. In other words, it was not their sense of legitimacy that drove their war-making rationale. Rather, and central to this dissertation's original contribution, they strike due to a perceived lack of legitimacy in their targeted adversary.

8.3.2. Economic Interdependence

Ogaden War. The chapter found that the economic interdependence thesis has validity for the Ogaden War as well. Overall, the share of Ethiopia in the country's exports was insignificant, consistently lower than the than the high watermark of 0.018% which had been reached in 1975. This thus demonstrates a lack of opportunity cost in initiating a war with Ethiopia. This case study has also demonstrated that the literature on interdependence, either on potential adversary and would-be mediators, ought to take into account the external reliance of the aggressor country in question in the first place. As this case demonstrates, while Somalia was an exporting nation prior to the war, these exports were declining in the years leading up to the war – which coincided with the consolidation of power by a regime its leader reliably considered weak between 1974 and 1977 based on signals of social unrest and mutinies – and they had already had a minimal share within its total GDP.

Uganda-Tanzania War. Trade between Tanzania and Uganda started to increase gradually soon after independence. The years following 1961 had seen two-way trade (both imports and exports) grow between the two states. This trade was further bolstered by the birth of the East African Community (post-1967). Following this, Tanzania's imports from Uganda were worth USS14.8-million in 1970 and her exports to Uganda were US$7.8 million. Noticeably, this was height of the trade, however. With trade growing but unsubstantial (with Tanzania taking up less than 1% of Uganda's exports at any given point), the relations were buoyed by political cordiality. The increase in trade between Tanzania and Uganda was also influenced by the improving relations between Nyerere and Obote. After Idi Amin's coup, the political relations changed, which also impacted the trade between the two states; trade reached only US$3.8 million in 1971 and did not grow much thereafter. With regards to sequencing, this case study demonstrates a clear case wherein political relations (based on regime type) can be an antecedent for trade, and economic interdependence (this has some similarity with the EU, which was a politically-motivated economic entity formed in the wake of WWII), the lack of which can in turn be an antecedent for a conflict between formerly cordial neighbours with

some territorial hang-ups to dispute over. This is thus the unique feature of the Uganda-Tanzania war when compared to the other two case studies studied here.

Eritrea-Ethiopia War. Eritrea likewise demonstrates a case of a coincidence of political and outward economic factors in driving the path to interstate war. By May 1998, the Eritrean constitution had been completed by the Constitutional Commission of Eritrea, and elections were pending and scheduled to take place within a matter of months. At this same time, the living standards of the population were stagnating (from a previous GDP per capita growth rate of 7.972% in 1995 to 1.254%, in a still war-ravaged state). So were exports (from a value of US$25.5 million in the previous year to US$23.3 million by 1997). The new currency, the Nakfa, made trade with Ethiopia virtually impossible as the two countries could not agree on a parity ratio between their two currencies. The existence of a new currency also nullified the existing free trade framework which had been enacted in 1993 between the two states. Further, the currency made the border, hitherto managed and handled at the level of the local governments, salient as free movement was now made a matter of dispute. Thus, these factors all coincided to make the war initiation by Eritrea all but inevitable. The diversion of exports away from Massawa and Assab further made retaliation against Eritrea less costly for Ethiopia.

8.3.3. Hegemonic Stability Thesis

The hegemonic stability theory was found to be of much relevance in the dissertation. To test this out, the dissertation plotted Kenya's military budget – due to Kenya having been the largest economy in the sub-region and due to the assumed correlation between economic size and hegemony in Chapter 3 in section 3.3.1 – alongside that of the rest of the countries in the region, with the aim of determining whether comparative declines in Kenya's military budget would coincide with the three wars under study. That is, the aim was to see whether the Kenyan budget would be relatively less than the warring adversaries at least a year prior to each war outbreak (1976; 1977; and 1997). From the onset of the dataset, Ethiopia had the highest military budget. However, it was taken over by Uganda after 1971. Uganda in turn was superseded by Tanzania, whose military budget was the largest in the region between 1973 and 1979. Within the dataset, Kenya's military budget has never been the largest in the region; it has reached second-largest status on a number of periods: 1977 to 1979, 1987 to 1993, and once more between 2000 and 2003. On the main, the data observes an interesting pattern, from the 1960s to the 1970s, the entire region saw a growth in military budgets, which was then followed by a decline in the 1980s, with the sole exception of Ethiopia, which between 1980 and 1990 had the single-largest military budget. 1994 marked the beginning of another period of growth in military budgets

across the countries, though Eritrea saw the sole dip in military spending in 1997, the year before the outbreak of the Badme conflict. By 1998, the year of the war, Ethiopia and Eritrea had the largest and second-largest military expenditures in the region, respectively. At the same time between 1998 and 2000, Kenya's military expenditure was actually on the decline, from US$263 million in 1998, to US$ US$165 million in 2000. Overall, then, the findings would appear to be consistent with the hypothesis; the comparative lowness of the Kenyan military budget compared with growths in those of belligerents in the region appear to be correlated with an interstate conflict outbreak. This also explains Kenya's lack of capacity to mitigate conflicts even after they have broken out. Indeed, Kenya's offers to mediate were turned down by Tanzania and Kenya could not compel Dar es Salaam to cease its counter-invasion of Uganda. Thus, though Tanzania and Uganda were comparatively poorer than Kenya, both these countries were able to divert considerable spending to military preparation as proportions of their total revenues. Further motives perhaps lay in differences of regimes as "weapons gathered by Amin were also meant to deter internal aggression" (Hansen, 2013: 92). With Kenya on the other hand, "the relations remained rather stable as Kenya took a patient and conciliatory stand in spite of various outburst from Idi Amin, for instance when he claimed that the Luos in western Kenya should belong to Uganda" (Hansen, 2013: 93). Further, Uganda, as a landlocked state depended more on Kenya than on Tanzania, with whom it also had regime differences that Tanzania appeared unwilling to accommodate and was actively working against (i.e., harbouring anti-Amin forces).

The early years of the 1990s saw Kenyan growth in GDP per capita terms slowed down and then stagnate. Decline then occurred in the second half of the 1990s; with nominal GDP only growing by 2.1% in the entire 1995-2001 period, with true signs of recovery only showing in 2003 and then fully in 2005 (Read and Parton, 2009: 571). This means Kenya was not keeping up with the individual averages of 3.8% and 5.3% for Eritrea and Ethiopia, respectively, and overall 4.6% between them both (World Bank, 2019). The latter two were also diverting much of their budgets disproportionally more to military spending. By condition of its economic slowdown, Kenya's government, which had also recently opened up for multiparty elections in the early 1990s and therefore had some domestic audience considerations to bear, could scarcely afford increasing its military expenditure to guarantee regional peace.

The conflict was made more likely by the end of the Cold War, as it led to a less ideologically inclined Russia that was willing to trade with any country. Eritrea spent about US$240-million on weapons imports; "to Russia alone it paid $90m for six MiG-29 fighters, four Mi-17

helicopters and 200 Igla transportable surface-to-air missiles" (*Strategic Comments*, 2000: 1). For its part, "Ethiopia reportedly spent $300m on weapons in this period. It purchased at least 50 standard T-55 tanks from Bulgaria, and 40 T-55s equipped with reactive armour and laser range finders from Belarus. In addition, it purchased eight Su-27 fighter aircraft, 4 Mi-24 helicopter gunships and 8 Mi-8 cargo helicopters from Russia" (*Strategic Comments*, 2000: 1). Both countries also hired foreign mercenaries and advisors. Eritrea hired Russians to help it maintain its surface-to-air missile systems, while Ethiopia contracted with Sukhoi, a Russian company, "for around 100 pilots and aircraft technicians" (*Strategic Comments*, 2000: 1).

With regards to Somalia, Kenya was a vested power with interests and its own rivalries with the region it ought to have ostensibly led. This also drew it closer with another state with a Somali rivalry signified by the 1979 mutual defence pact (see Makinda, 1982: 98). This indicates at least a 'shared regional hegemony' between Kenya and Ethiopia which is at once made inoperable due to overlapping interests and atavistic extra-continental alliances. The Kenyans were "more frightened by the American arms in Somalia than […] by the Soviet arms in Ethiopia" (Makinda, 1982: 9). In the meantime, Kenya continued allowing the Ethiopians "to receive arms shipments through its territory while at the same time denying Somalia access to its airspace" (Valeriano, 2011: 206). At the same time, Ethiopia has had far more active rivalries on which it has been acting. Because of Kenya's prodding, the US, however, limited its supplies to Somalia, as these could hypothetically have been redirected towards Kenya, with whom Somalia had irredentist claims. Thus, we may refer to this as Kenya's client hegemony.

Additionally, with regards to the Horn, Ethiopia – more than Kenya – has been widely viewed as the regional hegemon. This also demonstrates another important factor; the geography of necessity. As a littoral state, Kenya, unlike landlocked Ethiopia, may not have as much to gain from being as active in regional peace-making beyond pacifying its northern border. Yet even here, the necessity of action is more blatant for Ethiopia (see El-Affendi, 2009). The Somaliland dilemma demonstrates this. While both Kenya and Ethiopia are sympathetic to the Somaliland cause, Ethiopia has more to lose or gain; as discussed in Chapter 6, the Somaliland issue has also been a theatre of proxies between Ethiopia and Eritrea. Simultaneously, however, it is a site for another rivalry, in Somaliland, and by extension Egypt, who partially in consistence with the Arab position, is opposed to other states recognising Somaliland (Adam, 2009: 273). However, it is also suggested that "this is arguably due to Egypt's anti-Ethiopian politics over the Nile" (Adam, 2009: 273; discussed in greater depth in section 8.5.3 in this

dissertation). It has also been suggested that Djibouti's economy is inextricably linked to Ethiopian activity in its port:

> The small Red Sea port of Djibouti also cannot be viable without Ethiopia because most of its income is made from the trade via the Addis Ababa-Djibouti railway and Ethiopia's import and export which has now jumped to the previous level of 70 percent of its entire global trade. Even the countries that count when it comes to economic and political power in Africa consider Djibouti's economic importance only as it relates to Ethiopia (Milkias, 2004: 67).

Among the insights made from the findings from the case studies is that we can determine that there appears to be no revealed method for a would-be regional hegemon in East Africa to impose peace *between states*. At best, Kenya has been able to prevent conflicts between itself and other states

8.4. Overall Typology

Table 8.1. Taxonomy of theory relevance on the basis of the dissertation's findings.

Cases **Variables**	**Somalia-Ethiopia**	**Uganda-Tanzania**	**Eritrea-Ethiopia**
Democratic dyad?	NO	NO	NO
Lower ranking scorer initiated conflict?	YES	YES	YES
Significant export market of over 10% for conflict initiator?	NO	NO	NO
Growing export market?	NO	NO	NO
Outbreak of conflict preceded by comparative decline of the GDP of the largest economic entity?	YES	YES	NO

The interrelation among the three theories as presented by the findings in the various case studies are synthesised herein. Two of the three conflicts were initiated by states (Somalia and Eritrea) with no true democracies, but nonetheless with channels of popular expression for war preference – at the root of these lay irredentist claims, which was also the case in Amin-ran Uganda. While all three war initiating states were characterised by undemocratic regimes presiding over societies and legislatures without means through which the path to war, carried out in all cases by the executives, could be halted.




Figure 8.1. Political typology of causes of interstate conflict in East Africa.

This also provides a link to the interdependence theory. In the instance that a domestic audience could not mitigate the war-making inclinations of the regime, the next potential blocker, likewise rooted in the rational choice modus operandi posited by the democratic peace thesis, could be the state against whom a war is being considered. The thesis posited that the presence of an external market for the war-initiating state in the targeted belligerent would mitigate it's the appeal of the war option. In other words, economic interdependence would present an opportunity cost in that going to war with such a state would cause economic loss which would bring about potential economic decline. For states already in economic problems, such options do not present themselves, however. As discovered in the cases, all three of the conflict initiators were in economically dismal stages in their economic history, mostly due to the policies of the regimes in power; in Somalia, it was due to the collectivisation of the economy by the socialist Siad Barre regime, in Uganda it was the 'Economic War' waged against the

Indian merchant class, in combination with declining coffee prices in the global market, and in Eritrea it was due to the effects of the war of independence, combined with the introduction of the Nakfa currency. Given the above summary of the various nodes of the democratic peace thesis, it is worth evaluating which among them would provide linkages with the economic interdependence thesis in the sequencing process. While significant in themselves, factors 1 to 3 are not readily linked to the economic interdependence thesis. Factor 4, however, presents a link to the problem of economic interdependence. In turn, factor 2 (popular support for conflict initiation) determines the other state to which the conflict may be directed; this is the state with whom territorial disputes exist. It is worth restating that none of the territories at the time had revealed mineral or agricultural significance. All the wars were thus *proactive wars* in that the conditions for their occurrence already existed; it was not a matter of the motives for them forming and then being prevented from imploding. As seen, all three regimes were born fighting. Rather, it was a matter of inhibitory factors being needed to bring the path to war to a halt or elimination. These were further buoyed by popular support and lack of institutional constraints. However, the democratic peace literature's assertions on war outcome was found to be consistent with 2 out of 3 the results; particularly when Chiozza and Goemans's (2011: 57) conclusions that "autocratic leaders who initiate conflicts decrease their likelihood of both regular and irregular removal from power, as long as they do not subsequently lose an ensuing war." Similarly, Croco (2011: 457) had found that "culpable leaders—those leaders in power at the beginning of a war or who share a political connection with the leader in power at the beginning of a war—are more likely to be removed from office after losing a war in both democracies and nondemocracies." Eritrea was the main exception in this study. The explanation may lie in a lack of two factors which were found in the previous two wars; a successful counter-invasion, bolstered by a strong opposition. With Eritrea having only a few years of independence (a relatively brief time for opposition to form) and with the few signposts of opposition having been successfully repressed, the Isaias regime may have been insulated in comparison to the Barre and Amin regimes which had such issues.





Figure 8.2. Political-economic typology of interstate conflict in East Africa

Within this typology, factor 1 was present in two of the three cases, while factor 2 was present in all three. On the other hand, factors 3 and 4 were present in all three cases. The "final" additional factor in this sequencing ought to have been a regional actor able to withhold the conflict from being carried out or halted at an early phase. Regional hegemony presents itself in a series of steps throughout the sequence. Hegemony appeared to be relativistic and necessarily expressed in comparative terms; thus regional hegemony, in security terms, appears to not be conferred by virtue of having the largest economy, as this was rendered moot by the poorer states in the region having had larger military budgets in their respective years leading up to wars.



8.3. Political-economic-regional typology of interstate conflict in East Africa

As Kenya is both a littoral and outward-oriented state in terms of its trade, these conditions were both not met. Thus, the findings of the thesis have been consistent with the hegemonic stability theory. The would-be (hypothetical) regional leader was variously outspent by the warring states at the different points; by Uganda and Tanzania in the 1970s, and by Eritrea and Ethiopia in the 1990s. The only exception was Somalia, whose budget was less than that of

Kenya but was still capable of declaring a war on Ethiopia whom it regarded as too weak to defend itself.

8.5. Conclusions

The sections which follows, which is in two sub-sections, explores the implications of the findings made in this dissertation. The first explores theoretical implications, in terms of the vindications made and the modifications necessitated. The second explores the policy relevance of the findings made in the three areas the dissertation studied, namely domestic political institutions, intra-African trade and regional integration have on the security dimension.

8.5.1. Theoretical implications

This dissertation has integrated the hitherto unintegrated information problem as a feature of the democratic peace thesis on an interstate level. The information problem takes on a new dimension in Africa where borders are porous and ethnic groups (whom we may consider as information-carrying agents) are trans-bordered – the very root of the Ogaden War, and a factor of relevance of the Eritrea-Ethiopia War. The dissertation's findings demonstrate a hitherto overlooked factor; that the nature of a regime is not only implicative for itself but also its adversary. In theory, this should lead to more informed decision-making on the basis of an information privilege by the state seeking to initiate a war. However, in both instances, the war-initiating regimes (Somalia and Eritrea) gained information which signalled an opportune moment to initiate a conflict. Both countries, albeit at different points and with different sources of insight (for Somalia the Ogaden and the Western Somalia Liberation Front and for Eritrea its recent history of being a reluctant part of Ethiopia as well as its recent alliance with the TPLF), saw the situation as being ripe for a winnable conflict with Ethiopia.

As mentioned in Chapter 3, one of the challenges for the interdependence thesis, or at least in the literature which espouses it, was the lack of a universal definition of 'interdependence', a concept that is elemental to the very concept of what it argues. Thus, this dissertation sought to discover the threshold levels of non-interdependence; in essence, the state, among all the case studies tested, which had the highest export markets in another state but which still initiated a conflict with it will allow us to detect the minimum amount of trade required, all other things being equal, for conflict to not break out. In this dissertation this was found to be 0.018% in the Somalia-Ethiopia relationship in 1975, two years before their war. On the other hand, Uganda's share in Tanzanian exports was found to be 0.14% in the Uganda-Tanzania relationship, in 1976, also two years before their war, whilst Tanzania's share in Ugandan exports was at 0 from 1971 until after their war. Thus 0.14% stands as the minimum threshold; for war to be unlikely to take place between two polities. Thus, theoretically, in East Africa the country in question must at least have an export share of more than 0.14% in the potential targeted adversary in the dyad if conflict is to be averted.

Chapter 5 of this dissertation also linked research carried out by Rugimbana, Carr, Balitho and Walkom (2000) who found Tanzanians to be disinclined towards products sourced from the East African region. This Chapter therefore makes the theoretical amendment that this may at least indicate an overlap between the democratic peace thesis and the economic interdependence thesis; the domestic audience in any of the prospective adversary states in

their additional capacity as consumers also have a role in determining the degree to which a country will be interdependent with the given external state. This showcases a mediating role for the domestic population as it indicates that their preferential inclinations have an indirect but significant role that should be a factor as trade does not occur in a vacuum.

Another factor worth considering is the degree to which exports were or were not a significant factor within the Somali economy at the time of the immediate (2-5 year) pre-war period. As Chapter 4 demonstrated, in 1975, Somalia's GDP was US$711-million, while in 1976, the country had a total GDP of US$807-million, and by 1977 it had a GDP of US$499-million. There was thus a clear discrepancy between income from exports and the total size of the economy that shows a lack of dependency on exports. This was further widened in 1976 as exports *declined* but the size of the overall economy (as measured by GDP) still grew. Further, in real figures, the disparity was maintained despite the downturn in total GDP in 1977 as both GDP and income from exports declined significantly. This chapter therefore demonstrated that literature on economic interdependence, either on potential belligerents and would-be mediators, ought to take into account the external reliance of the country in question in the first place. As this case demonstrated, while Somalia was an exporting nation prior to the war, these exports were declining in the years leading up to the war – which coincided with the consolidation of power by a regime its leader considered weak and ripe for attack between 1974 and 1977 based on signals of social unrest and mutinies – and they had already had a minimal share within its total GDP. Thus, the absence of trade served as an opportunity cost minimiser for Somalia; the country was not only not interdependent with Ethiopia, it was also not interdependent with any other economy by this time. Thus, just as there were no internal inhibitors to make it refrain from a war path, but there also could be no external, third-party pressure to be exerted on it to curtail its path to war or commitment to war once it was reached.

In similar fashion, Chapter 6 also gave insights to the economic interdependence thesis which indicated that its scope needs to factor in some paradoxical scenarios. Notably by 1997, Eritrea's exports were losing their growth trajectory which had begun in earnest in 1993. But not only were Eritrean exports declining between (from US$25.5 million in 1996 to US$23.3 million by 1997), but also, as Figures 6.2 through to Figure 6.6 demonstrated, Eritrea's trade partners were increasing. This appears paradoxical and may have had a diversifying effect that made a war-making behaviour more likely on the part of Eritrea. Combined with a decrease in the total value of exports and a decrease in their total contribution to the economy, this may have had an opportunity cost-eliminating effect on the country's elite as it firstly, eliminated

any investment in the status quo (since no new gains were being made from trade due to lesser and lower exports) and, secondly, it may have induced a sense of security stemming from the fact that perfect coordination among its now-increased trade partners (among whom the exports were spread out) in a rapid amount of time for any punitive or behaviour-changing sanctions to have effect. Thus these two cases present scenarios hitherto unidentified in the existing literature, as well as the need to expand the scope of the thesis, whilst also making necessary caveats where required; in a situation where there is not much, or any, bilateral trade between the adversaries, this includes a cognizance of the degree to which a country's economy is externally dependent in the first place, and also of the degree to which its trade is spread out among its trade partners.

The dissertation also found the relevance of factoring intra-African political rivalries as more significant than external (extra-continental) actors or even superpowers, as none of the cases studied have ever been demonstrated to have been stoked by either the former colonial powers, the United States or the Soviet Union. Indeed, these players appear to have sought to prevent the conflicts and minimise them once they had broken out. The consideration for a third player to prevent the conflicts from breaking out fell on a theoretical regional hegemon. But Kenya was consistently militarily outspent by the war-preparing or already war-making states. Where successful, it was due to its own security-related reasons rather than as a shared/public goods measure; firstly, through curtailing Ugandan aggression by threatening denial of imports and exports to the landlocked state, and secondly through denying arms imports to Somalia and facilitating arms imports to Ethiopia. Kenya, by virtue of its status as a more principal ally to the US than US-allied Somalia, also encouraged the Carter administration to limit military support to Somalia, whom it characterised as a danger to its own northern frontier. In this way, then, the dissertation also identified the issue of client hegemony by which a hierarchy of allies exist in the region, and the higher-ranking ally is *abler* to influence the supplier with regards to its arms supply to the other states region, who may be a regional rival. Further highlighting the necessity of geography, Kenya has been less active in the region than Ethiopia. Thus, we can see spheres of activity between the two; with Ethiopia being more active in the northeast of the region regarding Somaliland, Eritrea, Djibouti, and even Egypt in north Africa over the Nile.

8.5.2. Limitations of the study

Inasmuch as the present study sought to be comprehensive and has made some modifications to long-held theoretical insights, the present study has some limitations which curtail its scope

for policymaking. Firstly, in this study we selected only for dyadic conflicts in East Africa. By virtue of this, we have left out non-dyadic interactions as well as interstate conflicts in the DRC in the 1990s, as well as the Chad-Libya war that lasted until the late 1980s. Likewise the method of case-selection necessitated a leaving out the Senegal-Mauritania dispute, which was less characterised by a conventional conflict and more by cross-border civilian disputes that saw displacement of populations as well as mass deportations. Moreover, discussions with people who experienced the wars as participants is a future area of research, with many potential insights for the democratic peace thesis in particular. This would thus give us a window into the lived domestic audience experience. In terms of economic interdependence, trade data was not only available but was also sufficient. There is no credible source which traces FDI inflows between the countries studied (e.g., the UNCTAD annual reports follow FDI inflows into Tanzania, Kenya and Uganda) and the offices visited (Ethiopia, Uganda) or otherwise contacted (EAC, Tanzania, Eritrea, and Somalia) in the relevant countries did not have 'FDI by source' data that stretched back to the 1970s in their possession. This is a definite area for further research as it will allow for deepened research if or when the data becomes available.

8.5.3. Contemporary policy relevance of findings

This thesis made findings on economic and political variables and their relevance to security in the continent. Much of the work in this dissertation is theoretical. Nonetheless, the theory-policy nexus can be said to exist, particularly stemming from the notion that the insights made were observations of the empirical world. Much of what informs theory is the aim of drawing correct (and falsifiable) observations about cause and effect and the necessity of correct observation. On the face of it, the developmental and integration agenda of the AU, and the various RECs appear to be in line with maintenance of peace among states. The assumption appears to be that economic growth in other states in the region will not lead to conflict, and democracy is an inhibitor of conflict, and regional integration is an unqualifiable positive. However, the findings present some cautionary tales. Particularly, neighbours are more likely to fight each other due to heightened interaction and geographical contiguity; though with the caveat of ethnic overlap, and territorial salience. Notably, territory has had a tendency to have a latency, and then become salient due to developments either within the territory-seeking state (e.g. economic downturn in Uganda), within the territory-possessing state (e.g., apparent domestic weakness in Ethiopia between 1974 and 1977), as well as between the two states (e.g., the introduction of the nakfa currency in Eritrea which nullified the free trade agreement and investment between Asmara and Addis Ababa). On the other hand, states with different

regime types are more likely to fight each other; thus uneven 'democratisation' can have unintended consequences, though notably this becomes a matter of significance when there are pre-existing issues such as territory and, moreover, if the neighbouring regime is actively aiding opposition forces which are a threat to the neighbouring government. Above all, trade asymmetry, which is a feature of early integration as some regional economies are more capable of exports than others, and a lack of economic interdependence manifest themselves in favour of conflict initiation.

Insights from the twentieth century cases studied in this dissertation provide some insights as to the variables which could lead to escalation on this. As seen, there are some tensions in the contemporary Kenya-Somalia relationship. While these appeared resolved for a time and indeed some cooperation was seen between Mogadishu and Nairobi over the common threat of Al-Shabaab, there nonetheless exist some flashpoints apparently in wait for escalation. At the core of this is the maritime border:

> Somalia contends that its maritime boundary with Kenya should run on a diagonal, extending from its land border and not in the current flow parallel to the line of latitude. The contentious triangle measures about 100, 000 square kilometres; for Kenya, it places 51, 000 sq km of its Exclusive Economic Zone and 95, 000 sq km of its continental shelf in jeopardy (Kiruga, 2019; August 15).

Further intensifying the issue are potential hydrocarbon deposits in the contested area (Kiruga, 2019; August 15). But there also appear to be domestic audience considerations that demonstrate the relevance of the democratic peace thesis. Firstly, in Kenyan media, Somalia's claim has been portrayed as a "land grab", while Somali president Mohamed Abdullahi Mohamed has been characterised as using the dispute "to shore up his position ahead of next year's elections, the first universal suffrage in Somalia since 1969" (Kiruga, 2019; August 15). Overall, reports of the use of the war on terror being used as a pretext for human rights abuses against the Somali minority in Kenya accentuate some issues which may further accentuate the dispute. Throughout the first half of 2019, the two countries engaged in reciprocating moves against each other:

> In February, Kenya recalled its ambassador to Somalia and expelled Somalia's envoy in Nairobi. In May, Kenya suspended direct flights from Somalia to Nairobi. Then it denied entry to three top Somali officials at the Jomo Kenyatta International Airport. In response, Somalia said its officials would no longer attend meetings in Nairobi, and banned all Kenya-based NGOs

> working in the country. In June, Kenya closed its border crossing with Somalia in Lamu citing security concerns (Kiruga, 2019; August 15).

In September, however, after talks organised by President El-Sisi of Egypt and erstwhile chair of the AU, between the presidents of Kenya and Somalia, they agreed to restore their "good brotherly relationship, strengthening the diplomatic and political cooperation" (Ombok, 2019; September 27). "We further agreed to leave the maritime dispute between the two countries to be resolved by the International Court of Justice," said the Somali leader, who also ensured regional players that "Somalia is committed to maintain a good relationship with Kenya and to the rest of the countries in the region" (in Ombok, 2019; September 27). At the time of writing, the ICJ was set to deliberate on the dispute in November 2019.

In related fashion, there has existed water-based continued tensions between Ethiopia and Egypt over the Nile. The lack of a universally acceded framework, with Ethiopian disregard for the colonial era agreements which only account for Sudanese and Egyptian interests, combined with the rapid industrialisation of Ethiopia. In 2011, at the height of the Arab Spring, Ethiopia pronounced the project, to be known as the Grand Ethiopian Renaissance Dam, which was to realise the goal of bringing electricity to some 60% of the country's population. With 2020, the official opening of the dam,

> the specter of a military confrontation has waned and negotiators are instead debating how long the process of filling the dam should take — with Ethiopia planning to fill it in three years and Egypt asking for 15 years to better prepare for the future (Islam, 2019; April 8).

"With the country already facing major water and food scarcities," the GERD is appraised "as a national security threat as well as a stain on Egypt's historical dominance of the revered river" (Islam, 2019; April 8). Between 2011 and 2017, "Politicians in Cairo called for sabotaging the dam. Media outlets in both countries compared the two sides' military strength in anticipation of hostilities" (Islam, 2019; April 8). Over time, things changed, however. A more conciliatory tone has emanated from both sides. "The election last year [2018] of Ethiopia's new prime minister, Abiy Ahmed, further minimized the possibility of conflict" (Islam, 2019; April 8). Prime Minister Abiy also took to Cairo in June of 2018, where he publicly reassured the Egyptian people of Ethiopia's commitment to working with Egyptian leaders to find a mutually equitable sharing scheme and timeframe.

Meanwhile, the Uganda-Rwanda relationship has had its own recent flashpoints and diffusion; probably being the most intense interstate relationship in contemporary sub-Saharan Africa.

The trigger seems to have been a December 2018 document by the UN Group of Experts the DRC that presented findings that the armed wing of the P5, and anti-government group in Rwanda, "was being armed and trained by Uganda, Burundi, and the DRC" (Nantulya, 2019; July 3; Frykberg, 2019; May 27). The P5 military forces are led by General Kayumba Nyamwasa, who is both a former senior member of the Ugandan Army and Chief of Staff of the Rwandan Army. Unlike other Rwandan rebel outfits such as the Interahamwe, the P5 is mainly composed of formerly high-ranking members of the Rwandan Patriotic Front and Rwandan government and served in various departments, including intelligence and the military. Some have also served in Uganda's military and intelligence structures.

In July and December 2018 as well as April 2019, the P5 along with their associated had launched attacks into Rwanda. In the December and April 2019 attacks, they killed two Rwandan soldiers and two civilians respectively (Frykberg, 2019; May 27). Rwanda subsequently captured these rebel leaders and placed them on a military tribunal. Furthermore, in February 2019, Rwanda decided to close its Uganda-facing border, accusing Museveni's government of "harboring Nyamwasa's fighters and arbitrarily detaining and torturing Rwandan nationals—charges Uganda denies" (Nantulya, 2019; July 3). The border was reopened briefly in early June but shut again a few weeks later. Like Kenya's leaders, the government of Rwanda declared travel restrictions for its citizens not to travel to Uganda. By all accounts, this conflict has not emanated from a vacuum as "over the past year [2018-2019], Ugandan President Yoweri Museveni and Rwandan President Paul Kagame have exchanged threats laced with loaded cultural messaging" (Nantulya, 2019; July 3). In many ways, the conflict has some similarities with the Uganda-Tanzania War:

> In May 2019, tensions rose after Uganda protested what it said was an incursion by Rwandan forces onto Ugandan territory, killing two civilians in the border town of Rukiga. Rwanda refuted the claim, saying that it was pursuing a group of smugglers that had illegally crossed over to its side of the border (Nantulya, 2019; July 3).

Further, and in relation to the democratic peace thesis, Paul Nantulya observes that "Reflecting the limited checks and balances in authoritarian governance structures, senior officials on both sides have also escalated their rhetoric rather than serving as moderating influences. This has put the two countries on a war footing" (Nantulya, 2019). A further complicating factor in the relationship, and one which makes the relationship so prone to escalation, is the fact that the bilateral relationship on both sides is handled by military and intelligence personnel. Thus the

lack of civilian involvement curtails the diplomatic options. This gap has tended to be closed by regional mediators, which usually consist of leaders from other countries.

Much like the leaders of Eritrea and Ethiopia,

> Museveni and Kagame share a complicated personal relationship that looms large in this crisis…Kagame served for seven years as Uganda's Deputy Director of Military Intelligence, putting Museveni a step ahead in defeating numerous insurgencies, including the notorious Holy Spirit Movement, which came within 40 miles of bombarding Kampala in 1987. In 1990, Museveni sent Kagame to the U.S. Senior Staff and Command College at Fort Leavenworth, but called him back to command the RPF after its first commander and former Ugandan Deputy Defense Minister, Fred Rwigyema, was killed during a failed invasion of Rwanda (Nantulya, 2019; July 3).

"Rwanda's President Paul Kagame fought in a guerrilla war that brought Museveni's rebel group, the National Resistance Movement, to power in 1986" (Jakachira, 2019; 26 June). Indeed, by some 1984, it was estimated that the NRM was some 33% composed of Rwandan migrants as well as the Banyarwanda (Rwandese-speaking) ethnic group within Uganda (Nantulya, 2019; July 3). Once in power, Museveni "returned the favour and backed Kagame's rebel group, the Rwanda Patriotic Front, to seize power to end the Tutsi genocide" (Jakachira, 2019; 26 June). After the RPF came to power in 1994, the two leaders formed a military alliance under joint command, that undertook a number of campaigns together, most notably the 1997 war against Zaire's Mobutu Sese Seko, bringing Laurent Kabila into power. There were immediate divergences of view, however, over the future course of the DRC:

> These differences grew sharper after the two fell out with Kabila and launched a second rebellion to remove him. Rwanda preferred a "lightning strike," capturing city after city, while Uganda preferred a slower and more protracted battle. The two countries ultimately suspended their Joint Command and disengaged their forces (Nantulya, 2019).

"We defeated them three times," Rwanda's President Kagame stated in a 2019 press statement, while also emphasising "Rwanda's steadfast rejection of a claim by many Ugandan military leaders that the RPF owes them a debt of gratitude for helping it seize power after the 1994 genocide" (Frykberg, 2019; May 27; Nantulya, 2019; July 3). Indeed, Kagame and others in the RPF elite have been constant critics of such sentiments; "Museveni is not the president of Rwanda and will never be" (Nantulya, 2019; July 3).

Economically, the costs of the crisis were already palpable. Uganda's imports from the EAC increased more than 8 percent in the 2017–2018 fiscal year, largely due to trade with Rwanda and Burundi. This is the differentiating factor with the war of 1977. However, this trade is projected to "decrease significantly given the restriction of movement across the Uganda/Rwanda border" (Nantulya, 2019; July 3). Already, by June 2019, Uganda claimed to have already lost some US$664-million worth of exports to Rwanda, while Rwanda had lost US$104-million in the three months since the border had been shut. This could be even more: "data from Uganda's East African Community Affairs Ministry excludes losses incurred by other service providers, such as transporters. Uganda is believed to have over 30 000 professionals and semi-skilled people working in Rwanda" (Jakachira, 2019; 26 June). Rwanda also has a sizeable number of students studying in Uganda who have also been affected (Jakachira, 2019; 26 June). Kenya, who does not have a direct border with Rwanda, has nonetheless been affected "as Kenyan exports through Uganda have been locked out" (Jakachira, 2019; 26 June). The Ugandan president, who was responding to a direct inquiry from a Member of Parliament during his party's "caucus retreat" in Kyankwanzi, said that "Uganda's market for its goods remains big especially in Kenya and Ethiopia" (NTV Uganda, 2019; March 15). He did so in full military regalia, signifying that this was more than a trade war (Nantulya, 2019). Despite an assertion by Mwanda (2019) that "Uganda and Rwanda will most likely degenerate into war," the two leaders apparently resolved the crisis following mediations by regional leaders. Indeed, as the case studies of Ogaden War and the war over the Kagera salient indicated, breakouts in conflict are often preceded by tensions that are diffused for a time but lie in wait for an outbreak in the future. But perhaps given the set of variables that exist, it is a matter of their configuration in a particular manner for the tension to trickle into a conflict. This makes the phenomenon of interstate war in Africa worthy of study perhaps now more than ever before.

Bibliography

Abbay, Alemseged. 2001. ‘‘Not with Them, Not without Them’: The Staggering of Eritrea To Nationhood,’ *Africa: Rivista trimestrale di studi e documentazione dell'Istituto italiano perl’Africa e l’Oriente* 56(4), 459-491.

Abbink, Jon. 1998. ‘An Historical-Anthropological Approach to Islam in Ethiopia: Issues of Identity and Politics,’ *Journal of African Cultural Studies,* 11(2), 109-124.

Aboagye, Festus. 2001. ‘Towards New Peacekeeping Partnerships In Africa?,’ *African Security Review* 10(2), 19-33.

Adam, Hussein M. 2009. ‘Somaliland: An African Struggle for Nationhood and International Recognition,’ *South African Journal of International Affairs* 16(2), 271-274.

Adebajo, A and Mustapha, R (eds.). 2008. *Gulliver’s Troubles: Nigeria’s Foreign Policy after the Cold War*. Scottsville: University of KwaZulu-Natal Press.

Ahluwalia, P.A.L. and Zegeye, Abebe. 2001. ‘Multiparty Democracy in Tanzania,’ *African Security Studies* 10(3), 34-47.

Alence, Rod. 2006. ‘SACU and the Political Economy of Regionalism: Towards Deeper and Broader Integration?,’ SAIIA Trade Policy Briefing. Johannesburg: South African Institute of International Affairs.

Allison, Graham. 2017. *Destined for War: Can America and China Escape Thucydides's Trap?* Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.

Allison, Graham and Zelikow, Philip. 1999. *Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis (2nd Edition)*. New York: Pearson.

Amusan, Lere and Oyewole, Samuel. 2014. ‘The Quest for Hegemony and the Future of African Solutions to African Development Problems: Lessons from Headways in the African Security Sector,’ *Journal of Asian and African Studies* 52(1), 21-33.

Anderson, David M. and Rolandsen, Øystein H. 2014. ‘Violence as politics in eastern Africa, 1940–1990: legacy, agency, contingency,’ *Journal of Eastern African Studies* 8(4), 539-557.

Ani, N. C. and Matambo, E. 2016. ‘African Solutions,’ *Journal of Africa Union Studies* 5(1): 83-111.

Apuuli, Kasaija Philip. 2017. 'Uganda in Regional and International Peacekeeping Operations,' *The Round Table* 106(5), 505-515.

Ashworth A. 1968. 'The sociology of trench warfare, 1914-1918,' *British Journal of Sociology* 19(4), 407-423.

Avirgan, Tony and Honey, Martha. 1983. *War in Uganda: The Legacy of Idi Amin*. Toronto: Lawrence Hill & Co.

Bahru, Zewde. 2001. *A History of Modern Ethiopia, 1855-1974*. Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University Press.

Barbieri, Katherine. 1996. Economic Interdependence: A Path to Peace or a Source of International Conflict? *Journal of Peace Research* 33 (1):29–49.

Barbieri, Katherine, and Jack S. Levy. 1999. Sleeping with the Enemy: The Impact of War on Trade. *Journal of Peace Research* 36 (4): 463–79.

Barbieri, Katherine, and Gerald Schneider. 1999. 'Globalization and Peace: Assessing New Directions in the Study of Trade and Conflict,' *Journal of Peace Research* 36 (4): 387–404.

Batten, J. and Kearney, C. 2006. 'Interdependence and Integration in Emerging European Financial Markets,' *International Finance Review*, 6 (1): 1-14.

Biles, Peter. 1991 (May 29). 'Addis Ababa falls to dawn onslaught,' *The Guardian*. Available at: https://www.theguardian.com/theguardian/1991/may/29/fromthearchive (Last accessed: 1 May 2019)

Blanchard, Jean-Marc F. 2005. 'Linking Border Disputes and War: An Institutional-Statist Theory,' *Geopolitics*, 10:4, 688-711.

Bouttin, Andrew. 2014. 'US foreign aid, interstate rivalry, and incentives for counterterrorism cooperation,' *Journal of Peace Research* 51(6), 741–754.

Bouzid, Bechar. 'Modelling the Duration of Conflicts Between Contiguous Antagonists: Reassessing the Role of Salient Borders and Political Regimes,' *Defence Studies*, 14(1), 1-29.

Boyle, Emma Leonard. 2017. 'Was Idi Amin's Government a Terrorist Regime?,' *Terrorism and Political Violence* 29(4), 593-609.

Bradley, Matthew Todd. 2007. 'Globalization and Political Elite Institutional Choices: The Impact on Democratization in Africa and the Middle East,' *Journal of International and Area Studies*, 14(2), 91-102.

Braithwaite, Alex. 2005. 'Location, Location, Location…Identifying Hot spots of International Conflict,' *International Interactions*, 31(3), 251-273.

Brands, Hal. 2018a. *American Grand Strategy in the Age of Trump*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.

Brands, Hal. 2018b. 'The Chinese Century?' *The National Interest*, 1 March-April: https://nationalinterest.org/feature/the-chinese-century-24557. (Last accessed: 29 December 2018).

Brecher, Michael, Peranson, Mark and Emelifeonwu, David. 1995. 'Profiles of interstate crises, 1918–1988,' *International Interactions*, 20(4), 375-401.

Brodie, B. 1973. *War and Politics*. London: Cassell.

Bryden, Matt and Brickhill, Jeremy. 2010. 'Disarming Somalia: lessons in stabilisation from a collapsed state,' *Conflict, Security and Development* 10(2), 239-262.

Bueno de Mesquita, Bruce and David Lalman. 1992. 'Domestic Opposition and Foreign War,' *American Political Science Review*, *84*, 747-766.

Bueno de Mesquita, Bruce. 1981. *The War Trap*. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press.

Bueno de Mesquita, Bruce, and David Lalman. 1992. *War and Reason: Domestic and International Imperatives*. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press.

Burke, Jason and Henley, Jon. 2019 (October 11). 'Abiy Ahmed, Ethiopia's Prime Minister, Wins 2019 Nobel Peace Prize,' *The Guardian*. Available at: https://theguardian.com/world/2019/oct/11/abiy-ahmed-ethiopian-prime-minister-wins-2019-nobel-peace-prize (Last accessed: 12 October 2019).

Butcher, Charity and Maru, Makda. 2018. 'Diversionary Tactics and the Ethiopia–Eritrea War (1998–2000),' *Small Wars & Insurgencies* 29(1), 68-90.

Carter, Jeff. 2017. 'The Political Cost of War Mobilization in Democracies and Dictatorships,' *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 61(8), 1768-1794.

Chan, Steve. 1997. 'In Search of Democratic Peace: Problems and Promise,' *Mershon International Studies Review*, 41: 59-91.

Chiozza, Giacomo, and Goemans, H. E. 2004. 'International Conflict and the Tenure of Leaders: Is War Still Ex Post Inefficient?,' *American Journal of Political Science* 48(3), 604-19.

Chiozza, Giacomo, and Goemans, H. E. 2011. *Leaders and International Conflict*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Clapham, Christopher. 2017. *The Horn of Africa: State Formation and Decay*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Cohen, Raymond. 1994. 'Pacific Unions. A Reappraisal of the Theory "Democracies Do Not Go to War with Each Other",' *Review of International Studies* 20(1), 207-223.

Collier, David. 2011. 'Understanding Process Tracing,' *Political Science and Politics* 44(4), 823-830.

Collier, David, LaPorte, Jody and Seawright, Jason. 2012. 'Putting Typologies to Work: Concept Formation, Measurement, and Analytic Rigor,' *Political Research Quarterly 65(1)*, 217–232.

Connell, Dan. 1997. *Against All Odds: A Chronicle of the Eritrean Revolution*. Asmara: Red Sea Press.

Cornelissen, Scarlett. 2017. 'Book Review: Small states in the international system: At peace and at war,' *South African Journal of International Affairs* 24(4), 550-552.

Craft, Cassady and Smaldone, Joseph. 2010. 'Arms imports in sub-Saharan Africa: Predicting conflict involvement,' *Defence and Peace Economics*, 14:1, 37-49.

Croco, Sarah E. 2011. 'The Decider's Dilemma: Leader Culpability, War Outcomes, and Domestic Punishment,' *The American Political Science Review* 105(3), 457-477.

Curry, Steve. 1982. 'The terms of trade and real import capacity of the tourism sector in Tanzania,' *The Journal of Development Studies* 18(4), 479-496.

D'Anieri, Paul. 2013. *International Politics: Power and Purpose in Global Affairs 3rd Edition*. Boston, MA: Wadsworth Publishing.

Dahl, Robert A. 1971. *Polyarchy*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Darnion, John. 1978 (November 28). 'Uganda Charges a Tanzanian Invasion,' *New York Times*. Available at: https://www.nytimes.com/1978/11/28/archives/uganda-charles-a-tanzanian-invasion-fighting-said-to-be-in-tanzania.html (Last accessed: 4 October 2019).

Debs, Alexandre, and Goemans, H. E. 2010. 'Regime Type, the Fate of Leaders and War,' *American Political Science Review* 104(3), 430-45.

Dercon, Stefan and Ayalew, Daniel. 1998. 'Where have all the soldiers gone: Demobilization and reintegration in Ethiopia,' *World Development*, 26(9), 1661-1675.

De Waal, A. 1991. *Evil days: 30 Years of War and Famine in Ethiopia*. New York, NY: Human Rights Watch.

Dirar, Uoldelul Chelati. 2004. 'From Warriors to Urban Dwellers: "Ascari" and the Military Factor in the Urban Development of Colonial Eritrea (Des guerriers devenus résidents urbains. Les ascaris et lefacteur militaire dans le développement urbain de l'Érythrée),' *Cahiers d'Études Africaines* 44(175), 533-574.

Dixon, D. M. 1964. 'The Origin of the Kingdom of Kush (Napata-Meroë),' *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 50(1), 121-132.

Dorussen, Han. 1999. 'Balance of Power Revisited: A Multi-Country Model of Trade and Conflict,' *Journal of Peace Research* 36 (4):443–62.

Doyle, Michael W. 1986. 'Liberalism and World Politics,' *American Political Science Review, 80*, 1151-1169.

El-Affendi, Abdelwahab. 2009. 'The Perils of Regionalism: Regional Integration as a Source of Instability in the Horn of Africa? *Journal of Intervention and Statebuilding*, 3(1): 1–19.

Elbadawi, Ibrahim. 1997. 'The Impact of Regional Trade and Monetary Schemes on Intra-Sub-Saharan Africa Trade,' in Ademola Oyejide, Ibrahim Elbadawi, and Paul Collier (Eds.), *Regional Integration and Trade Liberalization in Sub-Saharan Africa, Volume 1*. London: Macmillan, 210-255.

Engel, Ulf. 2014. 'The African Union, the African Peace and Security Architecture, and Maritime Security,' *African Security* 7(3), 207-227.

Erlich, Haggai. 2006. *Saudi Arabia And Ethiopia: Islam, Christianity, and Politics Entwined*. London: Lynne Rienner Pub.

Farber, S. Henry & Joanne Gowa. 1995. *Politics and Peace, International Security, 20* (2), 123-146.

Farrell, Henry and Newman, Abraham L. 2019. 'Weaponized Interdependence: How Global Economic Networks Shape State Coercion,' *International Security*, 44(1), 42-79.

Ferguson, Niall. 2015. *Kissinger, 1923-1968: The Idealist*. London: Penguin Books.

Flemes, D. 2007. 'Emerging Middle Powers' Soft Balancing Strategy: State and Perspectives of the IBSA Dialogue Forum,' *GIGA Working Paper No. 57*. Available at: https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1007692 (Last accessed: 27 October 2019).

Frank, Kevin K. 2015. 'Ripeness and the 2008 Djibouti-Eritrea Border Dispute,' *Northeast African Studies* (15)1, 113-138.

Franke, B.F. 2009. 'Security Cooperation in Africa: A Reappraisal.' Accessed from https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Security-Cooperation-in-Africa%3A-A-Reappraisal-Franke/d65ae8c4700c0e43edfc28d19167ffcdc346c119 (accessed: 20 June. 2020).

Frantz, Erica and Kendall-Taylor, Andrea. 2017. 'Pathways to democratization in personalist dictatorships,' *Democratization* 24(1), 20-40.

Frederick, Bryan A, Hensel, Paul R and Macaulay, Christopher. 2017. 'The Issue Correlates of War Territorial Claims Data, 1816–2011,' *Journal of Peace Research* 54(1), 99–108.

Frykberg, Mel. 2019 (May 27). 'Border killings stoke Uganda-Rwanda tensions,' *IOL News*. Available at: https://www.iol.co.za/news/africa/border-killings-stoke-uganda-rwanda-tensions-24185412 (Last accessed: 22 September 2019).

Fuller, D.Q. 1997. 'The Confluence of History and Archaeology in Lower Nubia: Scales of Continuity and Change,' *Archaeological Review* 14 (1), 105-128

Gasbarri, Flavia. 2018. 'From the Sands of the Ogaden to Black Hawk Down: The End of the Cold War in the Horn of Africa,' *Cold War History* 18(1), 73-89.

Gartzke, Erik. 1998. 'Kant We All Just Get Along? Opportunity, Willingness, and the Origins of the Democratic Peace,' *American Journal of Political Science* 42 (1):1–27.

Gartzke, Erik, and Dong-Joon Jo. 2000. 'Tipping the Scale: Signaling and the Democratic Peace.' Unpublished manuscript, Pennsylvania State University.

Gartzke, Erik, Quan Li, and Charles Boehmer. 2001. “Investing in the Peace: Economic Interdependence and International Conflict,” *International Organization* 55(2), 391–438.

Gasiorowski, Mark J. 1986. ‘Economic Interdependence and International Conflict: Some Cross-National Evidence,’ *International Studies Quarterly* 30 (1):23–38.

Gebrewold, Belachew. 2010. ‘The Cynicism of “African Solutions for African Problems,’ *African Security* 3(2), 80-103.

George, Alexander L. and Bennett, Andrew. 2005. *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.

Geva, Nehemia, DeRouen, Karl R. and Mintz, Alex. 1993. ‘The political incentive explanation of “democratic peace”: Evidence from experimental research,’ *International Interactions,* 18(3), 215-229.

Ghervas, Stella. 2017. ‘Balance of Power vs. Perpetual Peace: Paradigms of European Order from Utrecht to Vienna, 1713–1815,’ *The International History Review*, 39:3, 404-425.

Gibler, Douglas M. 2017. ‘What they fight for: Specific territorial issues in militarized interstate disputes, 1816–2001,’ *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 34(2), 194–211.

Gibbon, Edward (ed. by Saunders, Dero A.). 1952. *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*. New York: The Viking Portable Library.

Gilkes, Patrick. 1991. ‘Eritrea: Historiography and Mythology,’ *African Affairs* 90(361), 623-628.

Gilpin, Robert. 1981. *War and Change in World Politics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Gilpin, Robert. 1987. *The Political Economy of International Relations*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Gilpin, Robert. 1988. ‘The Theory of Hegemonic War,’ *Journal of Interdisciplinary History 18* (4): 591-613.

Goertz, Gary and Diehl, Paul F. 1995. “The Initiation and Termination of Enduring Rivalries: The Impact of Political Shocks,” *American Journal of Political* Science 39(1), 30-52.

Goldstein, Joshua S. 2012. *Winning the War on War: The Decline of Armed Conflict Worldwide*. New York: Plume.

Gordin, Michael D. 2007. *Five Days in August: How World War II Became a Nuclear War*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Gray, Alex. 2019 (May 4). 'Ethiopia is Africa's fastest-growing economy,' World Economic Forum. Available at: https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2018/05/ethiopia-africa-fastest-growing-economy/ (Last accessed: 11 August 2019).

Green, Elliott. 2015. 'Decentralization and Development in Contemporary Uganda,' *Regional & Federal Studies*, 25(5), 491-508.

Hagmann, Tobias. 2014. 'Punishing the periphery: legacies of state repression in the Ethiopian Ogaden,' *Journal of Eastern African Studies* 8(4), 725-739.

Haile, Semere. 1987. 'The Origins and Demise of the Ethiopia-Eritrea Federation,' *Issue: A Journal of Opinion* 15(1), 9-17.

Hansen, Holger Bernt. 2013. 'Uganda in the 1970s: a decade of paradoxes and ambiguities,' *Journal of Eastern African Studies* 7(1), 83-103.

Healy, Sally. 2009. 'Peacemaking in the Midst of War: An Assessment of IGAD's Contribution to Regional Security,' Crisis States Working Papers Series, Working Paper no. 59 London School of Economics.

Hellman, Gunther. 2003. 'Are Dialogue and Synthesis Possible in International Relations?,' *International Studies Review* 5(1), 123–153.

Henderson, Errol. 2008. 'Disturbing the Peace: African Warfare, Political Inversion and the Universality of the Democratic Peace Thesis,' *British Journal of Political Science* 39(1), 25–58.

Henderson, Errol A. 2015. *African Realism? International Relations Theory and Africa's Wars in the Postcolonial Era*. Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield.

Hendricks, Karel. 2012. 'African Vultures: The New Prevalence of Interstate War in Africa,' *Amsterdam Social Science* 4(1), 49-66.

Herbst, Jeffrey. 2000. *States and Power in Africa*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Hermann, Margaret G. and Charles W. Kegley, Jr. 1995. 'Rethinking Democracy and International Peace: Perspectives from Political Psychology,' *International Studies Quarterly, 39*, 511-534.

Hermann, R. K. 2002. 'Linking Theory to Evidence in IR,' (p. 119-136) in W. Carlsnaes, T. Risse, and B. Simmons (Eds.), Handbook of International Relations. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Hermassi, E. 1976. 'Towards a comparative study of revolutions', *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 18(1), 211–35.

Hughes, A. J. 1964. *East Africa: The Search for Unity*. London: Penguin.

Hundle, Anneeth Kaur. 2013. 'Exceptions to the expulsion: violence, security and community among Ugandan Asians, 1972–79,' *Journal of Eastern African Studies* 7(1), 164-182.

Huntington, Samuel. 1991. *Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century*. Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press.

Igunza, Emmanuel. 2019 (11 October). Nobel Peace Prize: Ethiopia PM Abiy Ahmed Wins, BBC News. Available at: https://bbc.com/news/world-africa-50013273 (Last accessed: 12 October 2019).

International Institute for Strategic Studies. 1976. 'The Military Balance (Volume 76),' London: International Institute for Strategic Studies.

International Institute for Strategic Studies. 1977. 'The Military Balance (Volume 77),' London: International Institute for Strategic Studies.

International Peace Bureau. 2012. 'Opportunity Costs: Military Spending and The UN's Development Agenda – A view from the International Peace Bureau.' Geneva: International Peace Bureau.

Ikome, Francis Nguendi. 2012. 'Africa's international borders as potential sources of conflict and future threats to peace and security,' Institute for Security Studies No. 233.

Islam, Salma. 2019 (April 8). 'The Ethiopians are building a massive dam, and Egypt is worried,' *Los Angeles Times*. Available at: https://www.latimes.com/world/la-fg-egypt-ethiopia-nile-dam-20190408-story.html (Available at: 28 September 2019).

Iyob, Ruth. 1995. *The Eritrean Struggle for Independence: domination, resistance, nationalism, 1941–93*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jakachira, Kelvin. 2019 (June 26). 'Stand-off costs Uganda and Rwanda,' *IOL News*. Available at: https://www.iol.co.za/news/opinion/stand-off-costs-uganda-and-rwanda-27640655 (Last accessed: 15 September 2019).

James, Patrick, Brecher, Michael and Hoffman, Tod. 1988. 'International crises in Africa, 1929–1979: Immediate severity and long-term importance,' *International Interactions* 14(1), 51-84.

Jaynes, Gregory. 1979 (December 20). 'Uganda War Broke Tanzania's Treasury but Not Its Spirit,' *New York Times*. Available at: https://www.nytimes.com/1979/12/20/archives/uganda-war-broke-tanzanias-treasury-but-not-its-spirit-uganda-war.html (Last accessed: 4 October 2019).

Jesse, Neal G and Dreyer, John R. 2016. *Small States in the International System: At Peace and at War*. Lanham: Lexington Books.

Jhazbhay, Iqbal M. 2007. Somaliland: Post-war nation-building and international relations, 1991-2006. PhD Thesis: Wits University, Johannesburg.

Jhazbhay, Iqbal M. 2009. *Somaliland: An African Struggle for Nationhood and International Recognition.* Johannesburg: Institute for Global Dialogue.

Jupille, J., Caporaso, J. A., and Checkel, Jeffrey T. 2003. 'Integrating Institutions: Rationalism, Constructivism, and the Study of the European Union,' *Comparative Political Studies* 36(1/2), 7-40.

Kant, Immanuel. 1795. 'Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Sketch.' Available at the Mount Holyoke College website: https://www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/kant/kant1.htm (Last accessed: 27 January 2019).

Kappel, R. 2011. 'The Challenge to Europe: Regional Powers and the Shifting of the Global Order,' *Intereconomics*, *46*, 275-286.

Karugire, Samwiri R. 1996. *Roots of Instability in Uganda*. Kampala, Uganda: Fountain Publishers.

Kebebew, Tadesse. 2018 (December). 'The Eritrea–Ethiopia Armed Conflict,' The Geneva Academy. Available at: https://www.geneva-academy.ch/joomlatools-files/docman-files/The%20Eritrea%E2%80%93Ethiopia%20Armed%20Conflict.pdf (Last accessed: 8 October 2019).

Kelsall, Tim. 2003. 'Governance, democracy and recent political struggles in Mainland Tanzania,' *Commonwealth & Comparative Politics* 41(2), 55-82.

Keohane, Robert O. 1984. *After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Khalif, Mohamud H. 2000. 'The politics of famine in the Ogaden,' *Review of African Political Economy* 27(84), 333-337.

Khadiagala, Gilbert M. 1993. 'Uganda's Domestic and Regional Security Since the 1970s,' *The Journal of Modem African Studies* 31(2), 231—255.

Khadiagala, Gilbert M. 2001. 'Foreign Policy Decisionmakiing in Southern Africa's Fading Frontline,' in Khadiagala, Gilbert M. and Lyons Terrence (Eds.), *African Foreign Policies*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner, 131-158.

Khadiagala, Gilbert M. 2014. 'South Sudan: The Perils of New States,' *E-IR*. Available at: https://www.e-ir.info/2014/04/15/south-sudan-the-perils-of-new-states/ (Last accessed: 9 May 2019).

Killian, Bernadeta. 2008. 'The state and identity politics in Zanzibar: challenges to democratic consolidation in Tanzania,' *African Identities* 6(2), 99-125.

Kindleberger, Charles P. 1973. *The World in Depression 1929-1939*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

King, Gary, Robert O. Keohane, and Sidney Verba. 1994. *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Kiruga, Morris. 2019 (August 13). 'Kenya and Somalia's maritime border spat risks degenerating,' *The Africa Report*. Available at: https://www.theafricareport.com/16164/kenya-and-somalias-maritime-border-spat-risks-degenerating/ (Last accessed: 28 September 2019).

Kornprobst, Markus. 2002. 'The Management of Border Disputes in African Regional Subsystems: Comparing West Africa and the Horn of Africa,' *Journal of Modern African Studies* 40 (3), 369-393.

Kuwali, Dan. 2008. 'The conundrum of conditions for intervention under article 4(h) of the African Union Act,' *African Security Studies* 17(4), 89-111.

Lai, B. and Slater, D. 2011. 'Institutions of the Offensive,' *International Political Science Review* 32(3), 303–21.

Laitin, David D. and Samatar, Said S. 1987. *Somalia: Nation in Search of a State*. Boulder, Colo.: Westview or Gower.

Lake, David A. 2013. 'Theory is dead, long live theory: The end of the Great Debates and the rise of eclecticism in International Relations,' *European Journal of International Relations* 19(3), 567–587.

Larebo, Haile. 1986. 'The Orthodox Church and the state in the Ethiopian revolution, 1974-84,' *Religion in Communist Lands* 14(2), 148-159.

Laruni, Elizabeth. 2015. 'Regional and ethnic identities: the Acholi of Northern Uganda, 1950–1968,' *Journal of Eastern African Studies* 9(2), 212-230.

Lata, Leenco. 2003. 'The Ethiopian-Eritrea war,' *Review of African Political Economy* 30(97), 369-388.

Layne, Christopher. 1994. 'Kant or Cant: The Myth of Democratic Peace,' *International Security* 19 (2), 5-49.

Le Gouriellec, Sonia. 2018. 'Regional power and contested hierarchy: Ethiopia, an 'imperfect hegemon' in the Horn of Africa,' *International Affairs* 94(5), 1059–1075.

Legum, C. 1967. *Africa: A Handbook*. London: Anthony Blond.

Lehnert, Matthias. 2007. 'Typologies in Social Inquiry,' in Gschhewend, T. and Schimmelfennig, F. (Eds.) *Research Design in Political Science: How to Practice What They Preach*. Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 62-82.

Levy, Jack S. 1989. 'The Causes of War: A Review of Theories and Evidence,' in *Behaviour, Society and Nuclear War*, Tetlock et al. (Eds.) New York: Oxford University Press.

Levy, Jack S. 2010. *Causes of War*. New York: Wiley-Blackwell.

Lewis, I.M. 1980. *A Modern History of Somalia*. London: Longman.

Lie, Jon Harald Sande. 2015. 'Developmentality: indirect governance in the World Bank–Uganda partnership,' *Third World Quarterly* 36(4), 723-740.

Linz, Juan and Alfred Stepan. 1996. *Problems of Democratic Transition and Consolidation*. Princeton, N.J.: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Lipset, Seymour M. 1994. 'The Social Requisites of Democracy Revisited,' *American Sociological Review* 59(1), 1-22.

Lloyd, Alan B. 2010a. 'The Reception of Pharaonic Egypt in Classical Antiquity,' (p. 1065-1085), in Alan B. Lloyd *A Companion to Ancient Egypt*. Malden, MA: Wiley.

Llyod, Robert B. 2010. 'Conflict in Africa,' *The Journal of the Middle East and Africa*, 1(2), 171-186.

Lobban, Richard. 1976. 'The Eritrean War: Issues and Implications,' *Canadian Journal of African Studies*, 10(2), 335-346.

Lockyer, Adam. 2018. 'Opposing Foreign Intervention's Impact on the Warfare in Civil Wars: the case of the Ethiopian-Ogaden Civil War, 1976–1980,' *African Security* 11(2), 181-199.

Lodompui, Jonathan. 2010. 'Tanzania's National Interest and The Collapse of East African Community.' Thesis: Nairobi University.

Luckham, Robin and Bekele, Dawit. 1984. 'Foreign powers and militarism in the horn of Africa: part I,' *Review of African Political Economy* 11(30), 8-20.

Luckham, Robin and Bekele, Dawit. 1984. 'Foreign powers and militarism in the horn of Africa: part II,' *Review of African Political Economy* 11(31), 7-28.

Lupogo, Herman. 2001. 'Tanzania: Civil-military relations and political stability,' *African Security Studies* 10(1), 75-86.

Lwanga-Lunyiigo, Samwiri. 2015. *A History of the Democratic Party of Uganda: The First Thirty Years (1954-1984)*. Oxford: Fountain Publishers.

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

Magu, Stephen M. 2015. 'Dilemmas of East African Cooperation: Domestic Audience and Prisoner's Dilemma Approaches on Regional Integration,' *African Studies*, 74(3), 388-403.

Makinda, Samuel M. 1982. 'Conflict and the superpowers in the horn of Africa,' *Third World Quarterly* 4(1), 93-103.

Makinda, Samuel M. 1983. 'Book review: *Eritrea: Africa's Longest War* by David Pool,' *Third World Quarterly* 5(3), 724-725.

Mansfield, Edward D., Pevehouse, Jon C., and Bearce, David H.. 2000. Preferential Trading Arrangements and Military Disputes. Security Studies 9 (1–2):96–118.

Maoz, Zeev. 1997. 'The Controversy Over the Democratic Peace: Rearguard Action or Cracks in the Wall?,' *International Security* 22(1), 162-198.

Maoz, Zeev and Abdolai, Nasrin. 1989. 'Regime Types and International Conflict,' 1816-1976, *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 33(1), 3-35.

Marwala, Tshilidzi and Lagazio, Monica. 2011. *Militarized ConflictModeling using Computational Intelligence*. London: Springer-Verlag.

Mehary, Tesfa-Yesus, Rao, Pulapa Subba, Pardhasaradhi, Y. and Tesfay, Henock. 1999. 'Human Resource Management Practices in Small and Medium Sized Industrial Units in Eritrea,' *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations* 34(3), 303-323.

Mello, Patrick A. 2010. 'In search of new wars: The debate about a transformation of war,' *European Journal of International Relatio*ns 16(2), 297–309.

Melin, Molly M. and Svensson, Isak. 2009. 'Incentives for Talking: Accepting Mediation in International and Civil Wars,' *International Interactions* 35(3), 249-271.

Mengistu, Muhabie Mekonnen. 2015. 'The Root Causes of Conflicts in the Horn of Africa,' *American Journal of Applied Psychology* 4(2), 28-34.

Menkhaus, Ken. 2014. 'Calm between the storms? Patterns of political violence in Somalia, 1950–1980,' *Journal of Eastern African Studies* 8(4), 558-572.

Meredith, Martin. 2006. *The State of Africa: A History of Fifty Years of Independence*. Johannesburg and Cape Town: Johnathan Ball Publishers.

Michaelis, Anthony R. 1990. 'If Peace Breaks Out,' *Interdisciplinary Science Reviews* 15(1), 1-5.

Milkias, Paulos. 2004. 'U.S. Foreign Policy Towards Africa with Emphasis on Ethiopia and Eritrea,' *International Journal of Ethiopian Studies* 1(2), 58-81.

Milner, C., Morrissey, O. and Rudaheranwa, N. 2000. 'Policy and Non-Policy Barriers to Trade and Implicit Taxation of Exports in Uganda,' *Journal of Development Studies* 37(2), 67-90.

Mitchell, Sara McLaughlin and Thyne, Clayton L. 2010. 'Contentious Issues as Opportunities for Diversionary Behavior,' *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 27(5), 461–485.

Moaz, Zeev. 1997. 'The Controversy over the Democratic Peace: Rearguard Action or Cracks in the Wall?,' *International Security* 22(1): 162-198.

Modelski, George. 1978. *The Long Cycle of Global Politics and the Nation-State*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mohanty, Pramod Kumar and Andemichael, Aron. 2010. 'Colonialism and Land in Africa: A Case of Italian Land Policy in Eritreanhighlands,' *Proceedings of the Indian History Congress* 71(1), 950-958.

Montesquieu, Charles-Louis. 1748 [2001]. *The Spirit of the Laws*. Ontario: Botache Books. Translated by Thomas Nugent. Available at: https://socialsciences.mcmaster.ca/econ/ugcm/3ll3/montesquieu/spiritoflaws.pdf (Last accessed: 10 June 2019).

Monyae, David. 2014. "Learning to Lead: South Africa's Role in Africa - Lesotho, Zimbabwe, Burundi and the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) Case Studies (1994-2008)," PhD Thesis: University of the Witwatersrand.

Moravcsik, Andrew. 2003. 'Are Dialogue and Synthesis Possible in International Relations?' *International Studies Review* 5, 123–153.

Morgan, Clifton and Schwebach, Valerie. 1992. 'Take Two Democracies and Call Me in the Morning,' *International Interactions* 17(4), 305-20.

Morrow, James D. 1999. 'How Could Trade Affect Conflict?' *Journal of Peace Research* 36 (4), 481–89.

Most, Benjamin A. and Starr, Harvey. 1989. *Inquiry, Logic, and International Politics*. Columbia, South Carolina: University of South Carolina Press.

Mugambi, Lee Mwiti. 2015. 'Hegemony and Regional Stability In Africa: A Critical Analysis of Kenya, Nigeria And South Africa As Regional Hegemons,' Dissertation: University of Nairobi.

Mukangara, Daudi. 2005. *Strengthening parliamentary democracy in SADC countries: Tanzania country report*. Braamfontein: South African Institute of International Affairs.

Müller, Tanja R. 2008. 'Bare Life and the Developmental State: Implications of the Militarisation of HigherEducation in Eritrea,' *The Journal of Modern African Studies* 46(1), 111-131.

Murphy, Sean D. 2016. 'The Eritrean-Ethiopian War (1998-2000),' in Olivier Corten and Tom Ruys (eds.), *International Law and the Use of Force: A Case-Based Approach.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Museveni, Yoweri Kaguta. 1997. *Sowing the Mustard Seed: The Struggle for Freedom and Democracy in Uganda*. London: Macmillan Education.

Mwenda, Andrew M. 2019 (March 13). 'Inside the Rwanda-Uganda conflict,' *IOL News*. Available at: https://www.iol.co.za/news/opinion/inside-the-rwanda-uganda-conflict-19865757 (Last accessed: 22 September 2019).

Nantulya, Paul. 2019 (July 3). 'Escalating Tensions between Uganda and Rwanda Raise Fear of War,' Africa Center for Strategic Studies. Available at: https://africacenter.org/spotlight/escalating-tensions-between-uganda-and-rwanda-raise-fear-of-war/ (Last accessed: 22 September 2019).

NTV Uganda. 2019 (15 March). 'Uganda will find better markets - Museveni on Rwanda border standoff,' YouTube. Available at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JuW4QLZMF6U (Last accessed: 28 September 2019).

O'Connor D. 1993. *Ancient Nubia: Egypt's Rival in Africa*. Philadelphia: University Museum, University of Pennsylvania.

O'Gorman, Melanie. 2012. 'Why the CCM won't lose: the roots of single-party dominance in Tanzania,' *Journal of Contemporary African Studies* 30(2), 313-333.

O'Loughlin, John and Anselin, Luc. 1991. 'Bringing geography back to the study of international relations: Spatial dependence and regional context in Africa, 1966–1978,' *International Interactions*, 17(1), 29-61.

Obote, Milton. 1968. *Common Man's Charter*. Available at: https://web.archive.org/web/20110727195757/http://www.radiorhino.org/htm_material/archiv/text/press/monitor/THE%20COMMON%20MAN%20CHARTER%20By%20DrAMO.htm (Last accessed: October 5 2019).

Observatory of Economic Complexity. 2019. 'Where does Ethiopia import from? (1969),' MIT Observatory of Economic Complexity. Available at: https://oec.world/en/visualize/tree_map/sitc/import/eth/show/all/1969/ (Last accessed: 21 June 2019).

Observatory of Economic Complexity. 2019. 'Where does Ethiopia import from? (1970),' MIT Observatory of Economic Complexity. Available at: https://oec.world/en/visualize/tree_map/sitc/import/eth/show/all/1970/ (Last accessed: 21 June 2019).

Observatory of Economic Complexity. 2019. 'Where does Ethiopia import from? (1971),' MIT Observatory of Economic Complexity. Available at: https://oec.world/en/visualize/tree_map/sitc/import/eth/show/all/1971/ (Last accessed: 21 June 2019).

Observatory of Economic Complexity. 2019. 'Where does Ethiopia import from? (1972),' MIT Observatory of Economic Complexity. Available at: https://oec.world/en/visualize/tree_map/sitc/import/eth/show/all/1972/ (Last accessed: 21 June 2019).

Observatory of Economic Complexity. 2019. 'Where does Ethiopia import from? (1973),' MIT Observatory of Economic Complexity. Available at: https://oec.world/en/visualize/tree_map/sitc/import/eth/show/all/1973/ (Last accessed: 21 June 2019).

Observatory of Economic Complexity. 2019. 'Where does Ethiopia import from? (1974),' MIT Observatory of Economic Complexity. Available at: https://oec.world/en/visualize/tree_map/sitc/import/eth/show/all/1974/ (Last accessed: 21 June 2019).

Observatory of Economic Complexity. 2019. 'Where does Ethiopia import from? (1975),' MIT Observatory of Economic Complexity. Available at: https://oec.world/en/visualize/tree_map/sitc/import/eth/show/all/1975/ (Last accessed: 21 June 2019).

Observatory of Economic Complexity. 2019. 'Where does Ethiopia import from? (1976),' MIT Observatory of Economic Complexity. Available at:

https://oec.world/en/visualize/tree_map/sitc/import/eth/show/all/1976/ (Last accessed: 21 June 2019).

Observatory of Economic Complexity. 2019. 'Where does Ethiopia import from? (1977),' MIT Observatory of Economic Complexity. Available at: https://oec.world/en/visualize/tree_map/sitc/import/eth/show/all/1977/ (Last accessed: 21 June 2019).

Observatory of Economic Complexity. 2019. 'Where does Ethiopia import from? (1978),' MIT Observatory of Economic Complexity. Available at: https://oec.world/en/visualize/tree_map/sitc/import/eth/show/all/1978/ (Last accessed: 21 June 2019).

Observatory of Economic Complexity. 2019. 'Where does Ethiopia import from? (1979),' MIT Observatory of Economic Complexity. Available at: https://oec.world/en/visualize/tree_map/sitc/import/eth/show/all/1979/ (Last accessed: 21 June 2019).

Observatory of Economic Complexity. 2019. 'Where does Ethiopia import from? (1980),' MIT Observatory of Economic Complexity. Available at: https://oec.world/en/visualize/tree_map/sitc/import/eth/show/all/1980/ (Last accessed: 21 June 2019).

Observatory of Economic Complexity. 2019. 'Where does Ethiopia import from? (1993),' MIT Observatory of Economic Complexity. Available at: https://oec.world/en/visualize/tree_map/sitc/import/eth/show/all/1993/ (Last accessed: 21 June 2019).

Observatory of Economic Complexity. 2019. 'Where does Ethiopia import from? (1994),' MIT Observatory of Economic Complexity. Available at: https://oec.world/en/visualize/tree_map/sitc/import/eth/show/all/1994/ (Last accessed: 21 June 2019).

Observatory of Economic Complexity. 2019. 'Where does Ethiopia import from? (1995),' MIT Observatory of Economic Complexity. Available at: https://oec.world/en/visualize/tree_map/sitc/import/eth/show/all/1995/ (Last accessed: 21 June 2019).

Observatory of Economic Complexity. 2019. 'Where does Ethiopia import from? (1996),' MIT Observatory of Economic Complexity. Available at: https://oec.world/en/visualize/tree_map/sitc/import/eth/show/all/1996/ (Last accessed: 21 June 2019).

Observatory of Economic Complexity. 2019. 'Where does Ethiopia import from? (1997),' MIT Observatory of Economic Complexity. Available at: https://oec.world/en/visualize/tree_map/sitc/import/eth/show/all/1997/ (Last accessed: 21 June 2019).

Observatory of Economic Complexity. 2019. 'Where does Ethiopia import from? (1998),' MIT Observatory of Economic Complexity. Available at: https://oec.world/en/visualize/tree_map/sitc/import/eth/show/all/1998/ (Last accessed: 21 June 2019).

Observatory of Economic Complexity. 2019. 'Where does Ethiopia import from? (1999),' MIT Observatory of Economic Complexity. Available at: https://oec.world/en/visualize/tree_map/sitc/import/eth/show/all/1999/ (Last accessed: 21 June 2019).

Observatory of Economic Complexity. 2019. 'Where does Ethiopia import from? (2000),' MIT Observatory of Economic Complexity. Available at: https://oec.world/en/visualize/tree_map/sitc/import/eth/show/all/2000/ (Last accessed: 21 June 2019).

Observatory of Economic Complexity. 2019. 'Where does Somalia export to? (1962),' MIT Observatory of Economic Complexity. Available at: https://oec.world/en/visualize/tree_map/sitc/export/som/show/all/1962/ (Last accessed: 21 June 2019).

Observatory of Economic Complexity. 2019. 'Where does Somalia export to? (1963),' MIT Observatory of Economic Complexity. Available at: https://oec.world/en/visualize/tree_map/sitc/export/som/show/all/1963/ (Last accessed: 21 June 2019).

Observatory of Economic Complexity. 2019. 'Where does Somalia export to? (1964),' MIT Observatory of Economic Complexity. Available at:

https://oec.world/en/visualize/tree_map/sitc/export/som/show/all/1964/ (Last accessed: 21 June 2019).

Observatory of Economic Complexity. 2019. 'Where does Somalia export to? (1965),' MIT Observatory of Economic Complexity. Available at: https://oec.world/en/visualize/tree_map/sitc/export/som/show/all/1965/ (Last accessed: 21 June 2019).

Observatory of Economic Complexity. 2019. 'Where does Somalia export to? (1966),' MIT Observatory of Economic Complexity. Available at: https://oec.world/en/visualize/tree_map/sitc/export/som/show/all/1966/ (Last accessed: 21 June 2019).

Observatory of Economic Complexity. 2019. 'Where does Somalia export to? (1967),' MIT Observatory of Economic Complexity. Available at: https://oec.world/en/visualize/tree_map/sitc/export/som/show/all/1967/ (Last accessed: 21 June 2019).

Observatory of Economic Complexity. 2019. 'Where does Somalia export to? (1968),' MIT Observatory of Economic Complexity. Available at: https://oec.world/en/visualize/tree_map/sitc/export/som/show/all/1968/ (Last accessed: 21 June 2019).

Observatory of Economic Complexity. 2019. 'Where does Somalia export to? (1969),' MIT Observatory of Economic Complexity. Available at: https://oec.world/en/visualize/tree_map/sitc/export/som/show/all/1969/ (Last accessed: 21 June 2019).

Observatory of Economic Complexity. 2019. 'Where does Somalia export to? (1970),' MIT Observatory of Economic Complexity. Available at: https://oec.world/en/visualize/tree_map/sitc/export/som/show/all/1970/ (Last accessed: 21 June 2019).

Observatory of Economic Complexity. 2019. 'Where does Somalia export to? (1971),' MIT Observatory of Economic Complexity. Available at: https://oec.world/en/visualize/tree_map/sitc/export/som/show/all/1971/ (Last accessed: 21 June 2019).

Observatory of Economic Complexity. 2019. 'Where does Somalia export to? (1972),' MIT Observatory of Economic Complexity. Available at: https://oec.world/en/visualize/tree_map/sitc/export/som/show/all/1972/ (Last accessed: 21 June 2019).

Observatory of Economic Complexity. 2019. 'Where does Somalia export to? (1973),' MIT Observatory of Economic Complexity. Available at: https://oec.world/en/visualize/tree_map/sitc/export/som/show/all/1973/ (Last accessed: 21 June 2019).

Observatory of Economic Complexity. 2019. 'Where does Somalia export to? (1974),' MIT Observatory of Economic Complexity. Available at: https://oec.world/en/visualize/tree_map/sitc/export/som/show/all/1974/ (Last accessed: 21 June 2019).

Observatory of Economic Complexity. 2019. 'Where does Somalia export to? (1975),' MIT Observatory of Economic Complexity. Available at: https://oec.world/en/visualize/tree_map/sitc/export/som/show/all/1975/ (Last accessed: 21 June 2019).

Observatory of Economic Complexity. 2019. 'Where does Somalia export to? (1976),' MIT Observatory of Economic Complexity. Available at: https://oec.world/en/visualize/tree_map/sitc/export/som/show/all/1976/ (Last accessed: 21 June 2019).

Observatory of Economic Complexity. 2019. 'Where does Somalia export to? (1977),' MIT Observatory of Economic Complexity. Available at: https://oec.world/en/visualize/tree_map/sitc/export/som/show/all/1977/ (Last accessed: 21 June 2019).

Observatory of Economic Complexity. 2019. 'Where does Somalia export to? (1978),' MIT Observatory of Economic Complexity. Available at: https://oec.world/en/visualize/tree_map/sitc/export/som/show/all/1978/ (Last accessed: 21 June 2019).

Observatory of Economic Complexity. 2019. 'Where does Somalia export to? (1979),' MIT Observatory of Economic Complexity. Available at:

https://oec.world/en/visualize/tree_map/sitc/export/som/show/all/1979/ (Last accessed: 21 June 2019).

Observatory of Economic Complexity. 2019. 'Where does Somalia export to? (1979),' MIT Observatory of Economic Complexity. Available at: https://oec.world/en/visualize/tree_map/sitc/export/som/show/all/1979/ (Last accessed: 21 June 2019).

Observatory of Economic Complexity. 2019. 'Where does Tanzania import from? (1968),' MIT Observatory of Economic Complexity. Available at: https://oec.world/en/visualize/tree_map/sitc/import/tza/show/all/1968/ (Last accessed: 21 June 2019).

Observatory of Economic Complexity. 2019. 'Where does Tanzania import from? (1969),' MIT Observatory of Economic Complexity. Available at: https://oec.world/en/visualize/tree_map/sitc/import/tza/show/all/1969/ (Last accessed: 21 June 2019).

Observatory of Economic Complexity. 2019. 'Where does Tanzania import from? (1970),' MIT Observatory of Economic Complexity. Available at: https://oec.world/en/visualize/tree_map/sitc/import/tza/show/all/1970/ (Last accessed: 21 June 2019).

Observatory of Economic Complexity. 2019. 'Where does Tanzania import from? (1971),' MIT Observatory of Economic Complexity. Available at: https://oec.world/en/visualize/tree_map/sitc/import/tza/show/all/1971/ (Last accessed: 21 June 2019).

Observatory of Economic Complexity. 2019. 'Where does Tanzania import from? (1972),' MIT Observatory of Economic Complexity. Available at: https://oec.world/en/visualize/tree_map/sitc/import/tza/show/all/1972/ (Last accessed: 21 June 2019).

Observatory of Economic Complexity. 2019. 'Where does Tanzania import from? (1973),' MIT Observatory of Economic Complexity. Available at: https://oec.world/en/visualize/tree_map/sitc/import/tza/show/all/1973/ (Last accessed: 21 June 2019).

Observatory of Economic Complexity. 2019. 'Where does Tanzania import from? (1974),' MIT Observatory of Economic Complexity. Available at: https://oec.world/en/visualize/tree_map/sitc/import/tza/show/all/1974/ (Last accessed: 21 June 2019).

Observatory of Economic Complexity. 2019. 'Where does Tanzania import from? (1975),' MIT Observatory of Economic Complexity. Available at: https://oec.world/en/visualize/tree_map/sitc/import/tza/show/all/1975/ (Last accessed: 21 June 2019).

Observatory of Economic Complexity. 2019. 'Where does Tanzania import from? (1976),' MIT Observatory of Economic Complexity. Available at: https://oec.world/en/visualize/tree_map/sitc/import/tza/show/all/1976/ (Last accessed: 21 June 2019).

Observatory of Economic Complexity. 2019. 'Where does Tanzania import from? (1977),' MIT Observatory of Economic Complexity. Available at: https://oec.world/en/visualize/tree_map/sitc/import/tza/show/all/1977/ (Last accessed: 21 June 2019).

Observatory of Economic Complexity. 2019. 'Where does Uganda export to? (1962),' MIT Observatory of Economic Complexity. Available at: https://oec.world/en/visualize/tree_map/sitc/export/uga/show/all/1962/ (Last accessed: 21 June 2019).

Observatory of Economic Complexity. 2019. 'Where does Uganda export to? (1963),' MIT Observatory of Economic Complexity. Available at: https://oec.world/en/visualize/tree_map/sitc/export/uga/show/all/1963/ (Last accessed: 21 June 2019).

Observatory of Economic Complexity. 2019. 'Where does Uganda export to? (1964),' MIT Observatory of Economic Complexity. Available at: https://oec.world/en/visualize/tree_map/sitc/export/uga/show/all/1964/ (Last accessed: 21 June 2019).

Observatory of Economic Complexity. 2019. 'Where does Uganda export to? (1965),' MIT Observatory of Economic Complexity. Available at:

https://oec.world/en/visualize/tree_map/sitc/export/uga/show/all/1965/ (Last accessed: 21 June 2019).

Observatory of Economic Complexity. 2019. 'Where does Uganda export to? (1966),' MIT Observatory of Economic Complexity. Available at: https://oec.world/en/visualize/tree_map/sitc/export/uga/show/all/1966/ (Last accessed: 21 June 2019).

Observatory of Economic Complexity. 2019. 'Where does Uganda export to? (1967),' MIT Observatory of Economic Complexity. Available at: https://oec.world/en/visualize/tree_map/sitc/export/uga/show/all/1967/ (Last accessed: 21 June 2019).

Observatory of Economic Complexity. 2019. 'Where does Uganda export to? (1968),' MIT Observatory of Economic Complexity. Available at: https://oec.world/en/visualize/tree_map/sitc/export/uga/show/all/1968/ (Last accessed: 21 June 2019).

Observatory of Economic Complexity. 2019. 'Where does Uganda export to? (1969),' MIT Observatory of Economic Complexity. Available at: https://oec.world/en/visualize/tree_map/sitc/export/uga/show/all/1969/ (Last accessed: 21 June 2019).

Observatory of Economic Complexity. 2019. 'Where does Uganda export to? (1970),' MIT Observatory of Economic Complexity. Available at: https://oec.world/en/visualize/tree_map/sitc/export/uga/show/all/1970/ (Last accessed: 21 June 2019).

Observatory of Economic Complexity. 2019. 'Where does Uganda export to? (1971),' MIT Observatory of Economic Complexity. Available at: https://oec.world/en/visualize/tree_map/sitc/export/uga/show/all/1971/ (Last accessed: 21 June 2019).

Observatory of Economic Complexity. 2019. 'Where does Uganda export to? (1972),' MIT Observatory of Economic Complexity. Available at: https://oec.world/en/visualize/tree_map/sitc/export/uga/show/all/1972/ (Last accessed: 21 June 2019).

Observatory of Economic Complexity. 2019. 'Where does Uganda export to? (1973),' MIT Observatory of Economic Complexity. Available at: https://oec.world/en/visualize/tree_map/sitc/export/uga/show/all/1973/ (Last accessed: 21 June 2019).

Observatory of Economic Complexity. 2019. 'Where does Uganda export to? (1974),' MIT Observatory of Economic Complexity. Available at: https://oec.world/en/visualize/tree_map/sitc/export/uga/show/all/1974/ (Last accessed: 21 June 2019).

Observatory of Economic Complexity. 2019. 'Where does Uganda export to? (1975),' MIT Observatory of Economic Complexity. Available at: https://oec.world/en/visualize/tree_map/sitc/export/uga/show/all/1975/ (Last accessed: 21 June 2019).

Observatory of Economic Complexity. 2019. 'Where does Uganda export to? (1976),' MIT Observatory of Economic Complexity. Available at: https://oec.world/en/visualize/tree_map/sitc/export/uga/show/all/1976/ (Last accessed: 21 June 2019).

Observatory of Economic Complexity. 2019. 'Where does Uganda export to? (1977),' MIT Observatory of Economic Complexity. Available at: https://oec.world/en/visualize/tree_map/sitc/export/uga/show/all/1977/ (Last accessed: 21 June 2019).

Observatory of Economic Complexity. 2019. 'Where does Uganda export to? (1978),' MIT Observatory of Economic Complexity. Available at: https://oec.world/en/visualize/tree_map/sitc/export/uga/show/all/1978/ (Last accessed: 21 June 2019).

Observatory of Economic Complexity. 2019. 'Where does Uganda export to? (1979),' MIT Observatory of Economic Complexity. Available at: https://oec.world/en/visualize/tree_map/sitc/export/uga/show/all/1979/ (Last accessed: 21 June 2019).

Observatory of Economic Complexity. 2019. 'Where does Uganda export to? (1980),' MIT Observatory of Economic Complexity. Available at:

https://oec.world/en/visualize/tree_map/sitc/export/uga/show/all/1980/ (Last accessed: 21 June 2019).

Ododa, Harry. 1985. 'Somalia's domestic politics and foreign relations since the Ogaden war of 1977–78,' *Middle Eastern Studies* 21(3), 285-297.

Oduntan, Gbenga. 2015 (July 14). 'Africa's border disputes are set to rise – but there are ways to stop them,' *The Conversation.* Available at: https://theconversation.com/africasborderdisputesaresettorisebuttherearewaystostopthem44264 (Last accessed: 21 September 2019).

Ofcansky, Thomas P. 2004. "Ethiopia and Eritrea: Cry Havoc!," in Colin Legum (Ed.), 3-15, *Africa Contemporary Record Volume XXVII, 1998-2000*. New York: Holmes & Meier Publishers, Inc.

Ogundele, Ayodeji Olusesi. 1987. 'Balance of Power Theory and the Ethiopian-Somali Conflict of 1977-1978,' Dissertation: North Texas State University.

Ogunnubi, Olusola and Okeke-Uzodike, Ufo. 2016. 'Can Nigeria be Africa's hegemon?,' *African Security Review*, 25(2), 110-128.

Ombok, Eric. 2019 (September 27). 'Somalia Pledges to Accept Court Ruling on Kenya Maritime Dispute,' *Bloomberg*. Available at: https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2019-09-27/somalia-pledges-to-accept-court-ruling-on-kenya-maritime-dispute (Last accessed: 28 September 2019).

Østerud, Ø. 1992. 'Regional great powers,' p. 1-15, in I. Neumann (Ed.), *Regional Great Powers in International Politics*, Basingstoke: St Martin's Press.

Ottaway, David B. 1979. 'Tanzanian Economy Hurt By Conflict With Uganda,' *The Washington Post*. Available at: https://www.washingtonpost.com/archive/politics/1979/01/16/tanzanian-economy-hurt-by-conflict-with-uganda/6549fcd2-2799-4972-9723-a49ec0 (Last accessed: 22 September 2019).

Osaghae, E. 1998. *Crippled Giant: Nigeria Since Independence*, Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Owen, John M. 1994. 'How Liberalism Produces Democratic Peace,' *International Security, 19(2)*: 87-125.

Özkeçeci-Taner, Binnur. 2002. 'The Myth of Democratic Peace: Theoretical and Empirical Shortcomings of the "Democratic Peace Theory",' *Alternatives: Turkish Journal of International Relations, 1* (3), 40-48.

Panel, Sophie. 2017. 'Regime Instability, Leader's Affiliation, and Organizational Culture: Why Are Military Dictatorships More Likely to Initiate Militarized Interstate Disputes? An Empirical Analysis, 1975–2006,' *Security Studies* 26(2), 333-358.

Papayoanou, Paul A. 1999. *Power Ties: Economic Interdependence, Balancing, and War*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Peceny, Mark, Beer, Caroline C. and Sanchez-Terry, Shannon. 2002. 'Dictatorial Peace?,' *The American Political Science Review* 96(1), 15-26.

Pella, John Anthony. 2015. 'International Relations in Africa before the Europeans,' *The International History Review*, 37(1), 99-118.

Pettersson, Therese and Wallensteen, Peter. 2015. 'Armed conflicts, 1946–2014,' *Journal of Peace Research* 52(4) 536–550.

Pinkard, T. 2002. *German Philosophy, 1760-1860: The Legacy of Idealism.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Piplani, Varun and Talmadge, Caitlin. 2016. 'When War Helps Civil–military Relations: Prolonged Interstate Conflict and the Reduced Risk of Coups,' *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 60(8), 1368-1394.

Plant, Martin. 2001. 'Towards a cold peace? the outcome of the Ethiopia-Eritrea war of 1988-2000,' *Review of African Political Economy* 28(87), 125-129.

Polachek, Solomon and Xiang, Jun. 2008. 'How Opportunity Costs Decrease the Probability of War in an Incomplete Information Game', Bonn, Germany: Institute for the Study of Labor.

Poole, Amanda. 2013. 'Ransoms, Remittances, and Refugees: The Gatekeeper State in Eritrea,' *Africa Today (Special Issue: Postliberation Eritrea)* 60(2), 67-82.

Powers, Kathy L. 2006. 'Regional Trade Agreements as Military Alliances,' *International Interactions* 30(4), 373-395.

Pretorius, Joelien. 2008. 'The Technological Culture of War,' *Bulletin of Science, Technology & Society* 28(4), 299-305.

Prys, M. 2008. 'Regions, Hegemony and Power: India and South Africa Compared,' PhD Dissertation, University of Oxford, UK.

Ranelletti, Andrea. *Enhancing regional governance and multilateral cooperation in Maghreb*. Rome: Edizioni Nuova Cultura.

Read, Donna M. Y. and Parton, Kevin A. 2009. 'Economic Deregulation and Trade Liberalization in Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda: Growth and Poverty,' *Journal of Economic Issues* 43(3), 567-586.

Reno, William. 2002. 'Uganda's politics of war and debt relief,' *Review of International Political Economy* 9(3), 415-435.

Reuters. 1988 (April 26). 'Ethiopian and Somali Forces Withdrawn Under Agreement,' *New York Times*.

Ricks, Thomas E. 2015. 'Annals of wars we don't know about: The South African border war of 1966-1989,' *Foreign Policy*. March 12: https://foreignpolicy.com/2015/03/12/annals-of-wars-we-dont-know-about-the-south-african-border-war-of-1966-1989/ (Last accessed: 25 January 2019).

Riggan, Jennifer. 2016. *The Struggling State: Nationalism, Militarism, and the Education of Eritrea*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Roberts, George. 2014. 'The Uganda–Tanzania War, the fall of Idi Amin, and the failure of African diplomacy, 1978–1979,' *Journal of Eastern African Studies* 8(4), 692-709.

Robinson, Colin. 2016. 'Revisiting the rise and fall of the Somali Armed Forces, 1960–2012,' *Defense & Security Analysis* 32(3), 237-252.

Robinson, Mark. 2007. 'The Political Economy of Governance Reforms in Uganda,' *Commonwealth & Comparative Politics* 45(4), 452-474.

Rossi, Christopher R. 2017 (December 6). 'What Migingo, the world's tiniest disputed island, tells us about international law,' *The Conversation*. Available at: https://theconversation.com/what-migingo-the-worlds-tiniest-disputed-island-tells-us-about-international-law-88536 (Last accessed: 21 September 2019).

Rugimbana, Robert O., Carr, Stuart C., Bolitho, Floyd and Walkom, Emily. 2000. 'The Impact of "Consumer Cringe" on Developing Regional Trade Blocks,' *Journal of African Business* 1(2), 91-106.

Rummel, Rudolph J. 1995. 'Democracies are Less Warlike Than Other Regimes,' *European Journal of International Relations, 1*, 457-479.

Russett, Bruce M. 1993. *Grasping the Democratic Peace: Principles for a Post-Cold War*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press;

Russett, Bruce M. 1995. The Democratic Peace: "And Yet It Moves", in International Security 19(4): 164-175.

Sanginga, Pascal C., Kamugisha, Rick N. and Martin, Adrienne M. 2010. 'Strengthening Social Capital for Adaptive Governance of Natural Resources: A Participatory Learning and Action Research for Bylaws Reforms in Uganda,' *Society and Natural Resources,* 23(8), 695-710.

Sachse, Victor Edward. 1989. 'Hegemonic stability theory: A n examination,' PhD Thesis: Louisiana State University and Agricultural & Mechanical College.

Sarkees, Meredith, Whelon, Reid Frank Wayman and Singer, J. David. 2003. 'Inter-State, Intra-State, and Extra-State Wars: A Comprehensive Look at Their Distribution Over Time, 1816–1997,' *International Studies Quarterly* 47(1):49-70.

Schedler, Andreas. 1998. 'What is Democratic Consolidation,' *Journal of Democracy, 9*, 2, April.

Schumpeter, Joseph A. 1942. *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy*. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Schwab, Peter. 1985. *Ethiopia: Politics, Economics and Society.* London: Frances Pinter.

Sejjaaka, S. 2004. 'A Political and Economic History of Uganda, 1962–2002,' in Bird F., Herman S.W. (eds) *International Businesses and the Challenges of Poverty in the Developing World*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Seymour, Lee J.M. 2013. 'Sovereignty, territory and authority: boundary maintenance in contemporary Africa,' *Critical African Studies* 5(1), 17-31.

Shaw, Timothy M. and Mbabazi, Pamela K. 2007. 'Two Ugandas and a "Liberal Peace"? Lessons from Uganda about Conflict and Development at the Start of a New Century,' *Global Society* 21(4), 567-578.

Shivji, Issa G. 1991. 'The democracy debate in Africa: Tanzania,' *Review of African Political Economy* 18(50), 79-91.

Singer, J. David, and Small, Melvin. 1972. *The Wages of War, 1816-1963: A Statistical Handbook*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Singer, Peter W. 2006 (August 19). 'Name That War,' Brookings Institution. Available at: https://www.brookings.edu/opinions/name-that-war/ (Last accessed: 11 May 2019).

Skaar, Elisabeth Stennes. 2015. 'Great Britain's Policy on the Uganda-Tanzania War (1978-9)'. Thesis: Norwegian University of Science and Technology.

Smith, Robert S. 1976. *Warfare and Diplomacy in Pre-colonial West Africa*. Madison, Wisconsin: Wisconsin University Press.

Solingen, Etel. 1998. *Regional Orders at Century's Dawn: Global and Domestic Influences on Grand Strategy*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Somali Democratic Republic. 1979. "The Constitution". Available at: https://www.worldstatesmen.org/Somalia-Constitution1979.pdf (Last accessed: 30 September 2019).

Somerville, Keith. 2002 (10 October). 'Border dispute an African colonial legacy,' *BBC News*. Available at: http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/africa/2316645.stm (Last accessed: 21 September 2019).

Speller, Ian. 2007. 'An African Cuba? Britain and the Zanzibar Revolution, 1964,' *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History*, 35(2): 283-302.

Spiro, David. 1994. 'The Insignificance of the Liberal Peace,' *International Security, 19(2),* 50-86.

Steves, Franklin. 2003. 'Regime Change and War: Domestic Politics and the Escalation of the Ethiopia--Eritrea Conflict,' *Cambridge Review of International Affairs* 16(1), 119-133.

Strategic Comments. 2000. 'Ethiopia and Eritrea,' *Strategic Comments* 6(2), 1-2.

Sunday Monitor. 2014 (April 26). 'Revisiting the Tanzania-Uganda war that toppled Amin,' *Sunday Monitor*. Available at: https://www.monitor.co.ug/SpecialReports/Revisiting-the-Tanzania-Uganda-war-that-toppled-Amin/688342-2293306-110gxl9/index.html (Last accessed: 22 September 2019).

Sylvester, Christine. 2012. 'War Experiences/War Practices/War Theory,' *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 40(3), 483–503.

Tangri, Roger and Mwenda, Andrew M. 2008. 'Elite Corruption and Politics in Uganda,' *Commonwealth & Comparative Politics* 46(2), 177-194.

Tangri, Roger and Mwenda, Andrew M. 2010. 'President Museveni and the politics of presidential tenure in Uganda,' *Journal of Contemporary African Studies* 28(1), 31-49.

TANU. 1967. *Arusha Declaration*. Dar es Salaam: Publicity Section, TANU. Available at: https://disa.ukzn.ac.za/sites/default/files/pdf_files/Acn2967.0001.9976.000.029.1967.4.pdf (Last accessed: 28 September 2019).

Taylor, Phillip. 1979. *When Europe Speaks with One Voice: The External Relations of the European Community*. London: Aldwych Press.

The Economist. 2006 (April 8). 'Africa's hegemon'. *The Economist*, A4.

The Monitor. 2009 (April 11). '30 years after the fall of Amin, causes of 1979 war revealed,' *The Monitor*. Available at: https://www.monitor.co.ug/SpecialReports/Amin/859112-860028-qexfmyz/index.html (Last accessed: 22 September 2019).

Thomas, Hugh. 1986. *Armed Truce: The Beginnings of the Cold War, 1945-46*. London: Hamish Hamilton.

Thompson, William R. 1996. 'Democracy and Peace: Putting the Cart Before the Horse?,' *International Organization, 50*, 141-174.

Thucydides. 1950. *The Peloponnesian War*. New York: Modern Library.

Tilly, C. 1975. *The Formation of National States in Western Europe*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Tilly, C. 1990. *Coercion, Capital and European States*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Tiruneh, Andargachew. 1980. 'The Ethiopian Revolution (1974 to 1984)'. Thesis: London School of Economics.

Toft, Monica Duffy. 2014. 'Territory and war,' *Journal of Peace Research* 51(2), 185–198.

Tseggai, Araia. 1976. 'The Case for Eritrean National Independence,' *The Black Scholar* 7(9), 20-27.

Tseggai, Araia. 1984. 'Ethiopian Economic Policy in Eritrea: The Federation Era,' *Northeast African Studies* 6(1/2), 81-93.

Tumusiime, James R. and Bichachi, Charles Odoobo. 2012. *Uganda's Presidents*. Kampala: Fountain Publishers.

Twaddle, Michael. 1979. 'The ousting of Idi Amin,' *The Round Table* 69(275), 216-221.

UNECA. 2004. *Assessing Regional Integration in Africa*. Addis Ababa: UNECA.

UNECA. 2006. *Assessing Regional Integration in Africa II*. Addis Ababa: UNECA.

United Nations. 1981. United Nations General Assembly Resolution on the 'Reduction of the Military Budget' (35/142). Available at: https://s3.amazonaws.com/unoda-web/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/A-72-293-GGE-Milex-4-August-2017.pdf (Last accessed: 27 October 2019).

Valeriano, Brandon. 2011. 'Power Politics and Interstate War in Africa,' *African Security* 4(3), 195-221.

Vasquez, John A. and Valeriano, Brandon. 2010. 'Classification of Interstate Wars,' *The Journal of Politics*, 72(2), 292–309.

Vener, Jessica I. 2000. 'Prompting democratic transitions from abroad: International donors and multi-partyism in Tanzania,' *Democratization* 7(4), 133-162.

Verhoeven, Harry. 2015 (April 12). 'Africa's Next Hegemon: Behind Ethiopia's Power Plays,' *Foreign Affairs*. Available at: https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/ethiopia/2015-04-12/africas-next-hegemon (Last accessed: 21 November 2019).

Wagermann, Claudius and Schneider, Carsten. 2010. 'Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA) and Fuzzy-Sets: An Agenda for a Research Approach and a Data Analysis Technique,' *Comparative Sociology 9*, 376-396.

Watkins, Thayer. 2000. 'Political and Economic History of Ethiopia,' San José State University Department of Economics. Available at: http://www.sjsu.edu/faculty/watkins/ethiopia (Last accessed: 3 October 2019).

Weber, Max (trans. Edward A. Shils). 1949. *The Methodology of the Social Sciences*. Glencoe: Free Press.

Weeks, Jessica L. 2008. 'Autocratic Audience Costs: Regime Type and Signaling Resolve,' *International Organization* 62(1), 35-64.

Weeks, Jessica L. 2012. 'Strongmen and Straw Men: Authoritarian Regimes and the Initiation of International Conflict,' *American Political Science Review* 106(2), 326-47.

Weisiger, Alex. 2014. 'Victory without peace: Conquest, insurgency, and war termination,' *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 31(4), 357–382.

Weldehaimanot, Simon and Kesete, Semere. 2012. 'Rubbishing: a wrong approach to Eritrea/Ethiopia union,' *Review of African Political Economy* 39(131), 45-62.

Wimmer, Andreas and Min, Brian. 2009. 'The Location and Purpose of Wars Around the World: A New Global Dataset, 1816–2001,' *International Interactions* 35(4), 390-417.

Woldegabriel, Berhane. 1993. 'Demobilising Eritrea's Army,' *Review of African Political Economy* 58(1), 134-135.

World Bank. 2018. "Ethiopia At-A-Glance," The World Bank in Ethiopia. Available at: https://www.worldbank.org/en/country/ethiopia/overview (Last accessed: 15 May 2020).

World Bank. 2019. "GDP per capita (current US$) – Somalia." Available at: https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.PCAP.CD?locations=SO (Last accessed: 2 October 2019).

World Bank. 2019. "Military expenditure (current USD) - Somalia." Available at: https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/MS.MIL.XPND.CD?locations=SO (Last accessed: 2 October 2019).

Wood, A. and Jordan, K. 2000. 'Why Does Zimbabwe Export Manufactures and Uganda Not? Econometrics Meets History,' *Journal of Development Studies* 37(2), 91-116.

Yihun, Belete Belachew. 2014. 'Ethiopian foreign policy and the Ogaden War: the shift from "containment" to "destabilization," 1977–1991,' *Journal of Eastern African Studies* 8(4), 677-691.

Zacarias, Agostinho. 1998. 'SADC: From a system to community of security?,' *African Security Review* 7(6), 44-61.

Zeleza, Paul Tiyambe. 2008. ‘Introduction,’ in Nhema, Alfred G. and Zeleza, Paul Tiyambe (Eds.), *The Roots of African Conflicts: The Causes and Costs*. Cleveland: Ohio University Press.

Archives

Carter Presidential Library. 1977 (May 16). ‘Memorandum from the President’s Assistant for National Security Affairs (Brzezinski) to President Carter’. Country File, Box 69, Somalia: 1/77–6/78.

Keesing’s Record of World Events (formerly Keesing’s Contemporary Archives). May, 1978. ‘Ogaden Area recaptured by Ethiopian Forces with Soviet and Cuban Support -International Ramifications of Ethiopian-Somali Conflict - Incipient Soviet and Cuban Involvement in Ethiopian Warfare against Eritrean Secessionists -Political Assassinations inside Ethiopia.’ Ethiopian, Page 28989.

Keesing’s Record of World Events (formerly Keesing’s Contemporary Archives). November, 1972. ‘Armed Invasion of Uganda by Followers of Ex-President Obote. Resultant Conflict between Uganda and Tanzania. – Somali Mediation leads to Peaceful Settlement.’ Uganda, Page 25543.

National Archives. 1977. ‘Telegram From the Embassy in Ethiopia to the Department of State.’ Central Foreign Policy File D770045–0693.

Ugandan Broadcasting Corporation Archives. 1972. ‘William Kalema, Minister of Commerce under Obote kidnapped 20 January 1972’. UBC 2043-002.

Ugandan Broadcasting Corporation Archives. 1972. ‘Benedicto, former Chief Minister of Uganda assassinated 22 September 1972’. UBC 1881-005.

Ugandan Broadcasting Corporation Archives. 1972. ‘Alex Ojera, former Minister of Information, Tourism, and Broadcasting assassinated late September 1972.’ UBC 2177-002.

Ugandan Broadcasting Corporation Archives. 1973. ‘Sgt. executed at Tororo 27 June 1973.’ UBC 3482-006. Staff sergeant Arukanjeru-Baru was the first soldier executed in public by President Amin’s government.

Ugandan Broadcasting Corporation Archives. 1973. ‘E.W. Nakibinge, former mayor of Kampala murdered August 1973.’ UBC 300140-014.

Ugandan Broadcasting Corporation Archives. September 1973. ‘Brig. Moses Ali clearing brush, Fort Portal.’ UBC 3634-2-014.

Ugandan Broadcasting Corporation Archives. 29 September 1975. ‘H.E. gives citizenship to British officials.’ UBC 4938-012.

Ugandan Broadcasting Corporation Archives. 20 November 1975. ‘H.E. meets India delegation on compensation of Indian officials.’ UBC 5026-010.

Ugandan Broadcasting Corporation Archives. April 1977. ‘Coffee smugglers checked by Vice President Mustafa Adrisi at Bugolobi.’ UBC 5561-002.

Ugandan Broadcasting Corporation Archives. 15 June 1978. ‘Paraffin smugglers arrested at Uganda-Zaire border.’ UBC 6533-026.

Interviews

Interview 1. (Seminar discussion). May 2019. Ambassador Welile Nhlapo, Former South African Ambassador to Ethiopia. Johannesburg.

Interview 2. July 2019. Ms. Haregewoin Mirotaw, Director of Technology & Investment Information Directorate. Addis Ababa.

Interview 3. July 2019. Mr. Awoke Asfie. Advisor, National Planning Commission of Ethiopia. Addis Ababa.

Interview 4. July 2019. Professor Dachesa Abebe. Assistant Professor, Socio-economic History Addis Ababa University. Addis Ababa.

Interview 5. July 2019. Dr Dugassa Mulugeta. Dean, Addis Ababa Science and Technology University. Addis Ababa.

Interview 6. July 2019. _____, Official at the Ministry of Innovation and Technology. Addis Ababa.

Interview 7. July 2019. _____. Curator, _____ Museum. Addis Ababa.

Interview 8. August 2019. _____ . Executive Director_____ Research Centre, _____. Kampala.

Interview 9. August 2019. _____. Researcher, _____ Research Centre, University of Makerere. Kampala.

Interview 10. _____. Researcher, _____ Research Centre, University of Makerere. Kampala.

Interview 11. September 2019. Professor Messay Mulugeta. Director, Centre for Food Security Studies, Addis Ababa University. Parktown.

Interview 12. September 2019. _____. Chief Executive Officer of an Ethiopian development group. Parktown.

Interview 13. September 2019. _____. Managing Director of an Ethiopian infrastructure and economic research group. Parktown.

Interview 14. (Seminar discussion). September 2019. Dr. Arkebe Oqubay. Senior Minister and Advisor to the Prime Minister of Ethiopia. Johannesburg.

Interview 15. October 2019. _____. Former lobbyist for Somaliland recognition (location concealed on request).

Interview 16. October 2019. _____. Researcher, _____.

Interview 17. _____. October 2019. Trade Officer: Russian Embassy in South Africa.

Interview 18. November 2019. Ambassador Legwaila Joseph Legwaila. Gaborone, Botswana.

Interview 19. _____. Employed by the United Nations (Office withheld on request). City withheld on request.

Appendices

Appendix A: Proof of Growths and Declines in East African Military Budgets

With Table A1 as the source of the raw data, the overall proof for the growth and/or declines in military expenditure in the region as referred to in Chapter 7 of the dissertation are calculated by decade below:

$$\Delta_{d}{}^{x} = \frac{\sum y - \sum x}{\sum x} \cdot 100$$

Where:

$\Delta_{d}{}^{x}$ is the percentage of change for each decade, with the decades ranging from d^{1} (1960s) to d^{4} (1990s)

$\sum x$ is the total expenditure at the beginning of each decade

$\sum y$ is the total expenditure at the close of each decade

For the 1960s, the pattern is:

$$\Delta_{d}{}^{1} = \frac{102.119 - 35.039}{35.039} \cdot 100$$

$$= 191.44\%$$

For the 1970s, the pattern is:

$$\Delta_{d}{}^{2} = \frac{1237.316 - 118.929}{118.929} \cdot 100$$

$$= 940.38\%$$

For the 1980s, the pattern is:

$$\Delta_{d}{}^{3} = \frac{1281.674 - 1357.618}{1357.618} \cdot 100$$

$$= -5.59\%$$

For the 1990s, the pattern is:

$$\Delta_{d}{}^{4} = \frac{1416.678 - 1171.116}{1171.116} \cdot 100$$


$$= 20.96\%$$

Table A1. Military budgets in East Africa, 1963-2003 (in US$-millions).

Years	Kenya's military budget	Somalia's military budget	Tanzania's military budget	Uganda's military budget	Ethiopia's military budget	Eritrea's military budget
1963	1.861	3.16	0	2.729	27.289	
1964	5.879	4.48	0	5.487	36.14	
1965	9.897	5.17	0	10.737	42.9	
1966	13.047	6.5	0	14.265	43.42	
1967	15.987	7.53	14.629	16.841	37	
1968	16.365	8.34	16.239	19.942	34.66	
1969	15.749	9	20.089	22.861	34.42	
1970	17.023	11.2	29.539	26.627	34.54	
1971	22.077	11.4	42.559	52.687	36.134	
1972	29.735	13.2	53.689	64.944	41.043	
1973	37.319	16.1	77.916	64.872	48.433	
1974	46.763	21.4	120.044	80.157	74.758	
1975	54.09	23.1	138.323	86.567	125.072	
1976	75.91	26.3	136.687	101.074	128.043	
1977	147.766	31.7	190.729	131.916	135.048	
1978	239.475	81.4	421.677	151.699	178.212	
1979	291.024	87.7	375.458	206.806	276.328	
1980	271.691	95.5	232.291	398.813	359.323	
1981	241.171	134	331.019	108.146	366.98	
1982	243.721	83.9	366.761	87.488	387.98	
1983	208.691	83.9	332.95	93.723	408.405	
1984	145.781	89.2	293.025	75.215	423.019	
1985	181.255	44.3	345.976	104.818	429.444	
1986	249.81	34.9	260.704	131.071	439.202	
1987	250.942	28.5	161.608	130.971	476.202	
1988	228.606	49.5	124.833	140.904	614.855	
1989	246.456	8.56	105.316	139.821	781.521	
1990	191.908		87.154	107.006	785.048	

1991	191.908		108.141	73.561	529.033	
1992	156.036		96.907	52.331	255.343	
1993	105.704		58.725	62.636	163.85	107.737
1994	117.331		58.375	104.127	148.961	80.198
1995	149.096		85.513	127.002	122.46	124.996
1996	170.804		101.038	135.393	126.454	152.271
1997	175.834		118.603	139.615	225.417	92.756
1998	171.964		134.276	154.712	458.549	263.001
1999	151.917		128.497	159.704	703.704	272.856
2000	165.584		135.055	141.303	617.541	230.67
2001	195.365		150.728	136.157	349.808	166.67
2002	213.894		140.753	142.191	288.932	150.764
2003	245.938		125.254	152.191	278.673	181.583

Appendix B: Figure A1. Historical World Coffee Prices (in US$ per pound)



Macrotrends. 2019. 'Coffee Prices - 45 Year Historical Chart,' Macrotrends. Available at: https://www.macrotrends.net/2535/coffee-prices-historical-chart-data (Last accessed: 11 September 2019).

Appendix C: Participation Letter

International Relations Department
1 Jan Smuts Avenue
Johannesburg, 2000
Robert Sobukwe Block
Office 102



WITS
UNIVERSITY

Dear Potential Participant,

My name is Bhaso Ndzendze and I am a PhD student in International Relations at the University of the Witwatersrand in Johannesburg. As part of my studies, I have to undertake a research project, and for this purpose I am investigating the relevance of conventional explanations for interstate war and testing them on the African context in the late twentieth century. The title of the study is 'Explaining East Africa's Interstate Wars, 1977-2000: Towards a Typological Theory?' The aim of this research project is to find out the causes of the wars between African countries in the late 1970s, particularly between Somalia and Ethiopia, as well as Uganda and Tanzania, and once again in 1998 between Eritrea and Ethiopia.

As part of this project, I would like to invite you to take part in an interview regarding the countries, and particularly about the relations between the countries since the conflicts. This activity will involve a discussion with myself and will take approximately 30 minutes. I can travel to avail myself to a venue most convenient to you. With your permission, I would also like to record the interview using a digital device which will be stored in a password-protected private storage facility and only be accessed by myself.

You will not receive any direct benefits from participating in this research, and there are no disadvantages or penalties for not participating. You may withdraw at any time or not answer any question if you do not want to, upon which the audio recording will be deleted.

If you have any questions during or afterwards about this research, feel free to contact me or my supervisor Professor Gilbert Khadiagala on the details listed below. This study will be written up as a research report which will be available online through the university library website. If you wish to receive a summary of this report, I will be happy to send it to you. If you have any concerns or complaints regarding the ethical procedures of this study, you are welcome to contact the University Human Research Ethics Committee (Non-Medical), telephone +27(0) 11 717 1408, email Shaun.Schoeman@wits.ac.za

Yours sincerely,
(Mr) Bhaso Ndzendze
707213@students.wits.ac.za
+27 60 454 7222

Supervisor: Professor Gilbert Khadiagala, gilbert.khadiagala@wits.ac.za, +27 11 7174387

Appendix D: Ethical Clearance Certificate Information

Type: Non-medical (R14/49)

Protocol Number: H19/06/27

Project title: Explaining East Africa's interstate wars, 1977-2000: Towards a typological theory?

Appendix E: Insights from Interviews

Below I outline a number of themes which emanated from the various interviews with the participants:

Ethiopian unity: Different interviewees commonly had harsh comments for Ethiopia's current ethnic-based federalism which they saw as being elites using ethnicity to divide the country. Many of these divisions, they noted, occasionally flare up as distrust has been sown with some success. They were just as adamant that the country, however, that the country, when at war, is very quick to be united and to "rally around the flag." This was seen in 1977 when Somalia attacked and in 1998 when Eritrea attacked.

Tanzanian unity: In a different manner to Ethiopia but with the same chief effect, interviewees were quite adamant on the unity of Tanzania. This was attributed to the CCM (as well as the fact that the military and society were integrated to each other and to the party) and to the leadership of Julius Nyerere. Indeed, this is to be seen in the fact of the war effort being assisted by the rural population of herders who gave their cattle to supply the military, and by the donation of vehicles by the private sector. A major highlight, however, is the imperfect unity between the Arabic population and black population from the federation of Tanganyika and Zanzibar. Nevertheless, as the war was conducted on the mainland, this does not play a factor in the war with Uganda. Nonetheless, future studies should examine this aspect of Tanzania and its manifestation in the war, if at all.

Kenyan neutrality/favouritism: A theme which emanated from the interviews was the preference of Kenya for Uganda over Tanzania, which in turn was used to explain Kenya's neutral position despite there being a clear aggressor in 1978. Kenyan bias was also noted against Somalia, as the country worked to ensure lack of US support towards the country despite it being in a war against a Soviet and Cuban ally.

Failure of institutions: A fourth theme to emanate from the interviews was the failure of institutions to live up to their stated purpose of maintaining peace in the region. This is noted with the failure of the OAU to curtail the conflicts between all Somalia and Ethiopia, Uganda and Tanzania, and (though less so) between Eritrea and Ethiopia. This failure is thus noted in their incapacity to either prevent nor effectively negotiate the conclusion of the conflicts. Similarly, failure was ascribed towards the EAC and to some degree the IGAD. IGAD was formed in 1986 (i.e., after the two wars of the 1970s had already taken place), moreover, there was no response from it to the 1998-2000 war between Eritrea and Ethiopia (handled primarily

by the UN and OAU), despite the IGAD committing itself to resolving intra- and inter-state wars (Article 6A(c). CEWARN, the early warning mechanism for war, was only formed in 2002 (i.e., after the outbreak of all three wars under study here).

Eritrea and the status quo: One theme to emanate from the interviews was the insistence that perhaps Eritrea's leadership prefers the status quo as it gives them the leeway to administer the country under "war conditions," hence the legislature has not met since 2002 and conscription is still rampant.

Acknowledgements

I am privileged to have worked under the guidance of my supervisor Professor Gilbert Khadiagala, whose impact on my academic trajectory started long before this dissertation was even an idea. I was encouraged and never fail to be astonished by the depth of his knowledge of the security landscape on the continent and was buoyed by his perspicacity and conviction that there is still a lot of unfilled intellectual space.

I thank my parents, especially my dear late mother Elfrieda, who passed two years before this thesis was completed and to whom it is dedicated, for valuing and encouraging education, scientific curiosity, coherence, independence and self-discipline. I wish to thank my uncles, Solomzi and Fezile Ndzendze, for being generous with their libraries of political science, economics and history books that led to my interest in the field from an early point in my life. I am fortunate to have Mkholisi, Msawenkosi and Sivuyise as my brothers and sources of guidance.

I owe a debt of gratitude to my esteemed colleagues at the University of Johannesburg, for their kind support and encouragement as this project was underway. For their understanding, accommodation and encouragement, Professor Peng Yi, (soon to be Dr) Charles Matseke, Lebo Masebua, Zizipho Masiza, Smangele Zwane at the Centre for Africa-China Studies were – and remain – of immense importance in my budding career. Professors Graham (both), Chikwanha, Landsberg, Ndletyana, van Wyk, Drs Otto and Nganje, and *Prof* Rae Israel at the Department of Politics and International Relations were of incalculable inspiration. I am grateful to the constant counsel of Dr David Monyae, Professor Tshilidzi Marwala, Professor Saurabh Sinha, Dr Emmanuel Matambo, Dr Bongani Ngqulunga, Dr Mothobi Mutloatse, Dr Essop Pahad, Dr Chris Williams, Dr Mopeli Moshoeshoe, Professor Messay Mulugeta, Dr Enid Schutte, Dr Kingsley Orievulu, Dr Michelle Small, Ambassador Baso Sangqu and Larry Benjamin. I am convinced that no one has ever had the good fortune of being as intellectually supported as I am.

I am appreciative of the editorial assistance and inputs provided by Monica Seeber, Florance Thobejane, and Riaan de Villiers. Many of my postgraduate students have been of insight as they pursue(d) their own academic journeys. The external examiners provided critical substantive insights that have further polished the work. Their keen observations towards the questions I have asked and the method of answering them are extremely valued.

Finally, the interview participants in the various countries were generous with their time, their knowledge and extremely hospitable. They provided nuanced insights into their complex countries and showed the true cost of war on a society. Any flaws that may be in this dissertation remain my own.