

Somaliland: An Examination of State Failure and Secession Movements

Daniel Forti

Undergraduate Honors Thesis

Sanford School of Public Policy, Duke University, Durham, NC

Advisors: Professor Judith Kelley and Professor Stephen Smith

December 2011

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my heartfelt gratitude to my two advisors, Professor Judith Kelley and Professor Stephen Smith. Their guidance, support, and tough love were invaluable throughout this process and have come to define my academic experiences at Duke. I would also like to thank the African Centre for the Constructive Resolution of Disputes, Dr. Kwesi Sansculotte-Greenidge, and Dr. William Tsuma: their wealth of knowledge and experiences were critical in shaping my research on Somaliland. Finally, this paper could not have been done without the love and support of my parents, Ellen and Edwin.

INTRODUCTION

The collapse of Somalia's central government in 1991 has fissured the state into three distinct socio-political regions. South-central Somalia struggles to emerge from a devastating state crisis and exhibits no institutional capacity; Puntland, the northeastern region of Somalia, declared itself a semi-autonomous federal state in 1998 but exhibits widespread poverty¹; Somaliland, the northwest region of Somalia, maintains a relatively stable society under a self-declared, but unrecognized, independent government. Despite a hostile geographical and political climate, Somaliland has undergone numerous peaceful electoral turnovers, a rarity in post-colonial Africa. In light of the striking juxtaposition between south-central Somalia and Somaliland, this paper explores both the links between state failure and secession movements as well as examines Somaliland's attempt to secede.

Following the end of the Cold War and collapse of Somali President Siad Barre's twenty-two year dictatorship, militias have engaged a low-intensity but deadly fight for power throughout south-central Somalia. The region lacks a cohesive and functioning central government capable of supplying basic services to its people; as a result, south-central Somalia has become the archetypical 'failed state.' The Transitional Federal Government (TFG), created in 2004 with the support of Ethiopia, the United States, United Nations (UN), and African Union (AU), is the only internationally recognized government structure within the greater Somalia. However its power and influence are largely limited to the capital, Mogadishu. Kenyan, AU, and Somali National forces launched a full-scale attack on *al-Shabaab* on 23 October 2011 in hopes of eradicating the Islamist militant group responsible for thousands of deaths since 2006. Somaliland has remained largely insulated from the chaos engulfing south-central Somalia by

¹ Despite its importance in the region's piracy challenge, Puntland will not be examined in this project.

implementing a localized statebuilding process, developing critical social infrastructure, and mobilizing support from the diaspora.

This paper seeks to assess the viability of Somaliland's secession movement while interrogating the relationship between failed states and secession movements. The next section reviews existing literature on state failure and secession movements to present a broad understanding of its relevance and shortcomings. The paper then develops an alternative theoretical framework that evaluates the duration of the secession attempt, the secession movement's institutional capacity, and the movement's international and diaspora support. This framework is then applied to three small case studies of secession attempts in Biafra, Eritrea, and South Sudan, and one large case study of Somaliland. The results will show that Somaliland's secession movement is likely to succeed.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Defining the State within the International Legal Frameworks

Standard definitions of the state and statehood are derived from the 1934 Montevideo Convention.² A state, as defined by international law, includes four significant qualifications: a) a permanent population; b) a defined territory; c) an effective government; and, d) capacity to enter into relationships with other states (O.A.S. 1934). The first qualification - a state's permanent population - centers on the legal understanding that states are both territorial entities and constituted by individuals and thus requires a permanent, but not immobilized, population.

² The Montevideo Convention on Rights and Duties of States was signed on 26 December 1934 during the Seventh International Conference of American States. The treaty, originally ratified by nineteen states, was adopted by the League of Nations in 1936 and subsequently accepted as an international norm.

The second qualification – a defined territory – requires the effective governance of a coherent territory (Schoiswhol 2004); numerous examples of disputed border claims disprove the notion that a state requires defined boundaries to constitute statehood. The third qualification – an effective government – necessitates the existence and role of an authority to effectively exercise government functions and represent the entity in international relations” (Schoiswhol 2004). Malanczuk identifies two components to effective governance: “the capacity to establish and maintain a legal order in the sense of constitutional autonomy...and the ability to act autonomously on the international level without being legally dependent on other States within the international order” (Malanczuk 1997, reprinted in Schoiswhol 2004: 15). The fourth and final qualification – the capacity to engage in relations with other states – underscores the state’s ability to use its political, technical, and financial means to conduct foreign relations. However, it is important distinguish this particular qualification as less of a prerequisite for statehood and more as a consequence of statehood: the international community’s willingness to engage a particular state, whether formally recognized as such or otherwise, may dependent on international politics as much as the capacity of the state in question.

These four qualifications detailed above create an apparent paradox within the international legal framework of the state: satisfying the Montevideo criterion does not guarantee any territory’s formal recognition as a state. As this paradox only emerges when discussing those territories outside of the internationally accepted community of ‘states,’ it is imperative to first examine the competing theories on statehood, followed by the two theoretical categories that stand outside of the statehood definition provided in the Montevideo Convention: failed states and secessionist regions.

State Failure

The concept of state failure is used to describe a state marred by socio-economic chaos, political turmoil and the inability to provide basic services. However the term remains loosely defined and frequently contested in both academic and policy realms. Theories on state failure can be grouped into two broad categories: those that define and label state failure based upon the absence of specific characteristics, and theories that assess existing conditions within a historical context. These contending views lead to two separate conclusions. First, while the term has empirical value as a label, it does not necessarily carry analytic weight. And second, attempting to determine and apply specific criteria of state failure without considering the unique characteristics of a country creates a weak link in the analysis.

1) The Absence of Specific and Definable Characteristics

Numerous theories assert that state failure is predicated solely upon the absence of select criteria. Such analyses focus upon three main attributes of the state: effectiveness, legitimacy, and a monopoly on violence. A states' effectiveness is described as its ability to provide basic functions such as physical security, economic security, basic educational programs and functioning health services (Goldstone 2008); legitimacy relates to the citizens' perceptions of the government as just or reasonable either through negative sovereignty³ or positive sovereignty⁴ (Ibid); the monopoly on violence is best understood as the state's fundamental capacity as a security provider so that all other services can function (Rotberg 2002). Williams similarly defines state failure as a nation's inability to control actors within its territory and

³ Robert H Jackson's seminal work, *Quasi-states*, defines negative sovereignty as: a normative framework, which upholds the de jure legal sovereignty of states in the developing world. Such states, in theory, enjoy legal freedom from outside interference but they lack the ability to meaningfully function or provide public services, including order (Cibian 2010)

⁴ Jackson defines positive sovereignty as: presupposes capabilities which enable governments to be their own masters: it is a substantive rather than a formal condition."

provide public goods to the entire population (Williams 2007). Without a monopoly on violence, countries can suffer enduring coercive violence, the inability to control borders, a deteriorating infrastructure, or the emergence predatory actors (inside or outside the government) (Rotberg 2002).

While these theories begin the discussion of failed states, they obscure contextual realities as utilizing a specific checklist narrows the analytical window. Select weaknesses do not fundamentally precipitate the absence of statehood, only a difference between stronger and weaker states; these theories “create a scenario where any deviation from the definition of statehood can only appear as a lack...” (Eriksen 2010: 233). The paradigm only restates an empirical observation; its negative definition of a particular condition leads to the development of negative framework for evaluating future policy.

2) Contextualizing Statehood

A second set of frameworks attempts to account for empirical realities through which any state is formed. Jones explains, “the problem with the ‘failed state’ discourse is not with the empirical identification of economic, political, and crises as such, but in the manner of characterizing and, above all, explaining the nature and production of such conditions” (Jones 2008: 182). Thus, statehood interpreted through the ‘failed state’ paradigm should be reevaluated as, “a socio-political order... [order] is used as a positive description of a set of organizations whose actions are governed by informal and formal rules and exhibit a certain degree of regularity” (Halden 2008: 17). This positive reconceptualization allows for examinations in terms of features states do possess, instead of those they do not. Divorcing itself from the Westphalian conception of a

state, Halden's work allows for us to examine unique historical characteristics while "envisioning a broader variety of solutions and future..." (Ibid: 18).

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

A select number of characteristics are attributed to all states. First, the state must maintain sovereignty over its territory and people. Sovereignty is predicated on the premise of authority, meaning that it must have the ability to dictate and regulate rules, activities and issues; sovereignty does not imply that the state must be able to enforce such rules. Two forms of sovereignty explain a state's control over its people: positive sovereignty expresses the ability to implement laws and make decisions, as well as make exceptions to such rules; negative sovereignty, disproportionately prevalent throughout Africa, signifies support from and non-interference by other states, implying that a nation does not exhibit necessary control over its territory and people and is instead propped up by outside forces. Second, the state is an administrative and bureaucratic entity that is both separated from society and bound by specific territorial limits. This institutional power permits the state to preside over and regulate all aspects of society and helps determine its relationship with the citizenry. The state's primary source of revenue (whether taxation or exploitation of a natural resource) will dictate this bureaucracy's responsiveness to society's demands. And third, the state must exhibit control over the monopoly of violence.

Crucial to this definition is the exploration of the state as the product of class consensus. De Waal argues that the state should also be perceived as an agreement on a political economy based predominantly on productive activities, creating a consensus over the distribution of key

resources. (De Waal 2007). De Waal explores this through Somalia's regions, highlighting the relative consensus of resource sharing in Somaliland versus the neo-patrimonial distribution of wealth and power in south-central Somalia as a key determinant in their respective successes and failures. Ensuring the success of any government stems from a balance between the state and the key economic sectors.

This definition of the state will enable us to analyze how statehood is not only disrupted but also shaped and influenced by secession movements. Tangible relations can be drawn between the state and key stakeholders in any geo-political context, including the populous, non-state actors (both domestic and international) and other nations. Exploring these relations during specific time periods will help us determine a nation's degrees of statehood, thus consisting of a fundamental component of the subsequent analysis.

Evaluating International Norms for Secession Movements

Three international principles have emerged in relation to state sovereignty. First, colonized region has a right to self-determination and freedom from external influence (United Nations 1970). However, the virtual elimination of colonialism renders this principle largely irrelevant. Second, any territory may use internal political mechanisms within existing state structures (such as a clause within a constitution) to pursue self-determination. While the conditions needed to meet this law may be strict, the existence of this clause would help establish the legal validity of such movements (Buchanan 2007). However, as secessions are detrimental to the unity of a state, such mechanisms are unlikely to be found within any constitution. Third, regions can pursue external (or *de facto*) self-determination, secession; the international community rarely supports secessions as they compete with the parent state's desires, highlighted by the UN and AU's

reluctance to support most secession movements (Kreuter 2011). Thus it remains virtually impossible for secession movements to act with legal support.

Studies of Secession Movements

Numerous studies attempt to isolate and explain both conditions causes secession movements as well as what determines their eventual successes or failures. Paul Collier and Anke Hoeffler's analysis concludes that two important characteristics for predicting secessionist attempts are high levels of natural resource endowments and low levels of secondary education. As economic advantages determine political identities, they argue, only those that perceive an inherent economic interest will adapt to create a unified political identity. Secession movements are fueled by natural resources because of "the opportunity which they provide to rebel groups to finance their activities during conflicts and the lure of capturing resource ownership permanently if the rebellion is victorious"(Collier and Hoeffler 2004: 12). Oil, among the most valuable of natural resources, is 'wealth without work' as the income generated accrues directly to those who are in control of the oil mines. Similarly, the authors determine that low levels of education enable politicians to create and maintain a community identity based on ethnicity or religion in order to mobilize support for their economic motives. The authors supplement the regression analyses with qualitative studies involving the Biafran and southern Sudan secession movements.

Two separate analyses attempt to highlight the challenges secession movements face. When considering the state's willingness to relinquish the territory in question, Hechter uses a rational choice premise to examine how secession movements differentiate from one another. While many frameworks focus on the secession movement itself, Hechter assesses the relative power of the parent state, "land is the pillar of the state; it provides tax revenue, a labor force,

mineral and other geographically based resources, and it is often vital for defense” (Hechter 1992: 277). Because of the territory’s inherent value to the state, governments will always attempt to avoid secession; this entails the use of constitutional reforms, socio-economic compromises, and repression to deter the movement. Horowitz contends that the newly created states would ultimately proliferate the conditions from which they were created, namely the repression of ethnic and cultural minorities. Horowitz writes, “secession is an anti-state movement, and an international law that forgets that states are its main subjects risks its own survival” (Horowitz 2003: 14). While this analysis provides valuable insight into understanding the inherent risks of secession movements, it is limited by the context of ethnic solutions. Further, Horowitz expresses reservations against amending international laws to support secession movements as such laws are intended to benefit the state whereas secession movements are anti-state actions. Such studies highlight the external challenges of any secession movement.

METHODOLOGY

Connecting two different elements of the crisis allows for a comprehensive examination of secession movements. Two analytical tracks comprise this study: an assessment of the quality of each parent state and the creation of specific categories to determine the factors that impact a secession movement’s success or failure. The first component is a conceptual revision of statehood. This paper does not create a series of precise categories, but instead proposes an open scale of statehood that facilitates a relative ranking of states across different time periods. A review of secondary literature is used to assess the relative strength or weakness of statehood. The second component will apply analytical criteria to four secession case studies to assess their

secession movements' successes or failures. Case studies are used explain the relationships between particular phenomena and the spaces in which they occur. Each study will examine the quality of the parent state through the analytical categories to assess each secession movement's success; the three chosen for this analysis include:

- Duration of the conflict
- Institutional capacity of the secession movement
- Perceived legitimacy from the international community and the diaspora

Data will be collected through a combination of secondary sources.

When discussing the international community, it is necessary to revisit the concept of negative sovereignty. Some suggest that this criterion carries disproportionately more weight as the international community can bestow statehood at its own discretion. While formal recognition does facilitate diplomatic and economic benefits, other criteria nonetheless hold important explanatory value. Analyzing secession movements require engaging the histories, contexts, and actions of each movement, a reality that cannot be explained solely through the lens of the international community. In addition, the international community does not constitute one unified body but comprises many actors, each with their own perspectives and agendas. International actors often play competing roles and have disproportionate influences over the outcomes of each secession movement.

The analysis will subsequently comprise a visual assessment of the criteria. One of seven grades will be assigned to each category within all four case studies (listed from lowest to highest): O ; O/+ ; + ; + /++ , ++ ; ++ / +++ ; and + + +. The O would therefore represent a relatively short conflict; a significant absence of any institutional capacity; or the absence of legitimacy from the international community or diaspora. On the other hand, a grade of + + + would be assigned to a conflict that lasted over a long period of time; a presence of strong state

and social institutions; or significant support from the entire international community or diaspora. Although the analysis may frame the “duration of the secession conflict” category as a dependent variable upon the other two categories (as both institutional capacity and perceived legitimacy can sustain a rebel movement), this category also assesses the parent state’s overall capabilities, providing a more in depth understanding of the secession movement relative to the parent state. After this chart is created, it will be used in an attempt to isolate patterns within the categories so as to best determine the viability of Somaliland’s secession movement.

It is relevant to only consider those movements that have occurred within Africa, as shifting between continents would introduce confounding variables pertaining to the regions respective histories and cultures. Despite the continent’s arbitrary borders⁵, conflicts over state boundaries have remained largely absent from the post-colonial era. From 1960 through today, only seven African countries have engaged secession movements. The high-intensity conflicts in Nigeria, Ethiopia, and the Sudan will be studied first, with the project culminating in a case study on Somaliland. Other secession attempts failed to gain similar traction: Katanga separated from the DRC weeks after the country gained independence from Belgium, but was quickly repressed by a combination of Congolese, Belgium, and UN forces. Casamance, the entire Senegalese territory below The Gambia has engaged in a low-scale conflict with the national government since 1980, though a once strong independence movement has fractured into competing and weakened factions. Finally, KwaZulu Natal’s Inkhata Freedom Party (IFP) attempted to obtain considerable provincial autonomy from South Africa’s transition government in 1994 but never declared its intention to secede.

⁵ Modern Africa’s borders were drawn during the 1884-85 Berlin Conference, subsequently marking the official beginning of European colonialism on the continent

CASE STUDIES

Biafra

The Biafran secession movement, lasting from 1967-70, marked the short and unsuccessful attempt by Nigeria's eastern region to secede from what they perceived to be an unjust and oppressive federal government. During the early 1900s, British colonialists created a tripartite federation between the north, southeast, and southwest that formalized and exacerbated unequal development. Members of the Ibo community, the dominant ethnicity in Biafra, disproportionately benefitted from federal structures as they previously acquired the necessary education and language skills to facilitate their seamless integration into the colonial political and economic structures established by the British. The Ibo developed urban city-states that strongly facilitated infrastructural and economic development relative to the northern communities (Ekwe-Ekwe 2006:45).

Colonial structures remained largely intact following Nigeria's independence in 1960, leading to a power struggle between the northern and eastern regions. This competition was exacerbated by the commercialization of the Biafra's oil reserves in the early 1960s; given that oil revenue accrued to the federal government and not individual states, many Biafran leaders found economic incentive to disengage from the federal government (Collier and Hoeffler, 2002; Fearon and Laitin 2006). Starting in January 1966, a series of military coups further distorted relations between the federal states and ethnic communities, culminating in a May 1966 federal campaign to drive ethnic Ibos from the north through the use of mass and indiscriminate violence. By October 1966, over 100,000 Ibos had been killed solely for being Ibo while hundreds of thousands more flocked to Biafra in hopes of avoiding the pogroms. After numerous failed peace

attempts in early 1967, Biafra's military-governor, Colonel Odumegwu Ojukwu, declared the region's unilateral independence on 30 May 1967.

The Biafran secession lasted for only three years and failed to generate tangible momentum. Nigeria's federal government immediately launched a full-scale counter-offensive to maintain the unity of the federation and protect national oil revenue. While Biafra initially repelled Nigerian forces, they were unable to sustain the fighting. A superior military facilitated Nigeria's ability to restrict inflows of economic aid and relief agencies into Biafra, isolating the region while sparking a humanitarian crisis that led to the death of over 180,000 Biafran civilians (Ian Smillie, quoted in De Waal 1997: 77). Federation soldiers implemented scorched-earth policies, destroying Biafra's agricultural base while simultaneously launching crippling air, land, and sea offensives. Biafra also struggled due to its inability to generate significant support within Eastern Nigeria: of an approximately 12 million population, only 7 million Biafrans were ethnic Ibos, while the other 5 million comprised a range of ethnic minorities; these non-Ibo minority groups benefitted from the federation structure where they had formal access to political power, a privilege that may have disappeared if Biafra seceded from Nigeria (Uwechue 1971: 62-3). In early January 1970, Nigeria captured the Biafran stronghold of Owerri, forcing Colonel Ojukwu to flee to Côte d'Ivoire and admit defeat. The short duration of the secession became the crucial determinant of its failure.

Biafra's secession government was incapable of constructing vital institutions for the region's survival. Basic social services such as schools and hospitals shut down during the war; economic blockades created devastating shortages of food, clothing, and medicine; mass starvation quickly became the 'plight of Biafra'. Humanitarian organizations struggled to enter the region and were unable to effectively deliver aid due to the strict blockade imposed by

Nigerian military. Profits from Biafra's oil reserves were channeled to the capital, eliminating the revenue earmarked for financing the secession movement. Despite its ability to marshal an army for three years, Biafra's inability to exert institutional capacity facilitated the rapid demise of the secession movement.

Limited international and diaspora support was more a response to the devastating humanitarian crisis than support for the secession itself. Biafra received emergency airlifts of food, medicine and military aid from France, who held a vested interest in destabilizing Nigeria. Both Britain and France maintained large spheres of influence within their former colonies, and as Nigeria constituted the largest British stronghold within the otherwise French West Africa, France found an opportunity to disrupt its largest competitor. On the other hand, Britain and the Soviet Union provided ample political support to the Nigerian federation: the British Royal Shell oil company maintained a significant investment in the Nigerian oil reserves while the Soviet Union recognized an important opportunity to improve its political ties with a central African heavyweight (Ekwe-Ekwe 1990: 21). The Organization of African Unity (OAU)⁶ and the UN refused to support Biafra as they both objected to the dissolution of state borders (Uwechue 1971:86); the five states that ultimately provided Biafra with diplomatic recognition (Côte d'Ivoire, Haiti, Gabon, Tanzania and Zambia) did so out of concern for the emerging humanitarian crisis instead of affirming the secessionist attempt (Uwechue 1971: 88). Biafra's limited diaspora failed to exert diplomatic or financial influence to support the movement. Thus the secession movement did not garner much outside support, further inhibited its success.

⁶ The preeminent African political body and precursor to the AU

Eritrea

The Eritrean secession movement, a prolonged conflict between Eritrean nationalists and the Ethiopian government lasting from 1961 – 1991, culminated in Eritrea’s secession and independence. Eritrea fell under Italian colonization in 1890, along with the southern portion of present-day south-central Somalia. Following the collapse of fascist Italy in World War II, Eritrea was designated as a British protectorate until 1951. Despite Ethiopian Emperor Haile Selassie’s attempts to claim both Eritrea and Italian Somaliland for Ethiopia, the UN facilitated a loose federation between Ethiopia and Eritrea under the rule of Emperor Selassie, where Eritrea would maintain its own domestic sovereignty and control over its political affairs. Between 1953 and 1961, Emperor Selassie systematically violated the UN resolution by imposing Amharic language within both the public and educational spheres⁷, excluding all Eritrean representation from the Ethiopian federal government, suspending Eritrea’s Parliament, banning trade unions, increasing direct taxes, and using disproportionate military force to suppress popular uprisings against the empire (Cervenka 1977: 42; Yohannes 1987: 655; Araya 1990:81-84). Following a number of violent outbursts against occupying Ethiopian forces, Selassie dissolved the federation in early 1962 and annexed Eritrea.

Eritrea’s secession was sustained for over thirty years due to the liberation movements’ populist goals and programs. Despite cultural, religious, and ideological differences between many different Eritrean factions, the secession was fundamentally based upon grievances against the separate and unequal development of Eritrea (Araya 1990). Until 1975, there was a significant conflict within Eritrea for dominance over the liberation struggle, pitting the Eritrean Liberation Front (ELF) (a primarily Islamic socialist and youth driven movement) against the

⁷ The dominant language throughout Eritrea was Tigryan

Eritrean Peoples Liberation Front (a populist-oriented Eritrean nationalist movement). The EPLF emerged victorious with support from traditional elders who ultimately called for the fighters to refocus their energies towards independence; other factions soon united under the EPLF to present a unified opposition against the Ethiopian regime. Ethiopian conventional army could not suppress Eritrea's guerilla forces, prolonging the conflict: each passing year further strained Ethiopia while invigorating Eritrea towards liberation. Following the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1989, Ethiopia lost its most prominent financial supporter, ultimately leading to the termination of Ethiopia's occupation of Eritrea in 1991. Eritrea's ability to outlast Ethiopia precipitated the region's achievement of independence.

Institutional development became a hallmark of the EPLF and played a critical role in the successful secession. The EPLF maintained local support from a wide range of ethnic groups and social classes by implementing an institutional platform to rebuild and strengthen Eritrea (Iyob 1995: 102). Among its most successful policy achievements, the EPLF facilitated advancements in women's rights, designed educational curriculums to promote an Eritrean national identity, constructed a health care system for the rural poor, and implemented a land reform system that disproportionately benefitted lower and middle class farmers (Iyob 1995; Pool 2001). EPLF officials also created a modest but efficient taxation system that redistributed revenue to the military and development programs, fostering a mutually beneficial relationship between the fighters and civilians. Historian Basil Davidson described the positive impact of the EPLF, "the administration is very popular among the majority of the people. It is very efficient under extremely difficult conditions of war and drought...[the EPLF] is serving a lot larger population proportionately, than in many independent countries, including the colonial power itself" (Babu

1988: 57). As a result, the Eritrean secession movement presented a positive institutional alternative to the Ethiopian government by creating the foundation for an independent state.

The international and diaspora communities' support of the EPLF was critical for the movement's eventual success. Early in the conflict, the Ethiopian government received the vast majority of international support: not only was Emperor Selassie universally praised throughout Africa as the father of the OAU, but was also supported by the United States, who sought to use Ethiopia and Eritrea as strategic pieces within the geopolitical paradigm of the Cold War (Babu 1988:49; Gilkes and Plaut, 1999). International support for Ethiopia waned following the political transition from Emperor Selassie to the *Dergue* in 1974⁸. Communist overtures and unsuccessful economic reforms, coupled with a devastating famine in 1974-5, brought to light limitations of Ethiopia's rule over Eritrea, leading America to redirect its investment into the EPLF. The Eritrean nationalist movement also received support from the Eritrean diaspora, as many shared a deep and personal association with the independence movement (Bernal 2004: 12). Members of the diaspora organized political and humanitarian promotions and activities across the world while sending remittances to finance the EPLF's military ventures (Ibid). Strong external recognition combined with critical diplomatic and financial support facilitated Eritrea's ability to outlast Ethiopia's military occupation and ultimately gain its independence.

⁸ A communist military junta led by Major Mengitsu Haile Mariam

South Sudan

South Sudan's secession movement was based upon distorted power structures and unequal access to development opportunities within Africa's largest country, spanning two civil wars and eventually leading to independence in 2011. Colonial structures during British rule disproportionately favored the northern Sudanese as infrastructure, health services, and educational opportunities exclusively concentrated in the areas around the capital, Khartoum. During the transition to independence in 1955, political power was concentrated within a small conservative Arab ethnic minority; conflict emerged when the government refused to introduce a federal political structure that would grant relative autonomy to the country's competing ethnicities. A violent crackdown on army mutineers inadvertently spawned a rebel movement that evolved into legitimate opposition forces responsible for waging Sudan's first civil war. The federal government's willingness to channel national cotton export revenue into the war further distorted development imbalances between Sudan's center and periphery (Omeje 2010; Murphy and Temin 2011). When the central government's revenue streams dissipated in 1972, General Gaafar Mohamed el-Nimeiri negotiated the Addis Ababa Peace Treaty with the southern rebels, granting the southern Sudanese regional political autonomy.

Conflict reemerged in 1983 following the discovery of oil reserves near the administrative border between North and South Sudan; now president, Nimeiri gerrymandered the three closest administrative territories into ten arbitrary states so as to claim the oil territories for the north (Omeje 2010). Nimeiri's decision to construct an oil pipeline extending from the South to the North, while imposing Sharia law throughout Sudan sparked a second civil war, pitting the federal government against a new rebel movement, the Sudanese Peoples Liberation Army (SPLA) [later becoming the SPLM (Movement)].

Despite the emergence of competing rebel movements, South Sudan sustained its secession movement for over fifty years. The prolonged conflict is less a mark of the SPLM's competence than the North's inability to maintain a monopoly on violence throughout Sudan. A number of rebel movements, both in southern Sudan and western Sudan (including the Justice and Equality Movement of Darfur), emerged to combat Khartoum's hegemony; the proliferation of actors and violent conflicts prolonged the war while further devastating the entire country. SPLM forces were weak and divided; the movement attracted a significant following only because of anger with the North and not due to a comprehensive policy platform, institutional ability, or a common bond forged between the revolutionaries and the masses (Nyaba 1997; Metelits 2004). While most of the SPLM's membership was pooled from the Dinka ethnicity (the same group of SPLM founder Dr. John Garang), a number of rebel movements and ethnicities from western and southern Sudan joined the movement, leading to internal power struggles and political challenges. Despite such divisions, the various rebel movements constituted a vital counterbalance to the repressive central government; by endearing the secession to the masses, the SPLM was able to survive significant limitations.

The SPLM was unable to exert any institutional capacity throughout the conflict. Rebel leaders could not fill the void of a nonexistent central government, despite occupying over 80 percent of the southern countryside by 1989 (Alier 1990). Food and medicine shortages were common while all schools outside of Juba (the de-facto Southern capital) were closed by 1987, further deteriorating the relationship between the militant leadership of the SPLM and the civilian population they were representing (Alier 1990; Nyaba 1997). Such struggles, compounded by years of inadequate administration, continued into the early 2000s when the rebel movement failed to establish any taxation system outside of soldiers' frequent extortions of

the civilian population. No formal economy was developed in the region, subsequently leading to an unequal distribution of revenue between the leadership of the SPLM, its fighters, and the civilians. The lack of institution building damaged the SPLM's secession attempt and forced the rebellion to rely upon international aid for survival.

Strong financial support from the United Nations and United States was paramount to South Sudan's successful secession. Following the 1988 famine in Sudan's Bahr el-Ghazal region, the UN mobilized Operation Lifeline, a humanitarian intervention directed to provide internally displaced persons with emergency relief and long term aid; comprised of over 35 UN-affiliated entities and non-government organizations (including UNICEF, the World Food Programme, Save the Children Foundation, and Médecins sans Frontiers), the umbrella operation coordinated the aid agencies in facilitating South Sudan's development (Taylor-Robinson 2002). The collapse of the Ethiopian *Dergue* and the end of the Cold War allowed the United States to assume a role as South Sudan's most prominent benefactor, "since the mid 1990s, about 80 percent of US aid to Sudan has gone to southern, rebel controlled areas... on humanitarian grounds United States Agency for International Development (USAID) has already committed to supporting the SPLA/M in the south, and Garang said the agency has committed US \$42.5 million over the next five years" (Cobb 2002:1, reprinted in Metelits 2004:75). The Americans' support for the SPLM became a crucial counterweight to China's investment in the Khartoum government, who sought the region's oil in exchange for economic and military support. Despite virtually no contributions from the diaspora, the South Sudanese movement survived with invaluable support from key members of the international community.

Analysis of Smaller Case Studies

A discussion of the three secondary case studies facilitates a broader analytical base on which the interaction with the Somaliland secession movement can be developed. Below is the chart applying the analytical framework to the respective secession movements.

Categories impacting Secession Movements	BIAFRA	ERITREA	SOUTH SUDAN
Duration of Secession Movement	O	+++	+++
Institutional Capacity	+	+++	O
International Support	+	++	+++
Diaspora Support	O / +	+++	O / +
Result	FAILURE	SUCCESS	SUCCESS

The data in this analysis points to the importance of maintaining a lengthy secession movement while garnering significant support from either the region's diaspora or the international community. These premises are the platform for analyzing Somaliland's secession movement.

SOMALILAND

Somaliland has been a self-proclaimed independent state since the collapse of the Somali central government in 1991. By creating a widely accepted government structure and rebuilding basic state institutions, Somaliland has laid a stable and secure foundation to support and sustain the secession movement. Without the need to combat a hostile parent state, Somaliland has turned inwards to foster peace and development. The active diaspora community continuously finances and supports Somaliland state building projects and local institutions. While there is little momentum for its formal recognition as an independent country, Somaliland nonetheless continues to function as well as, if not better than, a number of established African countries.

Background to the Conflict

Somaliland, Puntland, and south-central Somalia underwent vastly different experiences before and during the colonial era. Despite Somaliland's configuration as nomadic pastoral society, the region was dominated by the Adal Sultanate and the Ajuraan State from the fourteenth to seventeenth century; each wielded significant political and economic influence within East Africa, underscoring the historical presence of formalized state institutions within an agro-pastoral context. British naval fleets entered into treaties with Somaliland coastal traders in 1884, beginning a period of light colonial influences. South-central Somalia and Puntland (combined to form Italian Somaliland) underwent drastic changes as Italian colonies. A rapid transition from subsistence to export farming unintentionally severed traditional trade links between the region and other parts of Africa (Samatar 1989; Walls 2011). The widespread imposition of western governance structures led to the extreme centralization of power within the capital, Mogadishu,

while facilitating the birth of a elite politically educated minority and marginalizing the larger rural peripheries.

Following the end of World War II, both regions were mandated as British Protectorates with the understanding that they would unite to form a greater Somalia. British Somaliland declared independence on 26 June 1960, with Italian Somaliland following on 1 July; both legislatures enacted separate 'Acts of Union' to formally unite the two states into one 'Somali Republic' (Republic of Somaliland, 1960). However, the coalition government struggled to generate tax revenue while southern politicians quickly gained disproportionate influence, marginalizing many Somalilanders. On 15 October 1969, Somali President Abd ar-Rashid Ali Shirmake was assassinated in a military coup that led to the ascendance of General Mohamed Siad Barre. Barre imposed strict policies of "Scientific Socialism" to ultimately transform Somalia into a modern and powerful nation state. However, such policies solidified clan tensions while further concentrating power within Mogadishu. Despite introducing a modern written language while advancing women's political rights, Barre's regime began a sharp decline in 1974, sparked by the Dhabaadheer drought and famine cost that over 20,000 lives while draining the country's struggling export economy (Simons 1995). Soon after, Barre launched a costly war against Ethiopia over the Ogaden, a historically contested territory in between the two nations. Barre's resounding defeat in 1978, coupled with the resulting humanitarian crisis, gave rise to a powerful opposition movement in Somaliland during the 1980s.

The Somali National Movement (SNM) promoted a return to "Somali cultural values of cooperation rather than coercion" (Ahmed I. Samatar, 1988, reprinted in Walls 2011:123). Most important was the alleviation of considerable ethnic and regional imbalances that had minimized Somalilanders' influence and opportunities within the country's centralized structures. This

competition sparked a deadly war between the SNM and the Somali government as Barre launched numerous deadly air strikes and bombings on Hargeisa and Burao, Somaliland's two largest cities. The resulting civil war, lasting between May 1988 and March 1989 led to the death of over 40,000 Somali people, the majority of whom were from Somaliland. American aid, which was channeled into Somalia's military, ended along with the Cold War, rapidly facilitating the Barre regime's demise. A strong but uncoordinated coalition of rebel groups and warlords emerged from the power vacuum to contest Barre, sparking anti-government protest and violent clashes between civilians and the army; on 26 January 1991, Barre fled Mogadishu, leading to the collapse of functioning centralized governance in Somalia.

Legitimacy and State building - Sustaining the Secession Movement

Somaliland has successfully sustained its secession movement by developing a participatory and localized system of governance while creating broad acceptance of and institutional space for a national Somaliland identity. Following the government's collapse in 1991, Somaliland's political leaders and traditional elders set forward to develop government structures to sustain the region and subsequently transform the momentum into the foundation of a new state. Clan elders first initiated a number of local *shirs*⁹ to establish relationships with local constituents, end outstanding disagreements and conflicts between and within nomadic communities, and mobilize support for the creation of an independent Somaliland. As revered and respected figures, clan elders both prevented SNM domination of the statebuilding process and cut across all segments of Somaliland's society. Elders also utilized comparisons of Somaliland and south-central Somalia to restore order: not only had the Barre government killed thousands of people in

⁹ Decentralized and broadly participatory Somali traditional forums

Somaliland during the civil war, but an anarchic power struggle had also broken out between militant factions in Mogadishu following the collapse of the government. Assertions of the need for peace and unity in light of the chaos in south-central Somalia helped Somaliland avoid similar pitfalls.

From 1992-7, the region's business leaders organized a number of national conferences to establish future political structures, paramount for embodying the principles of the secession movement within the states frameworks. Throughout these conferences, attended by a significant cross-section of the region's stakeholders, Somalilanders transferred key political and decision-making power from the militant SNM to civilian leadership, designed a unique government combining Western and Somali-based political institutions, and overcame internal strife and political competition through a firm commitment to non-violent dispute resolution. This transition of power included a number of critical features to ensure the region's stability. The formal incorporation of revered clan elders within the national conference decision-making process facilitated a necessary degree of trust between Somaliland leadership and their constituencies. Brief periods of fighting between different sub-clans of the majority Issaq clan, and subsequent mediation by members of the Gadabuursi clan (a non-Issaq minority) underscored the critical notion that Somaliland's future political system would not be subjected to Issaq domination in the same way that the former Somali central government was dominated by members of Barre's Darod clan (Logan 2002; Moe 2009; Walls 2011). This indirect reassurance helped unite the diverse sub-clans and communities within Somaliland by facilitating their participation in the localized state-building project.

Finally, unlike other secession movements, Somaliland has not faced significant military opposition from south-central Somalia. Although violence and civil unrest has plagued south-

central Somalia since 1991, none of such violence has emerged from an attempt to reunify the greater Somalia.. This has been a critical factor in ensuring the survival of Somaliland's secession movement: as Somaliland avoided the pressures of violence and armed conflict, the government has focused its scarce resources on the region's development instead of engaging a sustained violent conflict.

Building a new Somaliland – The creation of lasting state institutions

Somaliland has crafted a number of important state institutions that ensured the region's survival and facilitated its growth from a secession movement into an established state. However, limited finances and a slow recovery from the devastating civil war have hindered Somaliland's overall development. The region's political system encompasses both Western and Somali institutions to assert its authority while limited tax revenue, generated through the livestock export sector, maintains a direct relationship of accountability between the government and the people throughout the region (Eubank 2011). Although access to educational and medical services has improved in recent years, educational achievement rates and health statistics have only begun to show modest positive changes.

Somaliland's government institutions contribute to the region's stability and political accomplishments. The political architecture that emerged from the National Conferences in 1997 contained a bi-cameral Parliament that infused both Western-styled and traditional Somali political units. Parliament's Lower House, the Assembly of Representatives comprises 82 elected officials based upon the number of votes received by each of Somaliland's three parties during a given election; Parliament's Upper House, the Assembly of Elders (*Guurti*), is comprised of 82 revered clan elders who were nominated by their respective clan and sub-clans to represent their

interests within the new government. The Guurti are specifically intended to use their experience and wisdom for dispute mediation and peace keeping, and over the past ten years the Guurti has become an indispensable force in maintaining Somaliland's fragile peace (Bradbury 2008; Logan 2002; Renders 2007). This body also provides significant cultural legitimacy to the government, as the traditional leaders constitute a powerful voice for their constituents as well as safeguards against political manipulation. Such stability has facilitated five successful and peaceful government elections since 2001, all of which were deemed relatively free and fair by international observers (Economist 2010).

The region's economy struggles to develop as the government lacks critical finances to support itself. Livestock trade, Somaliland's primary revenue stream, does not generate enough funds to account for a lack of foreign investment and international trade. Somaliland's 2010 budget did not surpass \$50 million; the government collected \$47 million from tax revenue that same year, and plans on increasing total receipts to \$106 million within a few years by raising personal and corporate tax rates while streamlining tax collection procedures at major ports (Clapham et al. 2011). Consequentially the government uses its strong relationship with the local livestock traders, the primary constituents of the domestic business community, to support a reliable and efficient taxation system. In addition, Somaliland's regional districts can exert their own fiscal influence by raising taxes on local resources, land, and businesses, an important layer of fiscal decentralization from the central government and a mechanism of accountability for local constituents (Eubank 2011). The government's dependence upon tax receipts as a primary means of economic revenue fosters both legitimacy from and accountability to the people of Somaliland despite the government's inability to exert significant economic influence within the country.

Given limited financial resources, Somaliland has been unable to make significant investments in social services and relies upon decentralized donor aid to facilitate development projects. In 2009 only 6.7 percent of Somaliland's national budget was devoted to development issues such as education and health care (UNDP 2010). Further, the country's unrecognized diplomatic status precludes Somaliland from receiving, coordinating, and distributing international aid; despite the presence of development agencies and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) throughout the country, their overall effectiveness is impeded by a lack of direction and implementation from the central government (Ibid). As a result, Somaliland has been unable to construct enough primary schools (both stationary and mobile) to support its nomadic population; UNDP estimates that in 2010, only 46 percent of boys and 33 percent of girls attended primary school this year. National literacy rates remain under 40 percent, with men achieving twice the literacy rates of women; Somaliland is steeped in a patriarchal culture and societal traditions that preclude women's access to education and political opportunities. Only three of Parliament's 182 members are women; two were elected in the Assembly of Representatives, while the third assumed a position in the House of Elders following the death of her husband. The development community has worked hard to improve overall access to basic health care provisions and services, though maternal death rates remain alarmingly high while hospitals are both scarce and under resourced. While Somaliland has developed critical political and economic institutions to support the state, basic development issues must be addressed so as to facilitate the region's growth and future stability. Womens' equality and access to basic political and economic resources remains among the most important challenges towards developing a strong and prosperous society.

Recognition – Domestic, International, and Diaspora

Somaliland's diplomatic status as an unrecognized state remains among the nation's most critical issues. The historically-predatory nature of the Somali central government vis-a-vis Somalilanders pushed the region towards its unilateral declaration of independence; the 2001 Constitution received virtually unanimous approval primarily as a response to its first Article, "...[the region] shall hereby and in accordance with this Constitution become a sovereign and independent country known as "The Republic of Somaliland" (Republic of Somaliland 2001).¹⁰ Independence for Somaliland constitutes both formal acceptance within the international community as well as acknowledgment of a distinction between Somaliland and south-central Somalia. The vibrant diaspora not only facilitated the 1990s statebuilding period but also mobilizes an extensive network of financial aid and human capital to support social institutions.

The international community presently focuses its resources on rebuilding the collapsed central government in south-central Somalia. Diplomats have made fifteen attempts to revitalize a central Somali government since 1991; the current attempt, embodied in the TFG, has failed to make any inroads outside of Mogadishu. TFG officials and diplomats alike publically call for the reunification of Somaliland with south-central Somalia and Puntland under one central government, thus refusing to acknowledge Somaliland's independence. However, the region's diplomatic portfolio has grown in recent years. In 2005 the AU explained, "Somaliland's search for recognition [is] historically unique and self-justified in African political history... the AU should find a special method of dealing with this outstanding case" (African Union 2005, reprinted in ICG 2006a). Somaliland's President, Ahmed Silanyo, and Foreign Minister, Dr. Mohamed Omar, have recently hosted delegations from Djibouti, Kuwait, Norway, Pakistan, the

¹⁰Author's emphasis

UN and the World Bank to mobilize economic and development aid and build relationships with regional actors. The United States, United Kingdom, and European Union have all launched development projects in Somaliland and look to increase their engagement with the country's stakeholders. China, Ethiopia, Saudi Arabia and Yemen have recently invested in Somaliland's livestock trade, oil companies, and infrastructure. While international support would boost access to key international economic, political, and development resources, the state has nonetheless increased its international profile without the formality of recognized statehood.

Somaliland's vibrant diaspora community remains among the most important facilitators of the region's development. Remittances from the diaspora community played critical roles in financing the statebuilding conferences; contributions not only financed the conferences themselves but also situated the diaspora as important stakeholders in deciding the country's future, adding an additional layer of accountability and legitimacy to the new government. The diaspora's remittances constitute large portions of the country's economy and social sector. Somaliland's remittance economy generates over \$800 million annually while constituting 40 percent of all education spending and 50 percent of all health care expenditures (Hammond 2011). Doctors and teachers not only return home to practice their trades but also to mentor young Somalilanders. The diaspora fills an important economic and societal void within Somaliland.

DISCUSSING THE SOMALILAND CASE STUDY

Ranking in “statehood” of pre-secession parent states and examining State Failure

Ethiopia constituted the strongest pre-secession parent state of the four examined, followed closely by Nigeria, with Sudan and Somalia lagging considerably behind. In 1961, at the dawn of Eritrea’s secession movement, the Ethiopian state provided considerable institutional services to its population while imposing a dominating military over its people. While the Nigerian state in 1967 also provided key social structures, there were significant development disparities throughout the country’s regions. Sudan and Somalia lacked considerable institutional strength at the time of their secession movements. The colonial period in Sudan distorted institutional and power structures within the country so that virtually all areas outside of Khartoum had eroded. However, the state endured throughout the country, regardless whether it was perceived as a positive or negative force. Somalia, on the other hand, had yet to recover from the Somali Civil War by 1991 and quickly fell into a power vacuum following Barre’s exit.

State failure remains an important but often ambiguous and misunderstood academic concept. There remains inherent value in applying the failed state label, partly because it is perceived as a self-evident condition within a given state. By encompassing a state’s history and contextual reality within the analysis, it is plausible to determine whether the state has truly failed or rather exists outside of the standard perception of a state. Based upon the data collected, it is reasonable to conclude that Nigeria, Ethiopia, and Sudan were not failed states at the point when their respective secession movements began. Whereas both Biafra and Eritrea spawned their movements from unequal representation and development, neither secessionist attempt came in response to the absence of the state. While Sudan’s state operated with less capacity

relative to Nigeria and Ethiopia, the state military continuously asserted its presence by directly challenging the numerous rebellions and uprisings throughout the country.

However, the evidence shows that Somalia constituted a failed state in 1991. The central government failed to offer any real institutional capacities throughout the majority of the country following the civil war between Barre’s forces and northern Somalis. Following the regime’s demise in January 1991, warlords and small militias engaged one another in a violent attempt to fill the subsequent power vacuum, ultimately sparking Somalia’s descent into instability and insecurity. From that point forward the state as a structured entity ceased to exist.

Analyzing the Secession Movement and Somaliland

Categories impacting Secession Movements	BIAFRA	ERITREA	SOUTH SUDAN	SOMALILAND
Duration of Secession Movement	O	+++	+++	++
Institutional Capacity	+	+++	O	++
International Support	+	++	+++	+
Diaspora Support	O / +	+++	O / +	+++
Result	FAILURE	SUCCESS	SUCCESS	????

Duration of Secession Movement: Somaliland's secession movement is a rather unique case: on the one hand, the region declared its independence from Somalia in 2001; on the other hand, Somaliland has yet to receive international recognition for its independence and must therefore continue with its secession movement. Thus while Somaliland considers itself autonomous from the rest of Somalia, the region nonetheless continues to pursue secession. Secession movements must be capable of surviving until the parent state concedes. The two successful attempts from the case study highlight the different ways in which a movement can outlast the parent state. Eritrea and the EPLF repelled Ethiopia's military occupation and improved the quality of life for its citizens; South Sudan survived with a continued military struggle while receiving invaluable support from international actors; Somaliland's commitment to internal development, combined with the absence of violent opposition, facilitates an important degree of legitimacy and sustainability, thus earning the grade of ++.

Institutional Capacity: Somaliland has achieved a number of institutional successes over the past twenty years, including the creation of a participatory and broadly supported government, a stable education and health infrastructure, a growing business economy, and vital police regiments capable of maintaining security throughout the region. However, far too many people struggle to obtain basic services and the government's limited budget prevents Somaliland from achieving further successes. Recent economic data points to positive trends and a brighter outlook for Somaliland's vital institutions. Only the EPLF attained similar levels of institutional development for its populace, which facilitated the movement's ability to survive for over 30 years, whereas Biafra's government failed in supporting its population, subsequently accelerating the humanitarian consequences of the Federation blockades. While Somaliland's institutional

capabilities are not perfect, the region has nonetheless established those vital services to support its citizenry, thus earning a grade of ++.

Support from the International Community and Diaspora: Somaliland's independence has not been recognized by any country and thus precludes the state from accessing critical financial and political institutions. While Somaliland has begun to create political and economic ties with other countries and nonetheless receives large contributions of indirect humanitarian and development aid from both foreign governments and non-government organizations, it lacks the political capital and support necessary to take further strides towards supporting its people, thus earning a grade of +. Somaliland's diaspora, on the other hand, has been an invaluable asset throughout the region's statebuilding process. Members of the diaspora have provided critical funds to support both the political conferences that led to the government's creation, acted as mediators between conflicting sub-clan members in government, and have returned home to bring more businessmen, doctors, and teachers into Somaliland. The diaspora has become a strong force throughout Somaliland and thus earns a grade of +++.

CONCLUSIONS

The longer a conflict persists, the more likely a secession movement will succeed. Eritrea and South Sudan were able to sustain their conflicts over a number of decades, providing a persistent challenge to their parent states that ultimately facilitated their secession struggles. Institutional capacity and perceived legitimacy appear to supplement one another: the SPLA/M in South Sudan did not develop any real institutional capacity but nonetheless supported its secession

movement and ultimately succeeded with significant contributions from the international community. The EPLF not only implemented strong state institutions throughout Eritrea but was also supported by the international community and the diaspora. In order to succeed, a secession attempt must not only survive internal and external opposition, but must also provide critical services, whether through the movement itself or with the support of international allies, to ensure its populations survival and growth throughout the duration of the conflict.

However, it is unlikely that the secession movements' respective successes and failures are directly connected to the presence of a failed state. Eritrea's successful secession Ethiopia, the relatively strongest state within the case studies, whereas South Sudan's successful secession movement emerged from relatively weak Sudanese state. Somalia remains the only example in this study that should be considered a failed state, and remains a unique case study within Africa.

These results suggest that Somaliland's secession movement is likely to succeed. Somaliland has been able to sustain its movement by developing critical state institutions as well as political and social institutions that elicit broad support of its population. Further, Somaliland has received invaluable aid from its diaspora, as well as friendly, though relatively isolated, support from the international community. Somaliland and Eritrea's secession movements share the most similarities: overwhelming support for independence, a commitment to internal development, and unabated diplomatic and financial support from the diaspora. While Eritrea outlasted Ethiopia, Somaliland must instead outlast the diplomatic community's insistence on a unified Somalia. This daunting challenge should not deter Somaliland, as the region has already achieved levels of peace, stability, and development unbeknownst to many recognized African states.

Limitations

First, this project does not attempt to provide a methodologically rigorous definition of statehood. Without such a definition, some may challenge the hierarchical rankings of statehood within the case studies as well as the subsequent implementation of the state failure paradigm. However, it is important to understand statehood and state failure as both complex and layered terms as well as self-evident representations of the conditions in a given country. Without providing critical contextual analysis of a state's history and interaction with its people, understandings of statehood and applications of state failure obscure the intricacies that define the state's relationship within a given country.

Second, this project does not provide quantifiable analyses of the conditions within the secession movements. However this analysis only seeks to develop a broad framework for comparing secession movements against one another. In addition, quantifying key factors may prove difficult as the successes or failures of secession movements are greatly impacted by external unquantifiable conditions such as political agendas and international precedents.

Further Questions for Research

It is important to examine the politics of state recognition and statehood. Each country acts upon its own interests; recognition of a secession movement can facilitate a potentially negative change in two already existing countries' relationship. Further research should explore how these political and economic challenges influence norms on state sovereignty and secession movements. Second, it is important to address the contextual reality of secession movements in the absence of a central government. As described in the literature review, one non-violent method of secession includes formal application to secede from the parent state; this raises an

important question as to how a secession movement should proceed in the absence of key state mechanisms. Further study is required to examine how secession movements can gain acceptance from the international community in absence of a functioning state.

Works Cited

1980. *Behind the war in Eritrea*, Nottingham, Spokesman.
2009. Faith, Citizenship, Democracy and Peace in the Horn of Africa. In: JAMA, A. (ed.) *7th Annual conference on the Horn of Africa*. Lund: Department of Sociology, Lund University.
2011. Somalia - Human Rights Watch. United States State Department.
2011. Somaliland Drought Situation Report. African Development Trust.
2011. *Annual Report 2011- Somalia* [Online]. Amnesty International.
Available: <http://www.unhcr.org/refworld/docid/4dce153e69.html>.
- Abokor, A. Y., Bradbury, M. & Yusuf, H. A. 2003. Somaliland: Choosing Politics over Violence. *Review of African Political Economy*, 97.
- Agaloglou, M. 2011. *Somaliland: Past, Present, Future* [Online]. Think Africa Press. Available: <http://thinkafricapress.com/somalia/somaliland-past-present-and-future> 2011.
- Ahmed, A. H. A. 2010. Politics of Transitional Justice Mechanisms from Below: The Case of Somaliland. *Peace and Conflict Monitor*. University for Peace.
- Albin-Lackey, C. 2009. "Hostages to Peace:" Threats to Human Rights and Democracy in Somaliland. New York: Human Rights Watch.
- Ali, H. 2011. *Horn of Africa to double livestock exports to Saudi Arabia* [Online]. SomalilandPress. Available: <http://somalilandpress.com/horn-of-africa-to-double-livestock-exports-to-saudi-arabia-21259>
- Alier, A. 1990. *Southern Sudan: Too Many Agreements Dishonoured*, Exeter, Ithaca Press.
- Amadi, S. 2007. *Colonial Legacy, Elite Dissension and the Making of Genocide: The Story of Biafra* [Online]. Social Sciences Research Council. Available: <http://howgenocidesend.ssrc.org/Amadi/> 2011.
- Araya, M. 1990. The Eritrean Question: An Alternative Explanation. *The Journal of Modern African Studies*, 28, 79-100.
- Azam, J.-P. 2010. *A State is Born: Transport Infrastructure and Democracy in Somaliland*. University of Toulouse.
- Babu, A. M. 1988. The Eritrean Question in the Context of African Conflicts and Superpower Rivalries. In: CLIFFE, L. & DAVIDSON, B. (eds.) *The Long struggle of Eritrea for independence and constructive peace*. Trenton, N.J.: Red Sea Press.

- Balewa, B. A. T. 1994. *Governing Nigeria : history, problems and prospects*, Lagos, Malthouse Press.
- Bates, R. H. 2008. The Logic of State Failure: Learning from Late-Century Africa. *Conflict Management and Peace Science*, 25, 297-314.
- BBC. 2011. *Regions and Territories: Somaliland* [Online].
Available: http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/africa/country_profiles/3794847.stm.
- Bernal, V. 2004. Eritrea Goes Global: Reflections on Nationalism in a Transnational Era. *Cultural Anthropology*, 19, 3-25.
- Bradbury, M. 2008. *Becoming Somaliland*. Bloomington, Indiana University Press
- Branch, A. & Cherian Mampilly, Z. 2005. Winning the war, but losing the peace? The dilemma of SPLM/A civil administration and the tasks ahead. *The Journal of Modern African Studies*, 43, 1-20.
- Brown, W. 2006. Africa and international relations: a comment on IR theory, anarchy and statehood. *Review of International Studies*, 32, 119-143.
- Bruton, B. E. 2010. *Somalia: A New Approach*. New York: Council on Foreign Relations.
- Buchanan, A. 2007. Secession. *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*.
Available: <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/secession/>
- Cameron, G. T. 2009. National Design and State Building in Sub-Saharan Africa. *World Politics*, 61, 623-669.
- Cervenka, Z. 1977. Eritrea: Struggle for Self-Determination or Secession? *Africa Spectrum*, 12, 37-48.
- Chauvet, L. & Collier, P. 2008. What are the Preconditions for Turnarounds in Failing States? *Conflict Management and Peace Science*, 25, 332-348.
- Cibian, S. 2010. *Failing Attempts to Westernise the Non-Western: Why There Are No States in Sub-Saharan Africa*. Doctorate, Central European University.
- Clapham, C. 1998. Degrees of Statehood. *Review of International Studies*, 24, 143-157.
- Clapham, C., Hansen, H., Herbst, J., Pham, J. P., Mazimhaka, P., Mills, G. & Schulman, S. 2011. *African Game Changer? The Consequences of Somaliland's International (non)Recognition*. Johannesburg: The Brenthurst Foundation.
- Cliffe, L. 1988. The Eritrean Liberation Struggle in Comparative Perspective. In: CLIFFE, L. & DAVIDSON, B. (eds.) *The Long struggle of Eritrea for independence and constructive peace*. Trenton, N.J.: Red Sea Press.

- Cobb, C. 2002. *Government, Rebels Sign Promise Not to Target Civilians*. AllAfrica.com. Available from: <http://allafrica.com/stories/200203260777.html>
- Collier, P. 2006. *Economic Causes of Civil Conflict and their Implications for Policy*. Oxford: Oxford University.
- Collier, P. & Hoeffler, A. 2002. On The Incidence Of Civil War In Africa. *The Journal Of Conflict Resolution*, 46 (1), Pp. 13-28.
- Collier, P. & Hoeffler, A. 2004. *The Political Economy Of Secession*. Available: <Http://Users.Ox.Ac.Uk/~Ball0144/Self-Det.Pdf>
- Dave-Odigie, C. P. 2011. Somalia Conflict: An African Indigenous Approach Towards A Peaceful Resolution. *Journal Of Law And Conflict Resolution*, 3, 63-70.
- De Waal, A. 1997. *Famine Crimes : Politics & The Disaster Relief Industry In Africa*, London, African Rights & The International African Institute.
- De Waal, A. 2005. Who Are The Darfurians? Arab And African Identities, Violence And External Engagement. *African Affairs*, 104, 181-205.
- De Waal, A. 2007. Class And Power In A Stateless Somalia. *Social Sciences Research Council*. February 20, Available From: <Http://Hornofafrica.Ssrc.Org/Dewaal/>
- Demissie, D. 1996. Self-Determination. Ethiopia: A Historical Background. *Suffolk Transnational Law Review*, 20, 177-192.
- Dfid. 2011. *Uk To Increase Assistance To Somalia To Takcle On-Going Humanitarian Crisis, Instability And Poverty* [Online]. Nairobi: Hiiraan Online. Available: Http://Www.Hiiraan.Com/News2/2011/Mar/Uk_Increases_Aid_To_Somalia.Aspx.
- Economist. 2005. International: A State Of Utter Failure; Somalia. *The Economist*, 377, 60.
- Economist. 2010. International: Not So Failing; Somaliland's Elections. *The Economist*. 1 July, Available From: <Http://Www.Economist.Com/Node/16488840>
- Ekwe-Ekwe, H. 1990. *Conflict And Intervention In Africa : Nigeria, Angola, Zaire*, New York, St. Martin's Press.
- Ekwe-Ekwe, H. 2006. *Biafra Revisted*, Reading ; Dakar, Senegal, African Renaissance.
- Englebort, P. & Tull, D. M. 2008. Postconflict Reconstruction in Africa Flawed Ideas about Failed States. *International Security*, 32, 106-139.
- Eriksen, S. S. 2010. 'State Failure' in Theory and Practice: The Idea of the State and the Contradictions of State Formation. *Review Of International Studies*, 37, 229-247.

- Eubank, N. 2010. Peace-Building Without External Assistance: Lessons From Somaliland. Washington DC: Center for Global Development Working Papers.
- Eubank, N. 2011. *Taxation, Political Accountability, And Foreign Aid: Lessons From Somaliland*. Phd of Political Economics, Stanford University.
- Farley, B. R. 2010. Calling a State a State: Somaliland and International Recognition. *Emory International Law Review*, 24, 777-820.
- Fearon, J. D. & Laitin, D. D. 2006. Nigeria. *Random Narratives*. Paolo Alto: Stanford University.
- Forti, D.R. 2011. A Pocket of Stability: Understanding Somaliland. *Occasional Papers*. Durban: African Centre For The Constructive Resolution Of Disputes.
- Freedom House. 2010. Freedom of the Press 2010 - Somalia. *Freedom Of The Press*.
- Gilkes, P. 2003. National Identity and Historical Mythology in Eritrea and Somaliland. *Northeast African Studies*, 10, 163-187.
- Gilkes, P. & Plaut, M. 1999. Conflict in the Horn: Why Eritrea and Ethiopia are at War. *Briefing Paper*.
- Goldstone, J. A. 2008. Pathways to State Failure. *Conflict Management and Peace Science*, 25, 285-296.
- Guled, M. 2011a. *Western Union Launch Money Transfer Service in Somaliland* [Online]. Available: <http://somalilandpress.com/western-union-launch-money-transfer-service-in-somaliland-21676>.
- Guled, M. 2011b. *Somaliland army overpowers surprise attack from Puntland* [Online]. SomalilandPress. Available: <http://somalilandpress.com/somaliland-army-overpowers-surprise-attack-from-puntland-22599>.
- Hagmann, T. & Hoehne, M. V. 2009. Failures of the state failure debate: Evidence from the Somali territories. *JOURNAL OF INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT*, 21, 42-57.
- Haile, M. 1994. Legality of Secessions: The Case of Eritrea. *Emory International Law Review*, 8.
- Halden, P. 2008. *Somalia: failed state or nascent states-system?*, Defence Analysis, Swedish Defence Research Agency (FOI).
- Halvorson, D. 2010. 'Bringing international politics back in': reconceptualising state failure for the twenty-first century. *Australian Journal of International Affairs*, 64, 583-600.
- Hammond, L. 2011. Cash and Compassion: The Role of the Somali Diaspora in Relief, Development and Peace-building. UNDP - Somalia.

- Harris, D. 2011. Somaliland's progress on governance: A case of blending the old and the new. *Development Progress*. London: Overseas Development Institute.
- Hechter, M. 1992. The Dynamics of Secession. *Acta Sociologica (Taylor & Francis Ltd)*, 35, 267.
- Herbst, J. 1996. Responding to state failure in Africa. *International Security*, 21, 120-144.
- Herbst, J. 2004. Let Them Fail: State Failure in Theory and Practice. *When States Fail. Causes and Consequences, Princeton NJ*, 302-318.
- Hill, J. 2005. Beyond the Other? A postcolonial critique of the failed state thesis. *African Identities*, 3, 139 - 154.
- Horowitz, D. L. 2003. The Cracked Foundations of the Right to Secede. *Journal of Democracy*, 14, 5-17.
- Hussein, Q. 2011. *Israel says ready to recognize Somaliland* [Online]. SomalilandPress. Available: <http://somalilandpress.com/israel-says-ready-to-recognize-somaliland-11628>.
- ICG 2003. Somaliland: Democracy and its Discontents. *Africa Report N.66*. International Crisis Group.
- ICG 2006. Somaliland: Time for African Union Leadership. *Africa Report N 110*. International Crisis Group.
- ICG 2010. Somaliland: A way out of the electoral crisis. *Africa Briefing N.67*. International Crisis Group.
- ICG 2011. Somalia: The Transitional Government on Life Support. *Africa Report N. 170*. International Crisis Group.
- IRIN. 2011. *Horn of Africa: Famine to spread across southern-Somalia* [Online]. United Nations OCHA. Available: <http://www.irinnews.org/report.aspx?reportid=93376> [Accessed 1 August 2011].
- Iyob, R. 1995. *The Eritrean struggle for independence : domination, resistance, nationalism, 1941-1993*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Jackson, R. H. 1993. *Quasi-states: sovereignty, international relations, and the Third World*, Cambridge Univ Pr.
- Jaroslav, T. 2005. Keeping the Peace after Secession: Territorial Conflicts between Rump and Secessionist States. *The Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 49, 713-741.
- Jendia, C. 2002. *The Sudanese civil conflict 1969-1985*, New York, Peter Lang Publishing.
- Jhazbhay, I. 2007. *Somaliland: Post-War Nation-Building and International Relations, 1991-2006*. Doctor of Philosophy in International Relations, University of Witwatersrand.

- Jhazbhay, I. 2008. Somaliland: The Journey of Resistance, Reconciliation and Peace.
- Johnson, D. H. 2003. *The Root Causes of Sudan's Civil Wars*, International African Institute.
- Jones, B. G. 2008. The global political economy of social crisis: Towards a critique of the 'failed state' ideology. *Review of International Political Economy*, 15, 180-205.
- Jones, S. 2011. *Al Shabaab: Samosas are too Christian* [Online]. Foreign Policy Magazine. Available: http://blog.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2011/07/27/al_shabab_samosas_are_too_christian
- Jooma, M. & Wallner, H. 2005. Places that do not exist: Experiences from the parliamentary elections in Somaliland. *African Security Review*, 14.
- JSLTIMES. 2011. *The three main political Parties welcomed the verdict of formation of more political parties* [Online]. Available: <http://www.jsltimes.com/the-three-main-political-parties-welcomed-the-verdict-of-formation-of-more-political-parties>.
- Kaplan, S. 2008. The remarkable story of Somaliland. *Journal of Democracy*, 19, 143-157.
- Kapteijns, L. 2011. I.M. Lewis and Somali Clanship: A Critique. *Northeast African Studies*, 11, 1-24.
- Keller, E. J. 1991. Eritrean Self-Determination Revisited. *Africa Today*, 38, 7-13.
- Kenning, D. 2011. Somalia and Somaliland: The Two Edged Sword of International Intervention. *Federal Governance*, 8, 63-70.
- Kibble, S. & Walls, M. 2009. Tradition and Modernity in Somaliland Beyond polarity: negotiating a hybrid state. *Democratisation in Africa*. University of Leeds.
- Kibble, S. & Walls, M. 2011. Somaliland: Change and continuity. Report by International Election Observers on the June 2010 presidential elections in Somaliland.
- Kohari, A. 2011. *Who, what, why: What is a famine?* [Online]. BBC. Available: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-us-canada-14199080>.
- Korieh, C. J. 2002. Agricultural Transformation, State Policy, and Agricultural Decline in Eastern Nigeria, 1960-1970. In: FALOLA, T. & OYEBADE, A. (eds.) *The transformation of Nigeria : essays in honor of Toyin Falola*. Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press.
- Kreuter, A. 2011. Self Determination, Sovereignty, and the Failure of States; Somaliland and the Case for Justified Secession. *Minnesota Journal of International Law*, 19, 363-397.
- Leonard, R. 1988. Popular Participation in Liberation and Revolution. In: Cliffe, L. & Davidson, B. (eds.) *The Long struggle of Eritrea for independence and constructive peace*. Trenton, N.J.: Red Sea Press.

- Lewis, I. M. 1960. The Somali Conquest of the Horn of Africa. *The Journal of African History*, 1, 213-230.
- Logan, C. J. 2002. *Rebuilding Somali political systems: growing new roots in indigenous realities, or merely reconstructing the past?* Doctor of Philosophy of International Relations, Tufts University.
- Malanczuk, P. 1997. *Akehurst's Modern Introduction to International Law*. New York, Routledge.
- Mcgregor, S. 2011. *Coca-Cola Invests \$10 Million in Somaliland Bottling Plant* [Online]. SomalilandPress. Available: <http://somalilandpress.com/coca-cola-invests-10-million-in-somaliland-bottling-plant-22645>.
- Menkhaus, K. 2006. Governance without governance in Somalia - Spoilers, state building, and the politics of coping. *International Security*, 31
- Metelits, C. 2004. Reformed Rebels? Democratization, Global Norms, and the Sudan People's Liberation Army. *Africa Today*, 51, 65-82.
- Moe, L. W. 2009. *Towards Alternative Precepts of Statehood in Africa: The role of traditional authorities in reconstituting governance and statehood in Somaliland*. Masters of International Studies, Stellenbosch University.
- Murphy, T. & Temin, J. 2011. Toward a New Republic of Sudan. *Special Report*. Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace.
- Nyaba, P. A. 1997. *Politics of Liberation in South Sudan: An Insider's View*. Kampala, Fountain Publishers.
- O.A.S. 1934. Convention on Rights and Duties of States A-40. Seventh International Conference of American States, Montevideo. December 26.
- Omeje, K. 2010. Dangers of Splitting a Fragile Rentier State: Getting it right in Southern Sudan. *Occasional Papers*. Durban: African Centre for the Constructive Resolution of Disputes.
- Ospina, S. 2004. Qualitative Research. In: G. GOETHALS, G. S., J. MACGREGO (ed.) *Encyclopedia of Leadership*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Pateman, R. 1990. *Eritrea: Even the Stones are Burning*, The Red Sea Press Inc.
- Paul, A. 2008. Reciprocity and statehood in Africa: from clientelism to kleptocracy. *International Review of Economics*, 55, 209-227.
- Perham, M. 1970. Reflections on the Nigerian Civil War. *International Affairs*, 46, 231-246.

- Pham, J. P. 2011. Somalia: Where a State Isn't a State. *The Fletcher Forum of World Affairs*, 35, 133-148.
- Pool, D. 2001. *From guerrillas to government : the Eritrean People's Liberation Front*, Oxford, James Currey; Ohio University Press.
- Post, K. 1973. *Structure and conflict in Nigeria, 1960-1966*, [Madison] University of Wisconsin Press [1973].
- Renders, M. 2007. Appropriate 'governance-technology'? – Somali clan elders and institutions in the making of the 'Republic of Somaliland'. *Afrika Spectrum*, 42, 439-459.
- Renders, M. & Terlinden, U. 2010. Negotiating Statehood in a Hybrid Political Order: The Case of Somaliland. *Development and Change*, 41, 723-746.
- Republic of Somaliland. 1960. 1960 Constitution of Somaliland. The Republic of Somaliland [Internet], 26 June. Available from: http://www.somalilandlaw.com/somaliland_constitution_1960.HTM
- Republic of Somaliland. 2001. 2001 Constitution of Somaliland. The Republic of Somaliland [Internet], 31 May. Available from: http://www.somalilandlaw.com/Somaliland_Constitution/body_somaliland_constitution.htm
- Rotberg, R. I. 2002. The New Nature of Nation-State Failure. *The Washington Quarterly*, 25, 85-96.
- Samatar, A. I. 1989. *Socialist Somalia: Rhetoric and Reality*, Institute for African Alternatives.
- Schoiswohl, M. 2004. *Status and (Human Rights) Obligations of a Non-Recognized De Facto Regimes in Law: The Case of 'Somaliland'*, Leiden, Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.
- Scott, P. 1985. The Sudan Peoples' Liberation Movement (SPLM) and Liberation Army (SPLA). *Review of African Political Economy*, 69-82.
- Serapiao, L. B. 1987. International Law and Self-Determination: The Case of Eritrea. *Issue: A Journal of Opinion*, 15, 3-8.
- Shepherd, G. W. 1993. Free Eritrea: Linchpin for Stability and Peace on the Horn. *Africa Today*, 40, 82-88.
- Shinn, D. 2011. Al Shabaab's Foreign Threst to Somalia. *Orbis - A Journal of World Affairs*, 55.
- Simons, A. 1995. *Networks of Dissolution: Somalia Undone*, Oxford, Westview Press.

- SOMALILANDPRESS. 2011. *Jamhuriya Editor Mr. Mohamed Omar Abdi (Cirro) Arrested by The Government* [Online]. Hargeysa: SomalilandPress. Available: <http://somalilandpress.com/somaliland-jamhuriya-editor-mr-mohamed-omar-abdi-cirro-arrested-by-the-government-22895>.
- Somaliland Government* [Online]. Available: <http://somalilandpress.com/somaliland-ssc-militia-begin-peace-talks-with-somaliland-government-22830> [Accessed July 2, 2011].
- SOMALILANDPRESS. 2011. *The Independent Scholars Group* [Online]. Hargeysa: SomalilandPress. Available: <http://somalilandpress.com/the-indepnedent-scholars-group-22981>.
- Spears, I. 2004. Debating secession and the recognition of new states in Africa. *African Security Review*, 13, 35-48.
- Strauss, A. L. & Corbin, J. 1990. *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*, Sage.
- Tilly, C. 2007. *Democracy*. New York : Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- UKAID 2011. Somalia: COI Report. *Country of Origin Information Report*. London: United Kingdom Border Agency.
- United Nations. 2011. Somaliland MDG Report, 2010. New York: United Nations.
- United Nations. 1970. General Assembly Resolution 2625. 24 October, New York: Twenty Fifth Session of the United Nations General Assembly
- UNDP. 2011. *Judiciary strengthened as first batch of judges graduate from legal training* [Online]. Hargeysa: United Nations Development Project.
- Ungeer, B. & Wils, O., PHD 2007. Systematic Conflict Transformation and Inclusive Governance in Sudan. *Fields of Application of the Systematic Conflict Transformation Approach for Development Cooperation*. Berlin: Berghof Foundation for Peace Support.
- Uwechue, R. 1971. *Reflections on the Nigerian Civil War: A Call for Realsim*, New York, Africana Publishing Corporation.
- Walls, M. 2009. The Emergence of a Somali State: Building Peace from Civil War in Somaliland. *African Affairs*, 108, 371-389.
- Walls, M. 2011. *State formation in Somaliland: Bringing deliberation to institutionalism*. Doctor of Philosophy in International Relations, University College London.
- Williams, P. 2007. State failure in Africa: causes, consequences and responses. *Africa South of the Sahara*, 37-42.

Yin, R. K. 2009. *Case study research: Design and methods*, Sage Publications, Inc.

Yohannes, O. The Eritrean Question: A Colonial Case? *The Journal of Modern African Studies*, 25, 643-668.

Young, C. 2004. The end of the post-colonial state in Africa? Reflections on changing African political dynamics. *African Affairs*, 103, 23-49.

Young, J. 2003. Sudan: Liberation Movements, Regional Armies, Ethnic Militias & Peace. *Review of African Political Economy*, 30, 423-434.