

3-29-2018

## Rebel Governance in Civil War: Variations in Rebel Governance - A Case Study Analysis.

Harriet Ann Sellers

*Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool\\_theses](https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool_theses)



Part of the [International Relations Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Sellers, Harriet Ann, "Rebel Governance in Civil War: Variations in Rebel Governance - A Case Study Analysis." (2018). *LSU Master's Theses*. 4660.

[https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool\\_theses/4660](https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool_theses/4660)

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at LSU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in LSU Master's Theses by an authorized graduate school editor of LSU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact [gradetd@lsu.edu](mailto:gradetd@lsu.edu).

REBEL GOVERNANCE IN CIVIL WAR:  
VARIATIONS IN REBEL GOVERNANCE – A CASE STUDY ANALYSIS.

A Thesis

Submitted to the Graduate School of the  
Louisiana State University  
Agricultural and Mechanical College  
in partial fulfilment of the  
requirements for the degree of  
Master of Arts

in

The Department of Political Science

by  
Harriet Ann Sellers  
B.A., University of Nottingham, 2016  
May 2018

# Table of Contents

Abstract.....	iii
1 Introduction: Governance and Insurgent Groups .....	1
2 Existing Explanations of Variations in Rebel Governance .....	3
3 Theory: The Determinants of Variation in Rebel Governance .....	9
3.1    Winning the ‘Hearts and Minds’ .....	9
3.2    A Unified Cause .....	10
3.3    Legitimacy .....	10
4 Methodology .....	12
5 A Case Study Analysis of Ethiopia (1974-1991) .....	15
5.1    Introduction to Ethiopia’s Civil Wars and Insurgent Groups .....	15
5.2    Overthrowing the Regime in Ethiopia .....	18
5.3    The Fight for Independence in Eritrea .....	23
5.4    Some Concluding Comments .....	29
6 A Case Study Analysis of Somalia (c1991-) .....	31
6.1    Introduction to Modern Somalia’s Political Struggles .....	31
6.2    Conclusion .....	45
7 A Case Study Analysis of Liberia (1989-2003) .....	48
7.1    Introduction to Governance and Insurgency in Liberia .....	48
7.2    First Liberian Civil War (1989-1997) .....	49
7.3    The Second Liberian Civil War .....	57
7.4    Concluding Comments on Liberia’s Civil Wars .....	60
8 Discussion of the Case Studies .....	61
9 Conclusion .....	64
Bibliography .....	68
Vita .....	84

## **Abstract**

Insurgent groups vary in how they interact with civilians. Some insurgent groups perform government functions to further their political objectives during civil war, whilst other rebel groups use solely violent means. Why do some insurgent groups perform governance functions to further their political objectives, whilst others interact very little with the local population? I seek to explain the variation in rebel governance, which I argue is motivated by the objective of the insurgency. More specifically, I argue that secessionist insurgencies are more likely to implement governance structures than non-secessionist insurgent groups. Using an in-depth case study analysis, I found varying results that both support and contradict the hypothesis. This underscores the importance of addressing variations in rebel governance in future research.

## 1 Introduction: Governance and Insurgent Groups

Insurgent and rebel groups have often been characterised as violent warlords, particularly those in the developing world (Mampilly, 2011). Whilst this perception may be applied to some rebel actors, it may not be a valid term for various contemporary insurgencies, some of whom control large territories and establish extensive governmental structures and policies to rule over a civilian population. Studies regarding the brutality and targeting of civilians by groups such as the Revolutionary United Front (RUF) in Sierra Leone provide a horrifying portrait of how rebel groups can behave (Kalyvas, 2006; Wood, 2010). On the other hand, groups such as the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE) in northeast Sri Lanka and the Eritrean People's Liberation Front (EPLF) in northern Ethiopia underline how some insurgencies implement extensive governance systems in order to organise civilians in an effective manner for a political purpose (Kasfir, 2015). Rebel governance is a political strategy that is used in accordance with a military strategy (Huang, 2016). Some insurgent groups use political organisation to forge and manage relations with civilians during civil wars. The variation between how rebel groups interact with civilians during civil war raises a critical question: what motivates how rebels act and interact with civilians during civil war?

I argue that the type of insurgency is the motivating factor determining whether a rebel group will establish a system of governance. More specifically, I argue that secessionist insurgent groups are more likely to establish governance systems than non-secessionist insurgent groups. This is for a number of reasons: first, secessionist insurgent groups have more incentive to win the 'hearts and minds' of the civilian population than non-secessionist groups (Stubbs, 1989). In order to do this, secessionist insurgent groups are more likely to provide a system of governance, in order to offer a better alternative than the existing status quo (Grynkewich, 2008). Second, insurgent groups mobilising around a secessionist agenda are incentivised to develop systems of governance, as this can help to mobilise mass support from the public around a unified cause (Montalvo and Reynal-

Querol, 2005). Third, insurgent groups who are wishing to secede from the state have an incentive to produce governance structures. In order to gain recognition and legitimacy as a sovereign territorial unit, the state must perform certain functions, including the provision of governance structures and basic social services (Kimenyi, Mbaku, and Moyo, 2010).

The variations in rebel governance is a curious one, and numerous competing explanations exist, including the presence of competition, out-migration, and the extraction of resources from civilian populations (Weinstein, 2007; Berman, Shapiro, and Felter, 2011; Steele, 2017). I contend that the existing explanations do not sufficiently explain variation in rebel governance. Whilst they offer valuable theoretical considerations, they do not account for the role that the motivation of the insurgency plays in how rebels act during civil wars and how they interact with civilians.

This paper will proceed as follows: first, existing explanations for variations in rebel governance will be addressed. This will be followed by an overview of the determinants of rebel governance, including the importance of insurgent motivations and the time frame they are operating under as an indicator of the likelihood of rebel governance. The paper will go on to provide rich case study analysis of three recent or ongoing civil wars: Somalia (1991-present), Ethiopia (1974-1993), and Liberia (1989-2003). Whilst the case studies produce some evidence that motivations and time-frames are important determinants of rebel governance implementation, they raise vital questions for future research. The anomalies found in the case studies, for example al-Shabaab in Somalia, provide avenues for the future research of rebel governance scholarship.

## 2 Existing Explanations of Variations in Rebel Governance

Insurgent or rebel governance has existed throughout the history of domestic warfare, but it has not gained the same attention from researchers as other elements of civil war. Most existing research on civil war takes the structure of insurgent groups as a given rather than trying to explain it (Staniland, 2014). As Huang (2012) argues, the concept of rebel governance stems back to the “revolutionary” wars of the twentieth centuries, featuring in many wars of independence against colonial powers. The writings and teachings of Mao Zedong, Chu Guevara, and Amilcar Cabral have been attributed with inspiring the idea of a “people’s war”, in which rebels established close ties with civilians through political organization (Huang, 2012). These revolutionary leaders stressed that for a rebel group to succeed, they must establish a political and social agenda that coincides with their military strategy (Mampilly, 2011). Guevara (1969) described the guerrilla fighter as a “social reformer”, emphasising that combatants should demonstrate an element of concern for the social welfare of local civilians through the provision of public services.

In order to gain support, the provision of public goods, security, and the guarantee of public order are invaluable instruments (Beckett, 2001). Rebel governance has been, and is, therefore, a vital feature of insurgent warfare. Rebel governance takes many forms: it can be sparse or elaborate, ineffectual or highly functional. Differing insurgency groups offer varying levels of rebel governance. Some form highly effective systems of governance, such as The Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE) in Sri Lanka, who formed an elaborate centralised system of civilian administration in the territory under their control (Mampilly, 2011; Staniland, 2014). Others, such as the Congolese Rally for Democracy (RCD) in the Democratic Republic of Congo, failed to establish a system of governance (Longman, 2002; Kisangi, 2003; Mampilly, 2011). Whilst scholars such as Arjona (2017), Staniland (2016) and Huang (2012) offer explanations for the variations in rebel governance, they overlook the role that motivation plays in how insurgents conduct civilian relations. This paper contends that it is the motivation of the insurgency that determines whether rebel governance is

implemented. More specifically, I argue that secessionist insurgencies are more likely to implement a system of rebel governance than non-secessionist insurgencies. I aim to contribute to an emerging literature on what insurgents *do* during civil war and how rebel groups and civilians interact. Furthermore, I aim to build on the emerging rich case study analyses of insurgent groups and how they conduct governance during civil wars.

As stated above, considerable variation exists in post-World War II insurgent governing behaviours. Rebel governance takes place in a myriad of ways. Some rebel groups engage in extensive forms of governance, including the formation of and participation in political institutions and providing social services (Huang, 2012). Others see their relations with civilians as much more ad hoc, choosing to interact only when necessary (Huang, 2012). The first argument for the provision of governance is that it is used to extract resources from the civilian population, ranging from recruits to information, financing, and equipment (Berman and Laitin, 2008; Berman, Shapiro and Felter, 2011; Salehyan, Siroky, and Wood, 2014). Berman and Laitin (2008) argue that this is particularly the case in areas where the provision of public goods by the government is weak. In response, rebel groups provide the missing public goods, and use this to recruit committed civilians who are willing to commit acts of violence for their cause (Weinstein, 2007; Berman and Laitin, 2008). An example of this is Hamas, who provide social and welfare services within Palestine and has used this to recruit members who are willing to conduct deadly violence, including a high proportion of suicide bombers (Berman and Laitin, 2008). I argue that the extraction of resources from civilians does not fully explain variation within rebel governance, as some insurgencies do not require governance structures to produce recruits from the civilian population. Recruitment can occur for a number of reasons including opportunity cost, fear, the threat of violence, or the use of violence against civilians (Wood, 2010; Holtermann, 2016). The opportunity cost argument infers that civilians take into account the cost of rebellion and the probability of victory (Collier and Hoeffler, 1998; 2004). If the expected payoff from a victory is superior to the opportunity cost of rebellion, recruitment from



among civilians is more likely (Collier and Hoeffler, 1998). Additionally, the extraction argument is flawed to the abundance of vulnerable people, particularly children, who are often victims of forcible recruitment during civil wars (Hart, 2006).

A second argument for the implementation of governance structures by rebel organisations is to gain economic resources from the civilian population. Weinstein (2007) argues that insurgencies use elements of governance, such as the provision of social services, to attract economic resources from within the population. Rebel governance often includes a system of civilian taxation, which can either be extorted from civilians or given voluntarily (Weinstein, 2007; Sabates-Wheeler and Verwimp, 2014). I argue that the extraction of economic resources from civilians is not sufficient in explaining why rebel governance occurs, as rebel groups are able to pull resources from a variety of other sources. Insurgent groups can enjoy economic support from foreign actors, natural resource rents, or remittances from abroad (Lujula, 2010; Huang, 2016). The extraction argument depends on the relative cost of services versus the value of the extracted resources. As the provision of services is costly and employs a large volume of resources, the opportunity cost argument arises in regards to the extraction of economic resources. If the services provided by an insurgent group exceed the amount of resources they are able to extract from the civilians, they would be left with a net loss of resources, thus the provision of services would be counterproductive. The extraction argument thus only holds if rebels are able to extract the amount of necessary resources for providing services (Hegre, 2004). This is often not the case, particularly when fighting an insurgency against resource-rich states who have the capability to utilise state resources to fund their counter-insurgency (Collier and Hoeffler, 2004).

A third explanation for implementing rebel governance is to prevent civilians fleeing, as they more commonly would under the threat of violence (Engel and Ibáñez, 2007; Ibáñez and Vélez, 2008, Alvarado and Massey, 2010). Insurgents have a vested interest in maintaining civilian

populations for a number of reasons, including for resources, recruits, information, and in order to maintain a level of protective cover from rivals (Stewart, 2017). I argue that this does not sufficiently explain the variations in rebel governance, as the use or threat of violence also plays a role in the civilians' decision to leave or remain in a community. Rebel groups may occupy peacefully, or they may target civilians selectively, indiscriminately, or collectively, each prompting a different reaction and creating different volumes of displacement and out-migration (Steele, 2017). The threat of violence at the individual or household level, as well as the presence of paramilitary and guerrilla groups, is strongly associated with out-migration (Engel and Ibáñez, 2007; Ibáñez and Vélez, 2008; Alvarado and Massey, 2010). The out-migration argument, therefore, does not fully explain the variation in rebel governance, as other factors, primarily the use of violence, influence whether civilians remain within a territory.

The final argument concerns civil wars where numerous factions are fighting. In this instance, it is argued that insurgent groups have to find methods to gain public support away from their competitors (Bloom, 2004). In order to persuade civilians to mobilise behind the cause, rebel groups often implement structures that replicate the state in order to appear as a coherent and capable alternative (Bueno de Mesquita, 2010). This often occurs when competition exists between rival insurgent groups or between a nonstate actor and the state. Grynkewich (2008) argues that a terrorist or guerrilla organisation providing social services to the local populace can threaten the social contract between the population and the state, undermining a key source of state legitimacy. This can also occur between a number of competing insurgent factions within a civil war. By implementing a system of governance, a rebel group can demonstrate that they are a more credible alternative to either the existing state government or to other competing insurgent groups (Bloom, 2004; Grynkewich, 2008). Civilians may decide who they grant their loyalty to based on the provision of governance by various actors in a civil war. Whilst the presence of competing insurgent groups may incentivise a rebel organisation to implement a governance structure, it is insufficient in fully

explaining why variation in rebel governance exists. There is evidence that the presence of competition will lead to an increase in the violent targeting of civilians (Chenoweth, 2010; Wood, 2010; Nemeth, 2013). Violence against civilians can occur either as a result of direct targeting or collateral damage, particularly in the instance that a new rival faction emerges (Kathman, 2015).

There are existing explanations for how the strategic objective and motivation of an insurgent group affects their desire to address civilian needs and implement rebel governance. Literature regarding the objectives of the insurgent group focus on two mechanisms: the “strategic objective” mechanism and the “insurgent promises” mechanism (Mampilly, 2011). The “strategic objective” mechanism argues that the leaders of power-seeking insurgent groups believe that diverting resources away from the military objective towards civilian governance is counterproductive to their power-seeking objective (Mampilly, 2011). On the contrary, leaders of secessionist insurgent groups will move beyond the military objective and devote resources to portraying itself as the “national” government (Mampilly, 2011). The “insurgent promises” mechanism argues that central power-seeking insurgent groups make promises to improve conditions for the local populace only after the organisation has taken power (Mampilly, 2011). Whilst the two mechanisms are a valid starting point for developing a theory of rebel governance, it does not go far enough in explaining *why* secessionist insurgent groups implementation of governance structures.

Existing explanations of rebel governance fail to properly address the variation in rebel governance and the provision of services as they do not go deep enough in to why secessionist insurgent groups implement rebel governance. Political scientists such as Grynkewich (2008), Wood (2010), and Huang (2012) have accounted for a number of scenarios in civil war governance, however I contend rebel groups with secessionist goals are more likely to implement a system of governance than those with non-secessionist goals. This is because secessionist insurgent groups are

motivated for a number of reasons: the need to win the 'hearts and minds' of the civilian population, the desire to form a unified cause to gain widespread support, and to gain recognition and legitimacy from both domestic and international actors. Whilst literature has begun to explain secessionist insurgencies and rebel governance, they do not go far enough in explaining why secessionist insurgent groups are more likely to implement rebel governance than non-secessionist insurgent groups.

### **3 Theory: The Determinants of Variation in Rebel Governance**

Insurgent groups emerge from differing prewar social bases, leading to a multitude of different types of organisations (Staniland, 2014). Some groups provide extensive governance structures to all civilians living under their territorial control and others provide no governance at all. The type of relationship a rebel organisation builds with the civilian population residing in the territory under their control is a strategic choice made under a number of political, economic, ideological, and social considerations (Huang, 2012). This section will address why the motivation of the insurgency is a key determinant in explaining why variation in rebel governance exists. More specifically, this section will argue that secessionist insurgencies are more likely to implement a system of rebel governance than non-secessionist insurgencies.

#### **3.1 Winning the ‘Hearts and Minds’**

Garnering true public support is a vital element in secessionist insurgencies. Firstly, secessionist insurgencies are less likely to target the civilians living under their territorial control than non-secessionist insurgencies (Fortna, 2013; Keller, 2013). Secessionist insurgent groups often have less military capability than the state they are fighting against, therefore violence against civilians can be counterproductive due to the increased need to gain resources, support, and recruits from the local population (Cunningham, Gleditsch, and Salehyan, 2009). Secessionist insurgencies, therefore, often need a mechanism through which they can win the loyalty of the civilian population (Grynkewich, 2008). One way they do this is by providing governance to those within their territorial control, in order to offer a better alternative than the existing status quo (Grynkewich, 2008). Both civilians and insurgents benefit from the implementation of a governance structure; the civilians stand to gain potential stability and order, as well as necessary services such as education and health, and the insurgents can utilise the resources of the civilian population that is now loyal to them (Grynkewich, 2008).

### **3.2 A Unified Cause**

More often than not, secessionist insurgencies are formed along ethnic lines (Fazal, 2014). Secessionist insurgencies are often a legacy of geographical borders that were imposed on the nation by colonial powers, as well as the maltreatment by former colonial powers, the exclusion of an ethnic group in political or economic opportunities, or the denial of rights (Muller, 2008; Mampilly, 2011). Secessionist insurgent groups often use their shared experience and identity to create emotive powers from the idea that members of an ethnic group are united around the notion of “us versus them” (Muller, 2008). Secessionist insurgent groups are more likely to implement a system of governance and service provision for those who share their history, culture, and language. The Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE) in Sri Lanka are a prime example of this; the LTTE claimed a mandate to represent the Tamil people, and subsequently developed a governance structure in accordance with their desire to create and rule their own independent Tamil state (Mampilly, 2011). Secessionist insurgencies are not guaranteed the support of their own ethnic kin; thus systems of governance are often used in order to convince them that the benefits of supporting the insurgency outweigh the potential risks (Mampilly, 2011). To sum, Secessionist insurgencies have a vested interest in providing a system of governance in areas under their territorial control, in order to earn mass support from the civilian population.

### **3.3 Legitimacy**

Seeking legitimacy and recognition by international actors is often a primary goal of secessionist insurgencies (Fazal, 2014). To be recognised as a sovereign territorial unit, the state must perform certain functions, including the provision of security, the rule of law, basic social services, and political services (Kimenyi, Mbaku, and Moyo, 2010). In order to offer a credible alternative to the nation state on the international state, an insurgent group needs to replicate some of the functions of the state (Mampilly, 2011). This includes providing services and governance to *all*

people living within the territory they wish to become independent, not just those who belong to the same ethnic group as the insurgents. Implementing an effective system of rebel governance during the insurgency is a vital step for secessionist insurgent groups to gain recognition and legitimacy. Not only does it show the international community that the rebels care about the civilians living within their territorial control, but it also signifies that the rebels are capable of running an independent sovereign state (Wimmer, 2012). Secessionist insurgents cannot rely on military power alone to pursue their goal of independence from the existing government structures and borders, therefore the adoption of a system of governance and service provision is an effective strategy through which they can gain both domestic and international legitimacy.

Insurgencies that need to gather and maintain wide civilian support are more likely to provide governance and services to the local populace. This is more likely to occur among secessionist insurgencies who are incentivised by the desire to win the support of the population, and in order to gain recognition and legitimacy from both domestic and international actors. Furthermore, insurgencies with future goals, as opposed to short-term present goals, are more inclined to establish systems of rebel governance as it is a necessary method of gaining resources, information, income, and recruits (Arjona, 2016). The testable hypothesis that has developed from the theory is as follows:

H1: Insurgent groups who wish to secede from the state are more likely to provide governance and services than those who do not wish to secede from the state.

Having explored the existing literature and outlining the theory regarding variation in rebel governance, the next section will outline the methodology which will be employed throughout the remainder of this paper to test the above hypotheses.

## 4 Methodology

As has been discussed, there is less literature on rebel governance than one would expect (Huang, 2012). Whilst useful theories and narratives exist, it is necessary to look at specific examples to assess the broader question of why variation in rebel governance exists. In order to do this, an in-depth case study approach has been adopted which builds on and enhances the current literature. Case study analysis has the benefit of providing both explanatory and exploratory power, and are a useful tool in understanding “complex social phenomena” (Yin, 1994). Whilst statistical analyses of large data sets can point to a correlation between two variables, it says little about *why* this effect occurs (Mampilly, 2011). By using a case study analysis, I was able to trace operational relationships between events in order to determine why rebel groups acted a certain way. The case studies underlined local and national dynamics and provided insight into the specific factors that shaped the observed outcome. The broad historical scope, including the background and history of each case study, allowed me to navigate how governance had evolved in each instance.

My primary concern was to select cases as randomly as possible, in order to have no preconceptions about the insurgents and their motivations. Case study selection can be biased or altered to make specific points, so by randomly selecting my cases I endeavored to avoid this as far as possible (Yin, 1994). In order to randomly select three civil war instances, I used the PRIO Battle Deaths Dataset and a random number generator to select the three cases of Ethiopia, Somalia, and Liberia. I used the PRIO Battle Deaths Data as it is a comprehensive dataset that covers all state-based armed conflicts in the period 1946-2008. Furthermore, the Battle Deaths dataset covers combatant and civilian deaths, thus differentiating between civil armed conflicts and one-sided violence (Lacina and Gleditsch, 2005). Whilst the cases may appear limited, due to their geographical location in the same region, this is unsurprising due to the disproportionate number of civil wars in Africa (Elbadwai and Sambanis, 2000). Additionally, the cases provide a natural control as all of the insurgent groups within each case were operating within the same set of conditions. The case



analysis, therefore, allows me to control for country-level variables, such as poverty levels, education levels, and geographic climate. This enables increased reliability in determining what factor influences the implementation of rebel governance, as all of the insurgent groups are operating in the same political, economic, social, and geographic climate. I believe the three case studies offer important insight into the way insurgent groups conduct themselves in civil war, as they portray the complexity of rebel governance and enable me to demonstrate either the uniqueness of or the commonalities between insurgent groups (Stake, 1995). As will be shown throughout the case study analysis, numerous insurgent groups contradicted expected trends in rebel governance. This is important as it enables new theories to be produced, particularly in regards to rebel groups who do not act in the way that would be expected from existing theories.

One of the main limitations in the random case study selection is that I was unable to determine the availability of sources prior to my research. Additionally, as it was not possible for me to conduct fieldwork myself, I was reliant on secondary sources and I was only able to draw on readily available information. The difficulties in conducting fieldwork in conflict zones meant that there are, in some cases, a heavy reliance on a small number of sources. I countered this as best as possible to cross-check the information by broadening my scope to look at news reports, ethnographic fieldwork and interviews from the conflict zones where available, historical sources, and sources from within the social sciences. Furthermore, in an effort to reduce bias from scholars, I utilized sources from a variety of people, including Western scholars, scholars from the conflict zones, reports from international organisations, and, where available, interviews with combatants and non-combatants from the civil wars in question.

The following sections look at the case studies of three civil wars: Ethiopia (1962-1991), Liberia (1989-2003), and Somalia (1991-). I tested the hypothesis that secessionist insurgencies are more likely to implement systems of governance than non-secessionist insurgencies. In order to

determine the motive of each insurgency, a brief historical context will be provided. From this, how the rebels conducted themselves during the civil war will be analysed, assessing whether or not they produced systems of governance. I will then draw conclusions and propose new hypotheses as to why some of the insurgent groups in the three civil wars contradicted my theory.

## **5 A Case Study Analysis of Ethiopia (1974-1991)**

### **5.1 Introduction to Ethiopia's Civil Wars and Insurgent Groups**

The simultaneous political struggles that emerged in Ethiopia – the Eritrean war of independence and the overthrow of the Derg regime - provide a previously unexplored case study into variation in rebel governance. This case study, as discussed in the methodology section, was chosen at random, but by exploring the civil-war history of modern Ethiopia this case study brings to light how rebel groups with different motivations came to mirror each other. This case study will be evaluated in relation to what extent this example supports the hypothesis set out in Section 3 of this paper.

Throughout the Eritrean struggle for independence and the overthrow of the Ethiopian regime, systems of rebel governance were established by a number of insurgent groups. Rebel interaction with civilians in Ethiopia was systematic and sustained, and it was often used as a method to gain support from the masses, as well as gaining legitimacy and recognition (Huang, 2012). The following sections will discuss the simultaneous insurgencies occurring in Ethiopia: one to overthrow the regime in Ethiopia, and the other fighting for secession and independence of Eritrea. The insurgent groups in Eritrea, the Eritrean Liberation Front (ELF) and the Eritrean People's Liberation Front (EPLF), had secessionist motivations, thus in relation to my theory and hypothesis, it is expected that systems of rebel governance would emerge. On the other hand, the insurgent groups in Ethiopia, the Tigray People's Liberation Front (TPLF) and the Ethiopian People's Revolutionary Party (EPRP), had non-secessionist motivations, therefore it is expected that they would not develop systems of governance. Table 1 presents the insurgent groups that will be discussed throughout this section, as well as the expected and actual result.

Table 1: Ethiopian Rebel Groups in Order of Discussion

Insurgent Group	Secessionist?	Expected rebel governance?	Evidence of rebel governance?
TPLF	No	No	Yes
EPRP	No	No	No
ELF	Yes	Yes	No
EPLF	Yes	Yes	Yes

This section will consider the civil war period from the ascendancy of the Derg regime to power and the two simultaneous civil wars fought in Ethiopia: the war of independence in Eritrea and the conflict to overthrow the Derg regime in Ethiopia. Whilst the war of independence in Eritrea began in 1962, following the unilateral annexation of Eritrea by Emperor Haile-Sellassie which conflicted with a UN agreement to create the federation of Eritrea, this section will focus on the post-1974 period following the Derg’s ascension to power. The conflict in Eritrea began with the Eritrean Liberation Front (ELF) who started an insurgency in the region to regain their independence. As this case study will show, they started the civil war but were unsuccessful in their programme. The eventual victors of the war were the Eritrean People’s Liberation Front (EPLF), an off-shoot branch of ELF. As will be shown, by working in tandem with Ethiopian resistance movements, Eritrean insurgents were effective in mobilising the Eritrean citizens, both peasants and intellectuals alike (Paul et al., 2013). In doing so, they successfully managed to create a combined military and political campaign that would end the brutal, authoritarian, nominally-Marxist, combined armed-forces regime, known as the Derg regime, and re-establish the independent Eritrean state (Pool, 2001). The success of the EPLF can be credited to the extensive system of governance they established, which fostered mass support from the local population (Pool, 2001). Their commitment

to reducing dependency through self-reliance led to the establishment of local administrations, education systems, and the provision of health care (Connell, 2001; Pool, 2001).

Whilst the ELF and the EPLF fought for the independence of Eritrea, a separate protest movement emerged in Ethiopia. The Derg regime had ascended to power following the overthrow of Emperor Haile-Selassie, declaring “Ethiopia Tikidam” (Ethiopia First), before asserting itself as a socialist government committed to effecting social change and promoting development and social justice (Tuso, 1997). In reality, however, the Derg regime emerged as one of the most brutal regimes in the world with little regard for human rights (Tuso, 1997; Young, 1998). With little genuine progression or conviction within the regime’s policies, the Derg failed to live up to the promise that they would produce change and offer an alternative to the previous regime of Haile-Selassie (Young, 1998). 1977-1978 saw the instigation of what has become known as the Ethiopian Red Terror, in which saw competing groups partake in a violent political campaign that led to the deaths of an estimated 750,000 people (Harff and Gurr, 1988). From the initiation of the Ethiopian civil war in 1974 until the defeat and overthrow of the regime in 1991, the Derg fought a number of rebel groups. At the forefront of the struggle was those fighting for Eritrean independence, predominantly the Eritrean Liberation Front (ELF) and later the Eritrean People’s Liberation Front (EPLF), and those fighting to overthrow the regime in Ethiopia proper, namely the Tigrayan People’s Liberation Front (TPLF) and later the Ethiopian People’s Revolutionary Democratic Front (EPRDF).

The following sections will discuss and evaluate the simultaneous insurgencies occurring in Ethiopia: some fighting to overthrow the Derg regime in Ethiopia and the other fighting for secession and independence of Eritrea from the Ethiopian powers. Ethiopia provides a complex case study as there were multiple civil wars happening simultaneously. Throughout the Eritrean struggle for independence and the overthrow of the Ethiopian regime, systems of rebel governance were established by a number of insurgent groups. Rebel interaction with civilians in Ethiopia was

systematic and sustained, and it was often used as a method to gain support from the masses, as well as gaining legitimacy and recognition (Huang, 2012). The complexity of the different groups all operating at the same time in the same country provides a myriad of evidence for how civil war governance emerges and why. It will become clear by looking at some of the prevalent civil war groups that it is not possible to distil actions of governance to simple causes. It will also become clear that the motivations and intended plans of the insurgent groups do not necessarily correspond to the expected level of governance.

## **5.2 Overthrowing the Regime in Ethiopia**

The overthrow of the imperial government of Haile-Selassie and the replacement of the government with a brutal military regime, the Derg, in 1974 marked the beginning of a tumultuous period in Ethiopia (Young, 1998). The anti-monarchy revolutionaries who had overthrown Emperor Haile-Selassie ran a ruthless regime, encouraging the emergence of a number of insurgent groups and marking the beginning of a lengthy civil war that would leave an estimated 150,000 civilians dead as a direct result of violence committed against civilians (Anon., 1991). The Ethiopian People's Revolutionary Party (EPRP) emerged as a contender to the Derg regime predominantly in the capital, Addis Ababa, and other urban areas. Whilst they would come to be defeated by 1977, they played an important role in the early years of the civil war, unleashing violence against the Derg regime in an attempt to overthrow them. Similarly, the people of Tigray were at the forefront of the rural movement against the Derg; both the Tigrayan People's Liberation Front (TPLF) and the Ethiopian People's Revolutionary Democratic Front (EPRDF), the group that would come to overthrow the Derg regime in Ethiopia, were established and managed by student revolutionaries from Tigray (Tuso, 1997). The following sections will discuss the tactics used by the EPRP and the TPLF throughout their bids to overthrow the Derg regime, with a view to analyse whether the non-secessionist insurgent groups in Ethiopia complement the theory established in Section 3.

### **5.2.1 Tigrayan People's Liberation Front**

The TPLF emerged from the Ethiopian student movement who had successfully overthrown the long-prevailing regime of Haile-Selassie. Initially spearheaded by a political elite of students and teachers, the movement was successful in gaining widespread regional support for their anti-Derg insurgency (Segers et al., 2009). Throughout the years of civil war, the TPLF came to represent the centre of popular resistance against the Derg in Tigray (Segers et al., 2009). Created by seven students in Addis Ababa, the group's membership was initially very small and in its early years it experienced significant difficulties recruiting from Tigray's predominantly rural population (Wood, 2010). The repression of the Derg alone was not enough to persuade the sceptical peasantry to join the insurgency. By the early 1980s, however, the group's recruitment had increased five-fold (Wood, 2010). The significant rise in recruitment has been credited to the TPLF's ability to convince the rural peasantry that the insurgency not only possessed the military capacity to defeat the Derg, but also that TPLF had the political capacity to provide services and institutions in the areas it controlled (Wood, 2010). The governance structures suggested and provided by the TPLF, therefore, fostered a strong mutual support between the insurgents and Tigray's rural population (Young, 1998).

For the Derg government, it was a critical element of their land reform policies to prohibit the hiring of labour. This was bitterly resented among Tigrayans. It was thus a priority for the TPLF to initiate land reform policies that would foster support from the masses (Young, 1998). The TPLF placed an emphasis on involving the community in the process of land distribution and committees of peasants of varying wealth were elected to execute the reforms (Young, 1998). Because of these policies and committees, in many locales within Tigray the land was divided between people in accordance with a number of factors, including the location of the land, the desire ensure that everyone was given land near their home, and the fertility of the land. These considerations were put into place in order to allow each peasant to get some land of quality (Young, 1998). All taxes on land were abolished during the war by the TPLF, and all land became declared national property,

thus prohibiting its sale (Agazi, 1983). This enabled the land reform process to continually change to fit the needs of the peasants and the changing local military and political conditions during the civil war years (Young, 1998).

The TPLF's priority of devolving administrative authority to the local level resulted in highly organised local administrations (Young, 1998). The area under Tigray control was divided into four administrative zones, known as *zobas*, which are then divided into seventy-eight districts, or *woredas*, and then further into the lowest level of government known as *tabias* (Young, 1998). Together, these made what is called the *baito* system. Anyone over the age of sixteen and a member of the TPLF mass association could stand election to the *baito*, which then oversaw most factors of daily life, including justice, security, agriculture, road building, health, and education (Young, 1998; Wood, 2010). The restructuring of administration under the *baito* system in Tigray underlined the TPLF insurgents' commitment to providing the Tigrayan people with better services and a democratic administration system that fostered participation and accountability (Young, 1998). Land reform was a vital form of rebel governance in the Tigray region due to the prominence of the peasant class. By integrating land reform policies into the TPLF's long-term system of governance, the TPLF was able to gain mass support from civilians in the territories under their control.

The TPLF argued that the rural population's poverty was due to the lack of education provided by the previous and existing governments. By providing new educational structures they were able to enhance their nationalist appeal and encourage recruitment (Young, 1998). Whilst the insurgents had very limited materials and financial resources, the TPLF recognised that providing the people with an education would deepen the political and national consciousness, as well as train future generations who could potentially be utilised in the future struggle (Young, 1998). The TPLF's decision to prioritise the education of youths aged twelve to eighteen was due to their preference of educating those who could soon be involved in the insurgency (Young, 1998). The provision of



education by the TPLF, therefore, was used as an effective recruitment tool as it advanced the political consciousness of the Tigray people, as well as strengthening loyalty to the insurgency (Young, 1998).

Very early on in their insurgency, the TPLF recognised the oppression of women in Ethiopian society as something that needed addressing (Tadesse and Young, 2003). The TPLF showed a commitment to the advancement of women, predominantly through their land reform policies. Under the regime of Emperor Haile-Sellassie, women had lost their right to land when they divorced. The TPLF altered this, granting divorced, separated, or unmarried women equal land to the men in the area (Young, 1998). It was also reported that a side effect of this policy was that domestic violence reduced dramatically, as men feared the loss of half the family land if their marriage ended (Young, 1998). Additionally, the TPLF offered women an opportunity to leave their family lives and join the insurgency in a combatant capacity. By the mid-1980s, around one-third of TPLF fighters were women (Tadesse and Young, 2003).

In summary, the TPLF, whilst nationalist and ethnic, was not looking to secede. Instead, their aim was to overthrow the repressive Derg regime in their area. The TPLF successfully overthrew the Derg government, and defeated the significantly larger Ethiopian military, in 1991. They did not achieve this alone, instead its success lied within years of cleverly forged political and military alliances with other insurgent groups (Akcinaroglu, 2012). They can, however, be credited with gathering mass popular support and a large number of recruits to their cause that came as a result of the elements of governance provided in the Tigray region by the TPLF.

### **5.2.2 The Ethiopian People's Revolutionary Party**

The Ethiopian People's Revolutionary Party (EPRP) was founded in April 1972 by exiled Ethiopian students in West Berlin, under the name the Ethiopian People's Liberation Organisation.

They emerged as the EPRP in August 1975, after remaining clandestine for over three years due to the ban on political parties by Haile-Selassie's regime (Zelege and Ayana, 1976). They chose to make themselves public by declaring open war against the Derg government in 1976, at a time when they perceived the Derg to be totally isolated (Zelege and Ayana, 1976). Considered the "revolutionary party of the proletariat", the overarching objective of the class-focused EPRP was the creation of a Peoples' Democratic Republic on the basis of a revolutionary Marxist dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry (Anon., 1975; Young, 1998). The abolition of feudalism and imperialism were at the forefront of the EPRP's agenda, with other key tenants of their political programme including the right of nationalities in Ethiopia to self-determination, creating a new democratic system of education and healthcare for the masses, and protecting the rights and equality of women (Anon., 1975).

Whilst the EPRP and the TPLF shared a common goal of overthrowing the Derg regime, the EPRP failed to become the vanguard organisation in Tigray due to its lack of popular support from the people (Young; 1998). They concentrated primarily on urban areas, so the EPRP were able to develop an initially well-supported system among teachers, students, and civil servants. Unlike the TPLF, however, they did not perceive the peasantry to be a vital component of the insurgency. More problematically in terms of support and recruitment, not only did the EPRP fail to recognise that the peasantry could be a revolutionary force in its own right, they perpetrated considerable violence against peasants (Young, 1998). Interviews with those who interacted with the EPRP, documented in Young (1998), emphasised that the EPRP saw little need or interest to help those living in rural areas. They committed acts of violence against those who they deemed to not be cooperating with their plans, and they also interfered with the livelihoods of peasants by interrupting the sale of livestock as they perceived people going into market towns would betray the EPRP insurgents to the Derg (Young, 1998). Unlike the TPLF, it is clear from the evidence available that the EPRP did not implement any system of rebel governance. Instead, they focused on military means in an attempt

to achieve their centre-seeking goal of overthrowing the Derg regime and ascending to power. Whilst evidence is not abundant in regards to the EPRP, it is clear that recruitment occurred primarily for objective reasons, and not due to any kind of persuasion in the form of rebel governance structures.

### **5.3 The Fight for Independence in Eritrea**

Whilst disputes were being voiced and fought over in Ethiopia, the fight for independence in Eritrea continued. Eritrean nationalism arose as a result of the region's colonial history under Italian and British rule, which lasted until 1950. A shared Eritrean national identity emerged among the region's religiously and ethnically diverse population (Paul et al., 2013). Once Ethiopia unilaterally annexed Eritrea in 1962, the sense of nationalism culminated with the outbreak of an insurgency (Paul et al., 2013). The twenty-nine-year struggle for self-determination and liberation began as a very limited, low-level insurrection (Rock, 1999). The insurgency began with hit-and-run guerrilla attacks on isolated Ethiopian troops by the Eritrean Liberation Front (ELF).

A parallel offensive by the EPLF in Eritrea and the TPLF in Ethiopia enabled the outright military victory that enabled the independence of Eritrea and the the overthrow of the Derg regime in May 1991. Eritrea's official independence was achieved and recognised in April 1993, following a UN-sponsored referendum in which the 98.8% vote for independence was declared free and fair by both regional and international observers (Rock, 1999). Whilst military capabilities played a role in the decisive defeat of Ethiopian occupation in Eritrea, the extensive system of governance established by the EPLF enabled the region to achieve legitimacy and recognition from the international community. During the fight for liberation and in the immediate aftermath, Eritrean people had the lowest income per capita in the world (Pateman, 1990). Furthermore, an estimated 60,000 combatants were killed and one million Eritreans became refugees or exiles during the fight for independence (Pool, 1993). Despite this, under conditions of great adversity, Eritrea was able to

build up a society from the inside out that that Pateman (1990) considers a model of development. Beginning with the ELF and then going into greater depth about the governance provided by the EPLF, the following sections provide evidence in support of the theory that secessionist insurgencies are more likely to establish systems of governance within the territories that they control.

### **5.3.1 Eritrean Liberation Front (ELF)**

The first movement of the secessionist insurgency in Eritrea, the ELF emerged as the only armed nationalist force in Eritrea (Connell, 2001). The ELF was organised into autonomous geographical regional divisions, based on ethnic or clan-based divisions. By structuring this way, the ELF leaders were able to carve up Eritrea into personal domains, allied with one another but not functioning as a coordinated political movement (Connell, 2001). Combatants were distributed throughout the regions on the basis of religion, ethnicity, and tribe and consequently recruitment was driven along the religious, ethnic, and tribal affiliations, as well as from a number of badly organised urban nationalist groups that had existed prior to the ELF's formation (Pool, 1980; Woldemikael, 1991). Whilst the ELF's focus on religious and ethnic cleavages assisted recruitment among those previously active in Eritrean politics in the 1940s and 1950s, it did little to persuade younger better educated Eritreans to join the ELF's movement (Woldemikael, 1991). Furthermore, evidence provided by Connell (2001) and Mekonnen (2013) suggested that the ELF leaders often punished and executed those they suspected of disloyalty, which fuelled internal divisions and hindered recruitment among Eritrean civilians. The ELF's ethnic and religious divisions dominated its political and military structures, and it is clear that the ELF's preoccupation with ethnicity and religion hindered their recruitment process (Pool, 1980; Riggan, 2016).

The ELF's religious dimension, which was portrayed as a predominantly Arab and Muslim struggle by its leaders, served as propaganda to raise finance and support from a number of Arab nationalist regimes (Cervenka, 1977; Pool, 1980; Paul et al., 2013). In addition to the external

support that the ELF received, the insurgents used military means to extract resources from Eritrean civilians. The ELF's military activities were used as a mechanism through which they could apply pressure on the population to supply resources such as food and intelligence to the group (Pool, 1980; Mekonnen, 2013). It is evident that the ELF relied on external financing from Arab regimes and military means directed at local civilians in order to fund their insurgency, rather than a system of rebel governance to encourage assistance from among the Eritrean population.

The ELF was rife with internal divisions and pressure from within which demanded change in the way that the ELF conducted its tactics and strategy (Pool, 1980). The Ethiopian People's Liberation Front (EPLF) emerged as a response to the ethnic and religious cleavages that had dominated the ELF (Woldemikael, 1991). Former ELF combatants formed the EPLF in an effort to move away from the divisions that had beset the ELF. The splintering of the EPLF away from the ELF led to a bloody civil war between the two organisations, contributing to the deaths of thousands of combatants, until 1982 when the EPLF defeated the ELF and the latter was driven out of Eritrea (Mekonnen, 2013). As this paper will present in the following sections, the EPLF was able to produce a more coherent unified national identity, through establishing governance structures that replaced the existing state system and benefitted the population of Eritrea.

### **5.3.2 Eritrean People's Liberation Front (EPLF)**

Splitting from the ELF in 1970, the EPLF spearheaded the independence war until the liberation of Eritrea in 1991 (Desta, 2009). From 1982 onwards, after a decisive victory over the ELF, the EPLF was the only effective opposition force in Eritrea (Rock, 1999). Unlike the ELF, the EPLF was highly centralised and disciplined. By appearing as a coherent, united organisation, the EPLF were able to portray to the public that they were an organisation that was capable of replacing the Ethiopian state (Desta, 2009). Furthermore, the leadership of the EPLF placed great emphasis on the secular and nationwide nature of its struggle, a tactic that enabled them to win mass support from

the various religions, ethnicities and clans within the Eritrean public (Pool, 1980; Dorman, 2003). The EPLF's commitment to Marxism-Leninism and the notion of self-reliance led to an extensive system of governance which oversaw the organisation and implementation of reforms in education, healthcare, democratic centralism, land reform and gender equality (Connell, 2001; Pool, 2001). The broad-based nationalistic approach to the liberation of Eritrea guided the EPLF's adoption of state-like qualities; for them, military victory and independence were not the sole purposes of the war (Desta, 2009). Instead, guided by a clandestine Marxist vision, the EPLF wanted to transform the Eritrean state and society both politically and socially (Connell, 2001). This marked a distinct departure from the ELF, who's primary focus was on liberation and not the larger task of social transformation and nation building (Riggan, 2016).

During the colonial era, the education system had been designed for the personal benefit of a small group of elites (Desta, 2009). Eritreans were further hindered when annexed by Ethiopia due to the implementation of Amharic, the Ethiopian language, as the language within schools (Desta, 2009). The EPLF, however, believed that education should serve the common good of the masses, and by doing so, political, social, and economic change would be facilitated. In 1976 alone, thirty-six schools were opened in EPLF areas, and by 1987, an estimated 25,000 students were enrolled in 125 schools (Desta, 2009). Additionally, the EPLF opened the "Revolutionary School" in their base area for 2,500 orphans, refugee children, and the children of EPLF fighters (Desta, 2009). Alongside regular curricular subjects, political education was a constant feature under the EPLF. Ranging from small meetings to large public village seminars, a political education program was implemented in order to increase morale, teach the masses about the meaning and method of political struggle, and to discredit the enemy (Connell, 2001). Education was important for combatants as well as civilians; a higher level of literacy and education among the fighters would ensure a more effective and motivated fighting force (Desta, 2009). The focus on adult literacy saw combatants routinely meet on the frontline to study a number of subjects, including language, mathematics, and geography

(Connell, 2001). In 1982 alone, nearly 10,000 Eritreans enrolled in the EPLF's literacy courses (Desta, 2009). It is evident that the EPLF's commitment to rebel governance through their education system facilitated essential recruitment from among the local populace.

The health sector, like the education sector, during the colonial period was focused on solely providing for the colonists, leaving most of the indigenous population to rely on traditional forms of medicine (Desta, 2009). The EPLF were faced with a challenging task; the Eritrean population was largely illiterate, with very few trained medical personnel. They were further hindered by a lack of resources, the geographical isolation of EPLF areas, and the general problems created by war (Desta, 2009). In order to combat this, over 1,500 'barefoot doctors' were trained, as well as forty village health workers, midwives, and specialist medical personnel (Desta, 2009). By 1984, the EPLF's Health Department was running six regional hospitals, eight health centres, fifteen health stations, and over forty mobile teams (Desta, 2009). Twice during the civil war period, between 1974-74 and again between 1983-85, drought escalated to the level of famine. The contested Ethiopian sovereignty over the rebel-held area of Eritrea contributed to the reluctance of the UN and other major donors to provide relief aid (Rock, 1999). Relief operations, therefore, primarily fell to the Eritrean-run, Khartoum-based Eritrean Relief Association (ERA). From their logistical bases in Northeast Sudan, the ERA mounted cross-border relief operations in association with the EPLF Health Department, ensuring that a large share of the vulnerable population received food and access to health units (Pool, 1993; Connell, 2001; Huang, 2012). Like the EPLF's education system, the implementation of a health system that benefitted the local population, particularly during a period where a large proportion of the population were in urgent need, was an important feature of the insurgency as it assisted in gathering recruits and support.

One of the EPLF's most decisive interventions was the village democratisation that occurred (Connell, 2001). Based upon the principle of democratic centralism, the EPLF actively encouraged

Eritreans to participate directly in the decision-making process (Pateman, 1993). Society was reorganised on a more egalitarian basis, exemplified by the elected administrations, known as People's Assemblies. The system was based on the establishment of five new 'national unions', for women, workers, students, peasants, and professionals (Pateman, 1993; Desta, 2009). Along with the military branch of the EPLF, the six national unions were responsible for selecting its own representative to a national congress, as well as the local-level People's Assemblies. By actively encouraging participation in the elective and decision-making processes, the EPLF, motivated by their political principles, signalled that they were committed to empowering the majority, who had previously been disenfranchised by the colonial system (Desta, 2009).

Under the colonial system, colonial authorities, feudal landlords, and collaborators increased their land holdings, taking land away from Eritrean families and leaving as many as forty percent of families without land (Pateman, 1993). The pre-colonisation society had operated a complex system of land tenure involving communal ownership and the redistribution of land every five to seven years in order to give all married men the chance to farm the more fertile land (Pateman, 1993). The EPLF reinstated the system of communal ownership, whilst making it a fairer, more equal system. As a predominantly agrarian society, with at least eighty percent of the population living in rural areas, it was important for the EPLF to improve agriculture and rural productivity (Pateman, 1993; Connell, 2001). By implementing policies that economically benefitted a large portion of the Eritrean population, the EPLF gained recruits, support and resources from the population.

Traditionally Eritrean women were considerably oppressed; they were excluded from land ownership, they played no role in social or political decision making, and marriage was essentially an economic transaction decided upon by male heads of families (Wilson, 1991; Desta, 2009). Under the EPLF, traditional gender perceptions and roles were modernised. Women's emancipation was endorsed, and women were actively encouraged to participate in social and political arenas



(Matsuoka and Sorenson, 1998). An estimated thirty percent of active EPLF militants were women (Pool, 1980; Desta, 2009). As well as combatant roles, women joined the movement as tailors, teachers, mechanics, technicians, and doctors, with a guarantee from the EPLF that they would receive equal pay for equal work (Pateman, 1993; Matsuoka and Sorenson, 1998). By increasing gender equality, the EPLF were able to increase their recruitment pool, contributing to their eventual success over the Ethiopian military.

The EPLF implemented a vast system of governance that proved its capability of post-conflict statebuilding (Huang, 2012). For two decades, the EPLF coherently constructed a unified sense of Eritrean identity and effectively replaced state institutions that would endure even after secession (Riggan, 2016). The war of liberation not only led to Eritrea becoming an internationally-recognised independent state, but it also marked a social transformation of the state through the construction of a national ideology and a system of governance that promoted it (Riggan, 2016).

## **5.4 Some Concluding Comments**

Ethiopia makes a complex case study as there were effectively two simultaneous civil wars occurring at the same time; Eritrea's war of liberation from Ethiopia was spontaneously occurring alongside a civil war in Ethiopia to overthrow the Derg regime. By working through the history and politics of the largest insurgent groups in Ethiopia, it becomes clear that there is not always a straightforward relationship between secessionist goals and the implantation of a governance system. It is apparent that there are numerous factors that need to be taken into account.

The case of the EPLF in Eritrea supports the hypothesis (H1) that secessionist groups are more likely to provide governance than non-secessionist groups. The EPLF, a secessionist insurgency, successfully implemented a vast system of governance in order to gain support from civilians, as well as portray themselves as a legitimate entity, capable of governing an independent state. The

implementation of new governance structures, designed to benefit the Eritrean population, assisted their bid to gain mass support from the public. Through the advancement of women's rights, land reform, village democratisation, and the development of the education and health sectors, the EPLF successfully achieved their goal of secession; governance was a key factor in their success. There appears to be little evidence, however, that their predecessor, the ELF, implemented a rebel governance structure, despite sharing with the EPLF a goal of secession. The case of the ELF contradicts the hypothesis and complicates the theory which suggests secessionist insurgencies are more likely to implement rebel governance than non-secessionist insurgencies. Consequently, this case study requires additional clarification to the hypothesis (H1) which states that "insurgent groups who wish to secede from the state are more likely to provide systems of governance than those who do not wish to secede".

The situation in Ethiopia varied across time and region, and this case study, by looking at the internal conflicts within Ethiopia, demonstrates that the hypothesis was not fully correct. Some of the insurgent groups looked at in this case support the hypothesis that insurgent groups not seeking a secession are less likely to implement governance. The EPRP, for example, appears to have done little to implement governance in the urban areas that they controlled. Instead, they initiated a violent campaign against the Derg. Despite their lack of success in achieving their goal of overthrowing the Derg regime, their case supports the hypothesis that non-secessionist insurgencies are less likely to implement governance structures. This is because they had less need to gain recognition and legitimacy. On the other hand, the TPLF, unlike the EPRP, did implement an extensive system of governance, despite having the non-secessionist goal of overthrowing the Derg regime.

## 6 A Case Study Analysis of Somalia (c1991-)

### 6.1 Introduction to Modern Somalia's Political Struggles

The complex politics and political vacuums which emerged in Somalia provide a previously unexplored case study into variation in rebel governance. This case study, as discussed in the methodology section, was chosen at random, by exploring the civil-war history of modern Somalia this case study brings to light how a number of different insurgent groups came to co-exist in the region and the different approaches they took to proposed and actual governance. Table 2 presents the insurgent groups that will be discussed throughout this section. From my theoretical framework, I hypothesised that the United Somali Congress (USC), the Islamic Courts Union (ICU) and al-Shabaab would not produce systems of rebel governance due to their non-secessionist goals. Additionally, I hypothesised that the Somali National Movement (SNM) would implement rebel governance structures due to their secessionist motivations.

Table 2: Somalian Rebel Groups in Order of Discussion

Insurgent Group	Secessionist?	Expected rebel governance?	Evidence of rebel governance?
USC	No	No	No
ICU	No	No	Yes
Al-Shabaab	No	No	Yes
SNM	Yes	Yes	Yes

Somalia has been a fractured country for much of its existence, shaped by a culture of decentralization and genealogy (Clark, 1992/3). Ahmed (2007) describes Somalia as a testing ground for competing and conflicting ideologies, including economic, clan-based, religious, and political

ideas. Nationalism in other former colonial states commonly developed as an opposition to colonial rule, however Somalia was unique in that it was uniquely fragmented and divided into five regional groupings; French Somaliland, the British Somaliland protectorate, the Italian colony of Somalia, the Ethiopian Ogaden, and British northern Kenya (Lewis, 2004). These “artificial divisions”, each with different administrative traditions and languages, paved the way for the politicisation of modern Somali culture that developed upon independence (Lewis, 2004). Following the unification of British and Italian colonies in 1960 and the creation of the independent state of Somalia, the east African nation has been embroiled in internal conflict. Byrden (1999) credits prolonged conflict to the “absurd colonial dismemberment” of Somalia between five sovereign states that left Somalia tragically underprepared for independence and statehood. Genealogy and clannism have historically dominated the foundation of order in Somali society, and the ongoing conflict and inherent instability stems from this clan-based system (Clark, 1992/3). The pastoral clan organisation of Somali society has contributed to structural competition and continually shifting alliances between different subclans within a clan family. Subclans vie with each other for resources, but, when threatened, will unify against a rival clan (Paul, Clarke, and Serena, 2014). Furthermore, these powerful local actors have a vested interest in continued state failure, in order to protect their own economic and political interests.

Invoking the Somali political economy provides one explanation that seeks to explain the self-perpetuating state failure that has plagued Somalia. Menkhaus (2005, 2006/7, 2008, 2009, 2014) has written extensively on the civil war in Somalia. He argues that the culture of statelessness, nomadism, and clannism present in Somalia are driving forces against the building of formal political institutions (Menkhaus, 2014). Moreover, the new generation of Somali political elites encourage a dysfunctional political culture that emphasises the manipulation of one’s clan identity for personal gain (Menkhaus, 2014). This has enabled politics in Somalia to be treated as a mechanism to pursue short-term profit-taking and violence. Additionally, almost seventy-five percent of the country’s

youthful population (thirty-five and under) have no living memory of a functional state (Menkhaus, 2014). The prevailing survival culture and risk aversion that exists in Somalia causes the civilian population to settle for a suboptimal outcome (Menkhaus, 2006/7).

An additional explanation of Somalia's protracted state failure is the involvement of external actors and the failed policies of international organisations. In their attempts at restoring a functional government, the United Nations, the African Union, and Western powers failed to account for Somalia's cultural and political differences. Instead, they attempted to impose a universal template of governance, ignoring the importance of local-level government in Somali political culture (Menkhaus, 2014). The lack of a functioning federal government for nearly three decades contributes to the little faith that Somalis appear to have in a national government. The Somali national consciousness has been further scarred, however, by the numerous famines that highlight the inability of a national government to provide food for its citizens (Webersik, 2004). Somalia has seen some of the world's worst humanitarian crises, with an estimated 1.3 million internally displaced persons and 3.5 million in need of emergency aid in 2009 alone (Menkhaus, 2009). The ongoing natural disasters has contributed to an opportunity structure that has fuelled the looting of private homes, businesses, and farms, as well as contributing massively to the amount of Somalis joining or associating with various actors, such as terrorist organisations, criminal gangs, and pirates (Menkhaus, 2006/7; Paul, Clarke, and Serena, 2014).

The attempts at governance analysed in this section are confined to the current civil war ongoing in Somalia, triggered by the overthrow of Siad Barre's regime in 1991. Whilst the analysis only considers the insurgencies in the post-1991 era, it is important to recognise that substantial human rights violations and violence existed long before this. The beginning of state violations against civilians began in 1969 with the ascension of Major General Mohamed Siad Barre into the presidency, by way of a military coup. Under the Barre regime, Somalia saw an intensification of

violence and human rights abuses, including torture, extrajudicial detentions, collective punishments, clan cleansing, mass executions, and internal displacements (Abdullahi, 2014). During the Barre regime, divide-and-rule tactics pitted clans against each other, leading to a fierce competition for resources in an already resource-scarce environment (Paul, Clarke, and Serena, 2014). The “real agony” of Somalia began with total state collapse on 26<sup>th</sup> January 1991, when Barre was overthrown by United Somali Congress (USC) rebels and fled the presidential palace in Mogadishu (Abdullahi, 2014). Since then, Somalia has been without a functional central government, making it the longest-running of complete state collapse in post-colonial history (Menkhaus, 2006/7). Somalia has seen fighting in every corner of the country, involving both non-state actors (such as warlords, the Union of Islamic Courts, and al-Shabaab) and external actors (like the United Nations Operations in Somalia, Ethiopian, Kenyan, and Ugandan militaries, and the African Union Mission in Somalia). Somali scholar, Hassan Cali Mire, phrased the outbreak of conflict in Somalia best: it was as though “all the pent-up frustrations of three decades of postcolonial independence exploded into the ugly rise of fratricide, which has made the barbaric killing of innocent members of other kin communities a worthy goal.” (Abdullahi, 2014).

### **6.1.1 United Somali Congress**

The post-1991 tumultuous period commenced with the overthrow of the Barre regime. Formed in 1987 as a response to the brutal treatment of the Hiwaye clan at the hands of the Barre regime, the United Somali Congress (USC) played a major role in ousting Barre’s government and is the first of four groups which will be discussed in this section who sought leadership throughout the civil war (Samatar, 1992). Declaring themselves victorious in January 1991, the USC initiated a program of clan cleansing by instigating large-scale communal violence against members of Barre’s Darood clan in areas across southern Somalia and Mogadishu (Kapteijns, 2012). The USC’s clan-based brutalisation of civilians contributed to the deaths of 30,000 civilians, the internal

displacement of 400,000 Somalis, the looting of properties, and the raping of women (Kapteijns, 2012).

The initial goal of the USC had been to overthrow the Barre regime in response to the atrocities committed against the Hawiye tribe. It is evident that the USC had few thought-out plans for once they had achieved this goal, and no future plans for repairing Somalia's institutional capacity or restoring peace (Samatar, 1992). It appears that the USC did very little in the way of governance. With the USC in charge, Mogadishu was engulfed in "utter mayhem" as numerous militias engaged in fighting with the USC, whilst simultaneously looting, pillaging, and killing civilians (Abdullahi, 2014). During the contests for strategic locations, such as the airport and the seaport, the USC leadership were powerless over their combatants, losing control of its militia (Samatar, 1992; Adam, 1995). Anarchy ensued; all state property, including factories and administrative offices, and social service sites, including schools and hospitals, were pillaged and gradually destroyed within Mogadishu and parts of southern Somalia (Abdullahi, 2014). Fighting among USC factions and various insurgencies across Somalia devastated crop growing regions, exacerbating famines and preventing aid relief from reaching civilians (Abdullahi, 2014). This was intensified by the scorched-earth policy of Barre's retreating troops, who slaughtered livestock, ransacked crops, and looted tools, and the subsequent counterattacks by USC troops (Stevenson, 1993).

### **6.1.2 Islamic Courts Union (ICU)**

The Transitional Federal Government (TFG) was created at national reconciliation talks in 2004, in response to the general lawlessness created by the TFG. Tasked with administering a five-year political transition to create a government of national unity, the TFG was considered Somalia's "best hope for stability and governance" (Menkhaus, 2009; Paul, Clarke, and Serena, 2014). The TFG was backed by Ethiopia, a source of historical animosity for many Somalis, thus the perception that it was a puppet government actively propelled civilian support to the national Islamist movement

(Little, 2012). The Islamic Courts Union (ICU) was a group of sharia courts that converged to form a rival administration to the TFG, gaining supremacy over the many clan-based factions that had been competing for power since 1991 (Ahmad, 2009). Whilst it is worth mentioning that the ICU was formed in response to the general failures of the TFG, the TFG was not an insurgent group and is subsequently not relevant to this study. Before discussing al-Shabaab, a radical offshoot of the ICU, who have dominated the Somali conflict since their emergence in 2006, it is necessary to outline the history of the politics, religious ideals, and governance of the short-lived ICU which al-Shabaab emerged out of. Attention will then be turned to analysing the governance put into place by al-Shabaab and what this tells us about insurgent motivations and rebel governance.

Whilst the ICU itself was not formed until 2006, it has its roots in the mid-1990s, when clans established several local-level courts with varying interpretations of sharia law. Somalia's Islamists varied from progressives with democratic values, opportunists using sharia courts to advance personal gains, conservatives focused on public morality, hard-liners who want an Islamic state and do not advocate political violence, and jihadis who use violence as a tactic of choice (International Crisis Group, 2006). Central to their message was that other non-Islamic identities, in particular clan and ethnic rivalries, were responsible for the civil chaos that has plagued Somalia (Ahmad, 2009). The solution they proposed was a unified Islamic national identity that could provide rule of law and political order (Ahmad, 2009). The sharia courts have in fact been credited by much of the population, as well as Somalia's important business community, for bringing order to certain parts of the country and for their opposition to warlordism (International Crisis Group, 2006; Harnisch, 2010). They were successful in taking control of much of southern Somalia for several months, including Mogadishu, which they took from US-backed militias in June 2006, and the strategically important port city of Kismayo (Menkhaus, 2009; Warner and Chapin, 2018).



In terms of governance, and in their attempt to declare and establish an Islamic State, the ICU replaced customary law with strict sharia law (Yihdego, 2007). In the absence of the rule of law, sharia courts, with their own appointed judge and enforcement militia, were used as a form of dispute resolution and for prosecuting criminal activity (Ahmad, 2009). Somalis living within ICU-controlled territories were told to abide with the strict sharia rules or face harsh reprisals (Yihdego, 2007). Whilst fear and threats certainly existed under the ICU, there is the argument that the Somali people openly accepted the Islamist movement as a credible alternative to the 'state of nature' that they had been living in since the outbreak of civil war (Ahmad, 2009). Due to the past two decades of lawlessness, the Islamic courts were, in a sense, the "closest semblance of institutionalised political authority" within Somalia (Menkhaus, 2005; Ahmad, 2009). For a short period of time, the ICU established a form of rebel governance in the practice of sharia law and the implementation of sharia courts. The case of the ICU contradicts the hypothesis (H1), as it was a religiously-motivated, non-secessionist insurgent group who provided structures of rebel governance.

The following section of this case study will explore the rise of al-Shabaab and the extensive system of governance they implemented in the territory under its control. The demise of the ICU occurred after its more radical elements declared jihad on Ethiopia, prompting the invasion of Somalia by Ethiopian troops in late 2006 and the disintegration of the courts (Harnisch, 2010). Most elements of the ICU fled the country, with the exception of the military wing, al-Shabaab, which has operated independently of the now-defunct ICU since early 2007 (Harnisch, 2010).

### **6.1.3 Al-Shabaab**

Somalia has been "plagued" by an ascendant Islamic movement that wields far more power than the TFG ever achieved (Menkhaus 2006/7). Although there were and are multiple rebel factions involved in the Somali civil war, al-Shabaab has dominated, emerging as the most coherent, well-organised, and extensive administration that southern Somalia has known in the past two decades

(Hansen, 2012). As just mentioned, al-Shabaab emerged in 2006 as the radical fundamentalist military off-shoot of the ICU (Harnish, 2010). Aligned with the ideology of al-Qaeda and the global jihad, the primary motives of al-Shabaab were the short-term goal of toppling the Western-backed government, and the long-term goals of establishing a Caliphate to unite all Muslims and implementing an Islamic sharia state (Bruton, 2010; Harnisch, 2010). Although al-Shabaab formally declared commitment to al-Qaeda in February 2010, their objectives are largely parochial and geographically limited to Somalia (Bruton, 2010; Jones, 2014).

The organisation developed from a small network of “Afghanistan alumni”, with only 33 members at the time of its inception in 2006 (Hansen, 2012). The political vacuum produced by decades of instability and the constantly changing sources of governance allowed al-Shabaab to flourish. The group quickly expanded, with an estimated 7,000-9,000 fighters today, recruiting heavily from Mogadishu’s illiterate poor youths who were opportunistically drawn to al-Shabaab (Burton, 2010; Council on Foreign Relations, 2018). Following al-Shabaab’s inception, swathes of young men wearing shirts declaring “I Am the Boss” roamed Mogadishu and southern Somalia; a phrase that “became synonymous [to Somalis] with the notion that there is security for nobody and violence for all” (Paul, Clarke, and Serena, 2014). Recruits were driven to join al-Shabaab for a number of reasons including financial gain, fear and forced recruitment, the desire to side with the winner, clan grievances, justice through Sharia legislation, jihad, and anti-Ethiopian sentiments (Burton, 2010). Ethiopia’s invasion of Somalia, from 2006 to 2009, was particularly important in creating a fertile breeding ground for insurgent organisations to thrive; the invasion of foreign forces impelled al-Shabaab to organise, thus aiding its recruitment (Menkhaus, 2009; Hensen, 2012). Additionally, a climate of corruption generated by the misuse of funds by the Western-backed government attempts enabled al-Shabaab to appear as a credible alternative (Hansen, 2012). To sum, al-Shabaab is a radical Islamist group who have a mixture of short- and long-term goals, with the primary motive of establishing an Islamic state in Somalia. The following paragraphs provide

evidence that al-Shabaab implemented a system of governance in the territories it controlled across southern, and in some localities operating shadow governments (Harnisch, 2010).

It has been argued by Hansen (2013) that Al-Shabaab's record of governance has been "far superior" to other attempts of governance by various factions, including those who have been externally sponsored by various international actors. Emerging as one of the most coherent and well-organised administrations that southern Somalia has known, al-Shabaab successfully organised local civil society in the areas that it controlled, even after periods of sustained chaos and violence (Hansen, 2013). In order to be relevant on the localised clan level – a highly important factor of Somali society – al-Shabaab had to be responsive to Somali issues that had little to do with a globalist ideology (Hansen, 2013). Additionally, al-Shabaab had to appear as a credible alternative to the TFG, thus they had to convince the local populations in southern Somalia – through both coercive and supportive means – that they were the better option (Anderson and McKnight, 2015).

The support received from numerous Somali clans meant that the insurgents had to adopt a more active political position in order to follow through with their promises. In this respect, al-Shabaab was required to govern in order to stay relevant and receive on-going support. They did this through a number of mechanisms; firstly, al-Shabaab produced an effective taxation system in the areas under their control in southern Somalia. Through the taxation of trade, particularly in vital economic bases such as the port of Kismayu, al-Shabaab pursued rent-seeking activities on major exports (Anderson and McKnight, 2014, 2015; Bryden, 2014). This system of revenue-raising proved extremely lucrative for the al-Shabaab insurgency, particularly whilst engaging in conflict against better funded internal and external actors. Additionally, the income raised from rent-seeking and taxation enabled al-Shabaab to pursue a substantial recruitment program. Economic deprivation was rife among young Somalis, thus the provision of protection and social services was a key incentive for youths to join such movements. Al-Shabaab reportedly paid its recruits a wage ranging

from \$60-200 a month, thus the opportunity to provide for family members was and is a driving force in widespread recruitment in the economically deprived southern Somalia (Anderson and McKnight, 2015). Furthermore, al-Shabaab reportedly collected a tax, known as *zakat*, from communities under its control and re-distributes it to those most in need (Harnisch, 2010). In doing so, al-Shabaab were effectively able to buy both recruits and support from within the populations it governed through actions which are on the surface level socialist and inclusive. Finally, taxation and rent-seeking behaviour enabled al-Shabaab to provide public works projects, such as restoring roads and building bridges (Harnisch, 2010). In a bid to win public support, the group sought to provide the services that would normally be provided by the state. The provision of such an extensive governance system disputes my hypothesis that non-secessionist insurgent groups are less likely to implement rebel governance. This will be addressed further in the concluding section of this paper.

The regulation of foreign aid flows into al-Shabaab-controlled territory was another mechanism used by the insurgents to portray itself as “protector of the people” (Harnisch, 2010). Through the ‘Office for Supervising the Affairs of Foreign Agencies’ and its subsidiary the ‘Humanitarian Coordination Office’, al-Shabaab regulated the distribution of foreign aid, and in many instances banned certain NGOs from operating in their territories (Jackson and Aynte, 2013). In doing so, they sought to challenge Western donors by accusing them of intentionally undermining Somali farmers (Harnisch, 2010). The self-proclaimed title of ‘Office for Supervising Affairs of Foreign Agencies’ provided al-Shabaab with a form of superiority to international actors by enforcing the perception that they had authority over the actions of international bodies within their territories (Harnisch, 2010; Zimmerman, 2011a, 2011b). Additionally, through the launch of their media branch, the al Kata’ib Foundation for Media Production, al-Shabaab took efforts to control the flow of information out of their territories and influence public opinion, through the dissemination of propaganda using news, statements, publications, and videos (Harnisch, 2010). Al-Shabaab also took steps to control the information flow through silencing journalists and other media outlets. Threats,

kidnappings, and assassinations were used to silence many independent journalists, subsequently leaving al-Shabaab outlets as the sole source of information for some localities (Mohamed, 2009). Whilst the regulation of information and the implementation of media networks is not a primary feature of rebel governance, the evidence that emerged from Somalia underscores the idea that al-Shabaab went to lengths to regulate and intervene in the daily lives of Somali civilians.

Whilst al-Shabaab has not been preoccupied with establishing schools, it exerted considerable influence over the education sector in southern Somalia. Al-Shabaab issued a statement in September 2009 warning schools from using textbooks provided by international organisations that encouraged what they saw as un-Islamic subjects (Harnisch, 2010). Human Rights Watch (hereafter HRW) reported that al-Shabaab's implementation of their interpretation of Islam prohibited English classes, science classes, and other subjects that they believed to be not conducive with Islam (HRW, 2012). Additionally, al-Shabaab exerted their authority by segregating boys and girls, as well as imposing a strict Islamic dress code (Harnisch, 2010; HRW, 2012). Recruitment to the group often occurred within schools, particularly in the *madrassas* (Islamic schools), where children were "indoctrinated" in radical interpretations of Islam and encouraged to join al-Shabaab (Harnisch, 2010). It is evident that al-Shabaab was concerned with regulating the daily lives of Somali children and their intervention in the education sector is a primary indicator of the insurgent group's extensive governance system.

The extensive application of sharia law by Islamic movements in southern Somalia appeared to be a backlash to the secular tendency of the modern Somali state (Abdullahi, 2014). Al-Shabaab's strict interpretation of sharia law extended further than the education sector. Various types of entertainment, including music and movies, were prohibited, as was smoking and the shaving of beards (Masters and Sergie, 2018). Harsh punishments for failing to adhere to the group's interpretation resulted in stonings and amputations performed on suspected thieves and adulterers,

as well as those who failed to participate in the mandatory five daily prayers (Harnisch, 2010; Masters and Sergie, 2018). Al-Shabaab used their interpretation of sharia law to control most aspects of the personal lives of women and girls; they were forced to wear a veil, and reportedly were prohibited from wearing bras (Harnisch, 2010; HRW, 2012). The implementation of the fierce interpretation of sharia law followed by most people in southern Somalia demonstrated al-Shabaab's complete control and authority over the area.

Whilst they facilitated an extensive governance system across the territories it controls, al-Shabaab remained one of the principle perpetrators of the violence that has plagued southern Somalia. Individual punishments for failing to adhere to the strict interpretation of sharia law were not uncommon. A religious police force, known as the Army of Hisbah, enforced the regulations and apprehended those who failed to do so (Harnisch, 2010). Punishments were often carried out in public, including the whipping of men who failed to maintain their beard and women who wore bras (Sheikh, 2009). Furthermore, reports of men and women being publicly stoned to death for adultery emerged from various cities across southern Somalia, including a thirteen-year-old girl who was reportedly a victim of rape (Anonymous, 2009a). Additionally, al-Shabaab carried out violent attacks on its rivals through the use of improvised explosive devices (IEDs), assassinations, ambush-style attacks, and most notably, suicide bombings (Kimenyi, Mbaku, and Moyo, 2010; Hansen, 2012; Paul, Clarke, and Serena, 2014). Designated the deadliest terrorist organisation in Africa, al-Shabaab carried out a known 216 suicide attacks between 2006 and 2017, killing an estimated 595 people (Warner and Chapin, 2018). Al-Shabaab conducted highly targeted attacks against the TFG and its supporters, Ethiopian, Kenyan, and Ugandan soldiers, personnel with the African Union Mission to Somalia (AMISOM), and other pro-government militias (Hansen, 2012; Jones, 2014).

Al-Shabaab is an interesting case study; the insurgent group implemented a well established system of governance across southern Somalia whilst simultaneously initiating an indiscriminate

violent campaign against combatants and non-combatants alike. Al-Shabaab's primary motivate was and is to establish an Islamic State in Somalia. In that respect, Al-Shabaab's insurgency is not secessionist per se, however the state formation element may share similar attributes to the secessionist insurgent nature. There is evidence, for example, that al-Shabaab have attempted to win the "hearts and minds" of the local populace, by providing for the poor (Harnisch, 2010). The case of al-Shabaab raises questions about why insurgent groups implement systems of rebel governance and challenges the hypothesis that secessionist insurgencies are more likely to establish systems of governance than non-secessionist groups.

#### **6.1.4 Somali National Movement**

In May 1991, at the same time that conflict gripped southern Somalia, the Somali National Movement (SNM) declared Somaliland, an area in northwestern Somalia, an independent state. Whilst the primary objective of the SNM was the removal of the Barre regime, the insurgency later altered its course, declaring independence from federal Somalia (Bradbury, Abokor, and Yusuf, 2003). Those living within today's Somaliland had long reasserted their desire to be the separate entity it had been as the colony of British Somaliland in the nineteenth century (Adam, 1994; Abdullahi, 2014). The colonial history had helped foster a distinct sense of identity among Somalis in the northwest (Adam, 1994; Bryden, 1999). Alongside their shared identity, intense state repression in northern Somalia, which caused between 50,000 and 100,000 civilian casualties, militarised the masses and had a unifying effect on the people (Hoehne, 2009; Walls, 2009; Ingiriis, 2012; Johnson and Smaker, 2014). The declaration of independence for Somaliland and the formation of a de facto state administration in May 1991 occurred following the USC's unilateral decision to form a government. During the 1980s, the SNM had fostered ties with a number of other insurgent groups, including the USC who they had agreed specific terms with for the period after the fall of the existing Barre regime (Walls, 2009). The ousting of Barre and the subsequent formation of a unilateral government angered the SNM, leading them to declare that Somaliland had seceded from Somalia

as an independent state, a move that remains unrecognised by national and international entities (Caplin, 2009).

The SNM insurgency's success following independence has contributed to Somaliland enjoying basic security, economic activity, and relative peace and order within its borders, a vivid contrast to al-Shabaab. Unlike Somalia, Somaliland is considered a functional state due to its capacity to maintain some degree of public order and stability, as well as generating economic recovery (Menkhaus, 2014). The security sector in Somaliland is respected, effective, and constrained; the government operates a seaport, an international airport, and a customs revenue collection; the electoral boards have carried out multiple free and fair elections; and, the government has succeeded in multiple constitutional transfers of power in their system of elected representation (Hansen and Bradbury, 2007; Menkhaus, 2014).

Politically, Somaliland is considered a relative success story in the ongoing Somali conflict; in a drastic contrast to the rest of Somalia, it has escaped the turmoil that grips the rest of the nation, instead achieving self-rule and stable democracy matched by few other countries in Africa and the Middle East (Hansen and Bradbury, 2007; Caplin, 2009; Walls, 2009). The bottom-up process in pursuing recognition as a sovereign state has not only had a unifying effect on its civilian population, but it has also created the pressures for democratisation that have failed to emerge in the rest of Somalia (Johnson and Smaker, 2014). Somaliland has independently succeeded in creating a working political system of elected representation; ten years after declaring independence, the SNM in Somaliland introduced a new constitution by way of a national referendum and two years later, in 2003, the nation held its first open presidential elections. In 2005, regular parliamentary elections began, all of which have been declared free and fair by international observers (Hansen and Bradbury, 2007). Furthermore, cross-clan votes have increased steadily, suggesting that policy, not ethnicity nor clan loyalties, determine elections in Somaliland, thus increasing the likelihood of a



capable and durable government (Caplin, 2009). Additionally, Somaliland has created its own army, police force, a judiciary, and its own national currency (Bradbury, Abokor, and Yusuf, 2003; Johnson and Smaker, 2014).

In terms of economic development, a large proportion of the infrastructure that was destroyed during the war has been restored and revived, particularly in Somaliland's urban areas, its municipal services, and its health and education sectors (Bradbury, Abokor, and Yusuf, 2003). As Somaliland is not recognised internationally, and consequently cannot access international loans, the government of Somaliland has focused on generating revenue through the taxation of ports and other trading hubs (Johnson and Smaker, 2014). Without external assistance, reconstruction has largely been achieved from the resources of Somalilanders themselves (Bradbury, Abokor, and Yusuf, 2003).

The SNM insurgent group reinforce the theory that secessionist insurgencies are more likely to implement effective systems of rebel governance. Somaliland's quest for recognition and legitimacy as an independent state provided the SNM with an incentive to demonstrate that they are capable of implementing peace and stability, as well as a coherent governance structure. By performing the functions of a state, including the provision of security, the rule of law, basic social services, and political services, the SNM have offered themselves as a credible alternative to the faltering nation state of Somalia. The case of the SNM confirmed the expected outcome that a secessionist insurgent group would implement rebel governance.

## **6.2 Conclusion**

Somalia is a unique case study; it is currently the longest-standing "failed" state and it has been without any kind of functioning government for nearly three decades (Menkhaus, 2014). The establishment of formal political institutions has been inhibited by Somalia's political culture, history

of statelessness, and clannism (Menkhaus, 2014). Over the past decades, Somali political elites have participated in a destructive form of politics, in which clan identity has been manipulated for personal gain and short-term profit-making (Menkhaus, 2014). As a result, numerous rebel groups have emerged and evolved and recruited different levels of support. In this section I have looked at attempts made by four insurgent groups who emerged from 1991 and attempted to fill the power vacuum in Somalia. In each case, there was a different motivation and degree of planning which impacted on their desire and ability to provide governance in Somalia.

The first post-Barre group discussed was the USC. An insurgency motivated by short-term power and control, they failed to provide an effective system of governance in part due to their lack of planning but also their extreme use of violence against civilian populations. The case of the USC supported my hypothesis (H1), as it was a non-secessionist insurgency I did not expect to see evidence of rebel governance. On the other hand, the ICU, a religiously-motivated insurgent group, implemented sharia courts and law across southern Somalia. Whilst the ICU's system of rebel governance was not as extensive and established as al-Shabaab, there is evidence that they implemented some form of rebel governance. The case of the ICU therefore contradicts the hypothesis (H1), as it was a non-secessionist insurgency that used rebel governance as a means to achieve their objective.

A more successful governance scheme was implemented by al-Shabaab. The group had a long-term plan, motivated by a zealous form of Sharia-Islam. Their desire to implement a Muslim state, rather than simply overthrow an existing group, meant they created a widespread system of governance that encompassed much of southern Somalia. Among other things, Al-Shabaab implemented a judicial system, media entities, and school curriculums. This contradicts the theory laid out in Section 3, which assumes that non-secessionist groups are less likely to implement a

governance system, as they are not in pursuit of legitimacy, the 'hearts and minds' of the civilians, and they are not fighting for a unified cause

Similar to the ICU and al-Shabaab in southern Somalia, the SNM implemented a broad, seemingly successful form of governance. The comparison with al-Shabaab is interesting as both created functional forms of governance which were utilized by citizens, but their motivations were completely different. The SNM emerged as a coherent unified entity, capable of creating lasting governance structures that have contributed to the relative peace and stability of northern Somalia, in part thanks to their long-term strategies. Seeking recognition as a legitimate independent state, the SNM were incentivized to provide a system of governance in order to portray to the international community that they were capable of replicating state functions and operating as an independent state entity. The case of the SNM supports my hypothesis that secessionist insurgencies are more likely to produce a system of rebel governance than those with non-secessionist goals.

## 7 A Case Study Analysis of Liberia (1989-2003)

### 7.1 Introduction to Governance and Insurgency in Liberia

The general statelessness fuelled by violent internal conflict in Liberia provides an interesting case study. By exploring the civil war history of modern Liberia, this case study brings to light how a number of different insurgent groups emerged in response to the state's inability or unwillingness to provide governance to the Liberian population, and yet failed to fulfil this role themselves. In this case study I will address the six main insurgent groups. I recognise in this case study that certain sources are relied heavily upon, due to the lack of extensive research on some of the smaller insurgent groups. Table 3 presents the six insurgent groups discussed in this section. As Table 3 exhibits, the six insurgent groups possess common elements as they are all non-secessionist, central power grabbing insurgent groups. Utilising the theory established in Section 3, I expect that there will be little evidence of rebel governance from the six non-secessionist insurgent groups.

Table 3: Liberian Rebel Groups in Order of Discussion

Insurgent Group	Secessionist?	Expected rebel governance	Evidence of rebel governance?
NPFL	No	No	No
INPFL	No	No	No
ULIMO	No	No	No
LPC	No	No	No
LURD	No	No	No
MODEL	No	No	No

## 7.2 First Liberian Civil War (1989-1997)

Triggered by the cross-border Christmas Eve attack by the Taylor-led National Patriotic Front of Liberia (NPFL) into the border town of Butuo, Liberia was plunged into what would become one of Africa's most brutal and violent civil wars (Ellis, 1995). Whilst civil war did not erupt until 1989, the preconditions for state collapse and civil war long preceded Taylor's invasion. Firstly, increasing state decay and institutional failure under the Doe government and his predecessor, President William Tolbert (1971-80), had weakened the Liberian bureaucratic system as a means of manipulating and expanding the patronage network that sought to benefit a very small elite group (McDonough, 2008). Second, high unemployment, the state's inability to pay government workers regularly, and the state's failure to provide basic social services fuelled a growing resistance to Doe's government (Harris, 1999; Kieh, 2004). Third, the rigged 1985 national election, which by all independent accounts Doe and his National Democratic Party of Liberia (NDPL) had lost, and the following repression and purging of real and imagined enemies gave rise to mass disenchantment (Sesay, 1996; Boas, 2001; Kieh, 2004). The resulting civil war, therefore, was the culmination of a long chain of events aimed at replacing the old political establishment with a new order (Sesay, 1996).

A number of rebel groups emerged in the first civil war; the Taylor-led NPFL and a number of offshoots, including the Independent National Patriotic Front of Liberia (INPFL), the United Liberation Movement for Democracy in Liberia (ULIMO) which later split into two factions known as ULIMO-K and ULIMO-J, and the Liberian Peace Council (LPC). Whilst most evidently embodied by the actions of Taylor, the warlord pursuit of commerce was evident by each faction (Reno, 1999). Whilst insurgent actions during the first civil war are often interpreted within a framework of ethnicity, the war was predominantly characterised by struggles between contending warlords (Riley, 1997; Cliffe and Luckham, 1999). Brutal military means, often perpetrated by unpaid soldiers who took advantage of the chaos for personal gain, were used to pursue commerce, resources, and in most instances, to secure political power (Adebajo, 1996). The following section will assess the

aforementioned insurgent groups. By identifying their motivations, wartime techniques, and any elements of rebel governance, I am able to address the hypothesis laid out in Section 3. I expect to find that the non-secessionist insurgent groups that emerged in Liberia's first civil war did not pursue systems of rebel governance.

### **7.2.1 The National Patriotic Front of Liberia (NPFL)**

The dominant insurgent group, the NPFL, emerged from a collection of exiles - a result of purges by the Doe regime - who had little in common apart from a strong aversion to President Doe (Johnston, 2008). Taylor, for example, had been a ranking official in Doe's government who had fled Liberia in 1983 amid charges of embezzlement. Through a combination of bribes and assassinations of potential rivals, Taylor installed himself as head of the NPFL (Kieh, 2004). Taylor led the December 24<sup>th</sup> 1989 cross-border attack with as little as fifty men (Reno, 1997). Within months of the ensuing civil war, the Taylor-led NPFL numbered more than 5,000 combatants, and they had taken control of an increasing amount of territory (Boas, 2001). Made possible by mass disenchantment with the Doe government, the NPFL successfully took control of around ninety percent of Liberia within three months (Kieh, 2004). As previously mentioned, the Doe government had become so illegitimate that most Liberians were prepared to support any kind of change (Harris, 1999; Kieh, 2004).

Whilst ethnicity was used as a tool for obtaining resources, mobilisation, and recruitment, it was clear that the real agenda of the NPFL was to overthrow the Doe government, implement Taylor as president, and use Liberia's natural resources for personal wealth and gain (Kieh, 2004; Jackson, 2011). Liberia's immense illiteracy problem, which at some estimates was at eighty-five percent of the population - made the population especially vulnerable to manipulation (Kieh, 2004). This was predominant at the outbreak of the war, as initially the Gio and Mano ethnic groups dominated the NPFL ranks, whilst Doe's Armed Forces of Liberia (AFL) predominantly consisted of the Krahn and Mandingo ethnic groups (Hegre, Ostby, and Raleigh, 2009; Paul, Clarke, and Serena, 2014). Ethnic

divisions were initially utilised to drive recruitment, foster support and as a pretext for the targeting of civilians, however the NPFL quickly attracted a multi-ethnic support base generated by a shared-resentment of the neo-patrimonial Doe regime (Harris, 1999; Boas, 2001). The NPFL itself, however, was not formed on the basis of ethnicity. Instead, it was an center-seeking insurgency formed to overthrow the government and take power for themselves (Kieh, 2004).

The wartime practices of the NPFL insurgency was marred with brutality and grievous human rights violations against the local populace. A witness to the violence branded the Liberian civil war as surpassing all other wars “in intensity, in depravity, in savagery, in barbarism and in horror” (Ellis, 1995). The post-Cold War disarmament generated an abundance of cheap weapons that became increasingly accessible to insurgents (Reno, 1995). With the availability of weapons, and with no discernible security sector in Liberia, civilians were at the mercy of insurgents, who one witness described as becoming “addicted to blood and violence” (Reno, 1995). Under what became known as “Operation Pay Yourself”, NPFL insurgents were given formal permission from Taylor to engage in looting and plundering as their form of payment (Johnston, 2008). Not only did NPFL combatants loot, pillage, and deliberately destroy infrastructure, they initiated a violent unrestrained campaign against Liberian civilians, raping, maiming, and killing indiscriminately (Cain, 1999; McGovern, 2005).

The prominence of child soldiers used by the NPFL, both voluntary and forced, indicated how little regard the NPFL had for gathering public support through any means but violence and economic incentives. The abundance of voluntary child recruits stemmed from the increasingly large number of orphaned, abandoned, homeless, and hungry children, many of whom were thrust into self-dependency and joined in the pursuit of power, protection, and economic opportunity (Human Rights Watch, 1994b; Murphy 2003; Woodward and Galvin, 2009). Whilst some voluntarily joined what appeared to be a free-for-all of looting and plundering, many other children were forcefully

recruited into the rebel movement or into domestic and sexual servitude (Murphy, 2003; McGovern, 2005; Boas, 2009). What resulted was an abundance of unpaid, traumatised youths – some estimates put figures at 10,000 child soldiers under the age of fifteen - resorting to looting and terror (Human Rights Watch, 1994b; Riley, 1997; Harris, 1999). The willingness of the NPFL to use such a large number of children as combatants indicated that there were willing to resort to any tactic, regardless of the brutality, in order to pursue their power-grabbing goal and economic accumulation. It is evident that the NPFL saw no need to win the hearts and minds of the Liberian people.

Similar to its recruitment tactics, it is clear that Taylor and the NPFL saw little need to implement a system of governance in order to obtain resources from civilians. This is exemplified in the establishment of his commercial empire, encompassing most of Liberia and parts of Guinea and Sierra Leone, which he proclaimed as “Taylorland” (Harris, 1999). Gbarnga, Taylorland’s proclaimed capital city, became the seat of Taylor’s National Patriotic Reconstruction Assembly Government. Within Gbarnga, Taylor established ministries, banks, and his own currency (Harris, 1999; Ellis, 1995). Furthermore, Taylorland boasted an international airport and a deep water port, allowing export trade to boom (Harris, 1999). Taylor’s freedom from creditors (as he was not the internationally recognised sovereign) allowed him to successfully exploit Liberia’s abundance of natural resources, particularly timber, for personal wealth, capital, and weapons (Reno, 1995; Johnston, 2004). Shady foreign firms were attracted to Liberia for the purpose of extracting primary commodities and participating in the burgeoning wartime weapons trade (Johnston, 2004). Timber was the largest sector of Taylor’s export economy and provided a crucial source of income in sustaining his dominance (Johnston, 2004). By 1991, Taylorland, under NPFL control, had become France’s third largest source of tropical hardwood (Reno, 1995). Income from this lucrative business enabled Taylor and the NPFL to almost entirely control their political networks through private channels (Reno, 1995). Motivated by economic accumulation for personal benefit, the NPFL had very



little need to implement a governing system. It is unsurprising that the NPFL did not preoccupy themselves with formulating a rebel governance system. The ministries and banks that were implemented were done so purely for the personal benefit of Taylor and specific NPFL elites, at the expense of a majority of the Liberian population (Jackson, 2011).

To conclude, any kind of 'governance' structure Taylor and the NPFL established was in order to consolidate their own power and to produce funds through exports that would be used for personal gain. Instead, the NPFL was a violent insurgency that saw little need to please the civilians in exchange for support. Whilst some Liberians joined out of fear or in the pursuit of economic opportunities, others were forced into participating. The case of the NPFL, a non-secessionist insurgent group, supports my hypothesis. From my theoretical outline established in Section 3, I had no expectation that a group motivated by power and economic gains would implement a system of rebel governance.

### **7.2.2 The Independent National Patriotic Front of Liberia (INPFL)**

As a splinter group of the NPFL, the Independent National Patriotic Front of Liberia (INPFL), shared similar goals of overthrowing the Doe regime and seizing power (Johnston, 2008; Kieh, 2004). Organised and led by one of Taylor's confidantes, Prince Yeduo Johnson split from the NPFL claiming that Taylor would not make a good leader for Liberia (Boas, 2001). Unlike the other warlords involved in the first civil war, Johnson was less occupied with the acquisition of wealth. Instead, the INPFL consisted of a number of Taylor's lieutenants who had been angered by Taylor's penchant for selling Liberia's resources for personal gain (Kieh, 2004). Overthrowing the Doe regime and the acquisition of power were the INPFL's primary concerns, thus it is expected that as a non-secessionist regime they are less likely to produce a system of rebel governance.

It is clear in the violent way that the INPFL conducted their wartime practices that they saw little need to develop a system of rebel governance to win support or resources. Like the NPFL, the INPFL committed its fair share of atrocities against the civilian population (Kieh, 2004). In their bid to capture territory from the NPFL, particularly the capital city, Monrovia, the INPFL utilised strictly military techniques (Boas, 2001). The superior military capability of the INPFL allowed the insurgent group to control two-thirds of the country previously held by Taylor's NPFL (Duyvesteyn, 2005). The violent nature of the INPFL was exemplified in the capture, torture, and death of President Doe at the hands of INPFL insurgents in September 1990, and the wide circulation of the video of his death is a reminder of the INPFL's violence (Harris, 1999). The INPFL's goal was to dispose of the Doe regime, take territorial control, and seize power. There is no evidence that the INPFL pursued these goals through any means other than violence and military techniques. The case of the INPFL supports my hypothesis, as they were a non-secessionist insurgent group who did not pursue any system of rebel governance.

### **7.2.3 The United Liberation Movement of Liberia for Democracy (ULIMO)**

Whilst ULIMO quickly divided into militia factions (ULIMO-J and ULIMO-K) as a result of internal divisions, power struggles, and ethnic tensions, I will be discussing the groups in conjunction with each other. Current research shows that they had very similar approaches to governance and the shared aim of seizing power (Ellis, 1995; Kieh, 2009). Emerging in response to Doe's capture and killing, and consisting predominantly of the former officials of the Doe regime, both ULIMO-J and ULIMO-K wanted to prevent Taylor and the NPFL ascending to the presidency. Due to the non-secessionist goal of central-power seeking of ULIMO-K and ULIMO-J, I expect that they did not implement a system of rebel governance, instead relying on other means to pursue their goals. The evidence will be presented below.

Similar to the NPFL and INPFL, the two militias, ULIMO-J and ULIMO-K, used similar fighting techniques, relying heavily on military capabilities to conduct territorial raids in the search of bounty and resources (Ellis, 1995; Kieh, 2009). The International Crisis Group (2003b) reported that ULIMO-K, in particular, was particularly notorious for its use of violence, labelling the militia as responsible for some of the heaviest looting and committing some of the worst atrocities in the first Liberian civil war. Victims of ULIMO-K raids reported that a common tactic was to kidnap women and threaten to kill them unless their husbands paid ransom money (Ellis, 1995). As with the NPFL and INPFL, both ULIMO-J and ULIMO-K enjoyed military success in gaining important territories, particularly in the diamond-rich region of western Liberia (Harris, 1999). Additionally, reports show that ULIMO-J was able to take control of some of Liberia's strategically important ports, which was a useful source of revenue for the group (Ellis, 1995). ULIMO-J and ULIMO-K were supported by external actors, the former by Sierra Leone and the latter by Guinea, both of whom wanted to pressurise Taylor militarily and prevent his ascension to power (Jaye, 2003). Whilst evidence regarding ULIMO-J and ULIMO-K is not expansive, it is apparent that both insurgent groups joined the other warring factions in their use of violent military techniques in the pursuit of power-seeking goals. As expected, there is little evidence indicating that ULIMO-J and ULIMO-K implemented systems of rebel governance.

#### **7.2.4 The Liberia Peace Council (LPC)**

Under the leadership of former government minister, George Boley, the Liberia Peace Council was a product of the dissolution of the Doe regime following his murder (Boas, 2001). The LPC attempted to appeal to the youth of various ethnic groups through a campaign of "cut[ting] the Big Men down to size" (Reno, 1997). They utilized civilians distaste towards Taylor and the NPFL by appearing as the insurgent group who wanted to hinder Taylor's power-grabbing goals, however it is evident that the leaders wanted to regain the political power they had under the Doe regime and to enrich themselves (Kieh, 2004).

Like both ULIMO factions, the LPC was supported by external actors, in this case the Nigerian peacekeeping force, who saw him as a proxy to stem Taylor's power (Reno, 1997). As well as receiving external support, the LPC vied for control of Liberia's natural resources with the NPFL. One report from Liberia claimed that the insurgent group took control of the formerly American-run Liberia Agriculture Company rubber plantation and were using 6,000 LPC captives to work at the plantation, generating substantial export revenue (Reno, 1997). Furthermore, Adebajo (1996) reported that it was not uncommon for LPC militias to block aid convoys and seize the peacekeepers' weapons and supplies. In this respect, it is evident that the LPC did not need the financial support of the Liberian civilians. It is unsurprising, therefore, that there is little evidence that a system of rebel governance emerged in the LPC-held territories.

As with all of the aforementioned insurgent groups involved in Liberia's first civil war, the LPC were a brutal group who used violence to further their goals. The harassment and killing of civilians was rife among LPC fighters. A report by Human Rights Watch (1994a) outlined the systematic targeting of civilians, especially those who had lived in previously NPFL-held areas despite their affiliation. Survivors of LPC attacks reported being tortured, beaten, and branded (HRW, 1994a; Kieh, 2004). Furthermore, the brutality of LPC tactics has contributed to the displacement of thousands of women, children, and the elderly, with one report estimating that there were 40,000 civilians displaced in the city of Buchanan alone (HRW, 1994a). Able-bodied men were either arrested, forcibly recruited, or incarcerated (HRW, 1994a). The extreme violence perpetrated by the LPC underline that implementing a governance structure was not on their political agenda. Instead, violent military means and the systematic targeting of civilians was used to further their goals. This supports the theory established in Section 3, as the LPC were a non-secessionist insurgent group who did not require civilian support or recognition and legitimacy.

### 7.3 The Second Liberian Civil War

Civil conflict within Liberia reignited following a brief interlude from 1997 to 1999. After failing to win the first civil war militarily, Charles Taylor had come to assume power through a presidential election in 1997. The resurgence of conflict can be attributed to a number of factors. Firstly, the failure of the post-civil war transitional processes, such as the disarmament, demobilization, and rehabilitation of former combatants into society (Kieh, 2009). Insufficient logistical preparations hampered demobilization centers, there was no civic education, and many of the weapons collected were either in poor condition or unserviceable (Tanner, 1998). Furthermore, those who joined the demobilization exercises tended to be the weaker combatants, whilst the hardened more loyal insurgents avoided participating (Tanner, 1998). Additionally, due to the brutal nature of the first civil war, a number of insurgents required professional psychological services in order to prepare them for re-integration into wider society (Kieh, 2009). The lack of assistance in rehabilitating and re-integrating insurgents left many combatants unemployed and uneducated, leaving many of them susceptible to returning to combat in order to pursue economic opportunities (Kieh, 2009). There was little to no assistance in integrating former combatants back into society and no community-based reconciliation programs existed involving former combatants and non-combatants (Kieh, 2009). The second factor for the resurgence of civil conflict was the failure, or refusal, of Taylor's government to address the underlying causes of the first civil war (Kieh, 2009). The failure to tackle the chronic social and economic problems across Liberia meant that many were dissatisfied with Taylor's rule. The neglect of Liberia's lower classes contributed to continued repression, poverty, and discontent thrived (Kieh, 2009). The following section will address the two most prominent insurgent groups of the second Liberian civil war, Liberians United for Reconciliation and Democracy (LURD) and Movement for Democracy in Liberia (MODEL). Both LURD and MODEL were non-secessionist groups, motivated by overthrowing the Taylor regime and ascending to power. As has been the case with the insurgent groups in the first Liberian civil war, I expect to find

little evidence of rebel governance due to the prominence of violent military capabilities as a means to achieve their power-grabbing goals.

### **7.3.1 Liberians United for Reconciliation and Democracy (LURD)**

Similar to the first phase of civil war, the second phase of the Liberian civil war arose as a result of discontent towards the sitting president (Kieh, 2009). Rebels under the banner of Liberians United for Reconciliation and Democracy (LURD) emerged in 1999 with the catchphrase 'Taylor must go', with the motive of removing Taylor from not only the presidency, but the country (Kaihko, 2015). Comparable to the initial formation of the NPFL, LURD insurgents were bonded together by a shared resentment towards a common enemy (Kaihko, 2015). Whilst it is clear that LURD was a more cohesive, albeit decentralised, organisation with a better thought-out strategy than previous insurgent groups in Liberia, there was little agreement on what would follow after they had achieved their initial goal of deposing Taylor (International Crisis Group, 2003a; Johnston, 2008; Kaihko, 2015). Moreover, it is evident that LURD was more concerned with public perception and support (Kaihko, 2015). It remains, however, that there is little evidence that LURD occupied themselves with developing any system of governance.

LURD was a descendent from the defunct ULIMO-K, who, as previously mentioned, had an appalling human rights record in western Liberia (International Crisis Group, 2003b). Because of this, LURD had to overcome a level of distrust among the Liberian population. Initially, LURD went to lengths to avoid human rights abuses and the indiscriminate targeting of civilians (International Crisis Group, 2002). Throughout the duration of the war, however, LURD increasingly resorted to violent means to in pursuit of their power-grabbing goal. A report by the International Crisis Group (2002) detailed one example where LURD rebels attacked a refugee camp and took hostage five nurses working with Merci, a Liberian humanitarian organisation. Additionally, whilst advancing in to

Monrovia in an attempt to capture the strategically important presidential Executive Mansion, there were reports of LURD bombing non-combatants (ICG, 2003b; Kaihko, 2015).

Whilst reports suggest that LURD was considerably less violent in its interaction with civilians compared to its predecessors in the first Liberian civil war, there is little evidence that LURD attempted to implement a system of rebel governance. They had a more thought-out strategy than the insurgent groups in the first civil war, however this strategy appeared to go no further than disposing of Taylor and seizing power (International Crisis Group, 2003a; Keihko, 2015).

### **7.3.2 Movement for Democracy in Liberia (MODEL)**

The Movement for Democracy in Liberia (MODEL) was the smallest of the major warring factions in the second Liberian civil war. Whilst LURD descended from ULIMO-K, MODEL emerged as a descendent of the ULIMO-J militia (International Crisis Group, 2003b). As has been the case throughout this case study, MODEL was a central power-seeking insurgent group, motivated by overthrowing the Taylor regime and ascending to power (Kieh, 2009). As prior insurgent groups in the Liberian case study have shown, I expect that MODEL did not implement a system of rebel governance in the areas under their control.

MODEL's success in rapidly taking control of much of southeastern Liberia was accredited to the major support from the Côte d'Ivoire, whose president, Laurent Gbagbo, wanted to see Taylor removed from power (International Crisis Group, 2003b; Kieh, 2004). A report by the International Crisis Group (2003b) detailed the support, outlining that MODEL insurgents were heavily supplied by Ivorian uniform, weaponry, and funding. Recruitment was also driven from the Côte d'Ivoire, where a number of displaced Liberian refugees had settled following the violence of the first civil war (Human Rights Watch 2005). The external Ivorian support and recruitment from the large number of

displaced refugees indicated that MODEL had no need to implement a governance system to gather resources, recruitment, and support.

#### **7.4 Concluding Comments on Liberia's Civil Wars**

The insurgent groups involved in both the first and second civil wars in Liberia were similar in a number of respects, including their motivations, how they conducted their wartime practices, and their disregard for a system of rebel governance. The readily available commercial and economic possibilities on offer, through control of Liberia's abundant natural resources, fuelled conflict and contributed to the proliferation of warring parties (Harris, 1999). All six of the insurgent groups discussed in the Liberian case study support my hypothesis that non-secessionist insurgent groups are less likely to implement rebel governance than secessionist groups. Instead, the insurgent groups chose to focus their resources on their military objectives in the pursuit of power and economic personal gain. This is evident through the violent military techniques adopted by the rebel groups, as well as the reported indiscriminate violence towards the Liberian population.



## 8 Discussion of the Case Studies

As has been shown by this paper and previous scholarship rebel governance takes place in a myriad of ways (Huang, 2016). The analysis in this paper has provided an insight into how some insurgent and rebel groups engage with civilians, and how insurgent groups act during civil wars. I hypothesized that secessionist insurgent groups have more incentive to provide rebel governance in their bid to win the hearts and minds of the civilians, gain widespread united support for their cause, and to gain recognition and legitimacy as a sovereign authority. Overall, the three case studies of Ethiopia, Somalia, and Liberia offer support and contradictions for this hypothesis.

Table 4. Frequency of expected and evident rebel governance

	Frequency	Expected rebel governance	Evidence of rebel governance	% with rebel governance
Secessionist	3	3	2	67
Non-secessionist	11	0	3	27

When looking at Table 4, it is evident that variation in rebel governance exists, and insurgent groups do not tend to follow a single theory put forward by political scientists. Whilst it is evident that there was a skewed number of non-secessionist insurgent groups discussed, the evidence provided in Table 4 demonstrates that the case of the secessionist insurgent groups supported the hypothesis at a much higher rate than the non-secessionist insurgent groups. Two-thirds (67%) of the secessionist insurgent groups discussed supported the hypothesis that secessionist insurgent groups are more likely to implement rebel governance than non-secessionist insurgent groups. This is compared to the 27% of non-secessionist insurgent groups that provided evidence of rebel governance, therefore the secessionist insurgent groups discussed in the three cases provided

evidence of rebel governance at a rate of three-times more than the non-secessionist insurgent groups.

The case of Liberia, for example, presents six non-secessionist insurgent groups all of whom did not implement any evident system of rebel governance, offering support for the hypothesis. Liberia's first and second civil wars were fought with the primary motive of seizing power and taking control of Liberia's natural resources. The fact that the Liberian insurgent groups did not implement any systems of governance and interacted with civilians on a primarily violent basis lends support to the hypothesis. The cases of Ethiopia and Somalia are much more complex. In some instances, for example the SNC in Somalia and the EPLF and the EPRP in Eritrea and Ethiopia respectively, the insurgent groups acted as hypothesised. The non-secessionist insurgent groups did not implement rebel governance, as they did not need to gain recognition and legitimacy, nor were they concerned with winning the hearts and minds of the civilians or offering a unified cause for non-combatants to mobilise around.

Two of the secessionist groups discussed, the Somali National Movement (SNM) and the Eritrean People's Liberation Front (EPLF), fulfilled the hypothesis. Both implemented structures of rebel governance with the goal of seceding from the state and becoming independent entities. Furthermore, many non-secessionist groups fit the hypothesis as they did not implement rebel governance. This includes the Ethiopian People's Revolutionary Party (EPRP), the Somali National Congress (SNC), and the six insurgent groups discussed in the Liberia case study. The case of the Eritrean Liberation Front (ELF), a secessionist insurgent group, also contradicts my hypothesis. I subsequently hypothesise that this is due to their preoccupation with infighting and their subsequent conflict with EPLF, a splinter group of the ELF. The cases of the Islamic Courts Union (ICU), al-Shabaab and the Tigray People's Liberation Front (TPLF), however, provide evidence that

contradict the hypothesis. These are instances of non-secessionist insurgent groups implementing widespread systems of rebel governance.

Overall, it appears there was not a coherent trend in the data across the countries discussed. Whilst some of the insurgent groups in Ethiopia, Somalia, and Liberia supported the hypothesis, the anomalies of the ICU, al-Shabaab and the TPLF provide contradictory evidence. This indicates that there may be other elements that interact with the insurgent groups' motivation to determine where a rebel group implements a system of governance.

## 9 Conclusion

This paper has presented an assortment of evidence through political and historical analysis of three case studies, which both supports and contradicts of the hypothesis that secessionist insurgent groups are more likely to implement rebel governance than non-secessionist insurgent groups. I argue that secessionist insurgent groups were more likely to implement rebel governance for three factors: first, secessionist insurgent groups are more likely to implement rebel governance structures as an incentive to win the 'hearts and minds' of the local populace than non-secessionist insurgent groups (Stubbs, 1989; Grynkewich, 2008). Second, secessionist insurgent groups, which are often ethnic in nature, are more often fighting for a unified cause than non-secessionist insurgent groups. In order to convince civilians to mobilise around their agenda, a system of rebel governance is utilised (Montalvo and Reynal-Querol, 2005). Third, secessionist groups are looking to secede from the existing state to create a new independent state, therefore they need to gain recognition and legitimacy as a sovereign territorial unit (Kimeny, Mbaku, and Moyo, 2010). One way that secessionist insurgent groups show that they are capable of ruling and gain legitimacy from both domestic and international actors is to implement governance structures that mirror those of a sovereign state. The cases of Ethiopia, Somalia, and Liberia provide an array of evidence, both in support and in contradiction of this theory.

The cases of the EPLF in the Ethiopian civil war and the SNM in the Somali civil war provide evidence in support of the hypothesis. In both instances, the two insurgent groups had secessionist motivations. There is an abundance of evidence to suggest both insurgent groups implemented vast systems of rebel governance, including education systems and the implementation of health care infrastructures. Additionally, there is evidence that the political and social rights of the civilians in their respective territories were advanced under both insurgent groups. The EPLF in Eritrea and the SNM in Somaliland managed to win widespread support from the local populations as they won the 'hearts and minds' of the civilians by providing them with governance systems that worked to

advance daily life within their established territories. Additionally, the EPLF and the SNM were fighting for a unified cause, which, in both instances, was the establishment of the independent territories of Eritrea and Somaliland respectively. Both the EPLF and the SNM had the goal of creating independent states, thus they had the aim of gaining legitimacy and recognition from both domestic and international actors. In order to do so, the two insurgent groups implemented governance structures in their respective territories with the aim of mimicking the actions of a nation state. The EPLF and the SNM, therefore, support the theoretical framework and hypothesis established in Section 3.

Utilising secondary sources, including fieldwork in the conflict zones and interviews from combatants and non-combatants, this thesis has used an abundance of sources to broaden current understanding of variations in rebel governance. By bringing together these previously separate sources, this thesis has provided new insights into how rebels act within civil wars and how rebels and civilians interact. By analysing the three civil war case studies, I found that insurgent groups do not necessarily follow the expected trends for insurgent-civilian interactions. Throughout the research, it became clear that how rebels act in civil wars and how they interact with civilians does not necessarily follow a set pattern. The case studies of Ethiopia, Somalia, and Liberia are indicative of how complex insurgent groups' actions and their interactions with civilians can be. By looking at Table 4, however, it is evident that the case studies are bias in favour of non-secessionist insurgent groups. This occurred due to the process of randomization used for case selection. The lack of variation in the types of insurgent groups may have impacted my findings. A more even selection of secessionist and non-secessionist insurgent groups may have furthered my theory, by providing more evidence in support of the secessionist hypothesis (H1).

The research suggested that whilst some secessionist insurgent groups do implement systems of rebel governance, a number of non-secessionist insurgent groups did the same. The cases

of the ICU and al-Shabaab in Somalia and the TPLF in Ethiopia, for example, contradict the theory that secessionist insurgent groups are more likely to implement systems of rebel governance than non-secessionist insurgent groups. Future research into rebel governance needs to focus on insurgent groups who present as anomalies to the prevailing theories. The case of al-Shabaab, for example, raises questions about radical Islamist groups. Future research should assess whether the goal of implementing an Islamic state contributes to Islamic insurgent groups mirroring the actions of secessionist insurgents. The motivation of creating a new state by replacing the existing state structures, rather than seceding certain territory, may influence how insurgent groups act and contribute to them exhibiting similar characteristics to secessionist insurgent groups. Additionally, the case of the TPLF presents an anomaly to the theory that secessionist groups are more likely to implement rebel governance than non-secessionist groups. The TPLF, a group motivated by overthrowing the existing regime, effected a wide system of governance, including the provision of healthcare and education. The concentration of the TPLF's governance structures in the ethnically homogeneous region of Tigray in northern Ethiopia indicates that the ethnic cohesion of the TPLF may have influenced the actions of the insurgent group. Future research should consider ethnic homogeneity and heterogeneity as an indicator of the likelihood of rebel governance. In the case of the ELF, a secessionist group that did not implement rebel governance, their preoccupation with infighting and internal divisions may have been a hindrance in the pursuit of their secessionist objective. Future research should consider how the cohesiveness of an insurgent group affects the likelihood of rebel governance, regardless of the objective of the insurgent group. The evidence shows that rebel groups do not act in one coherent manner and are motivated to implement rebel governance for an array of factors. Ultimately, rebel governance in civil wars is an increasingly important facet of war-making and it requires a lot more attention.

This thesis sought to move beyond existing explanations of variations in rebel governance. It contributed to the growing literature concerning rebel governance, by providing in-depth case

analyses of three civil wars, Ethiopia, Somalia, and Liberia. Whilst literature on rebel governance was relatively sparse, the research presented here presents some contradictions. This thesis has contributed to an emerging literature on rebel governance. The research presented here offers a theoretical basis as to why secessionist insurgent groups are more likely to implement rebel governance than non-secessionist insurgent groups. Whilst the research presented some anomalies, it is a valid starting point from which to continue a flourishing facet of rebel groups and civil wars.

## 10 Bibliography

- Abdullah, Ibrahim. 1998. "Bush Path to Destruction: The Origin and Character of the Revolutionary United Front/Sierra Leone." *Journal of Modern African Studies*: 36(2) 203-235.
- Abdullahi, Abdurahman M. 2014. "Conceptions of Transitional Justice in Somalia: Findings of Field Research in Mogadishu." *Northeast African Studies*: 14(2) 7-44.
- Adam, Hussein M. 1994. "Recognition of New States: Somaliland in Contrast to Eritrea." *Review of African Political Economy*: 21(59) 21-38.
- Adam, Hussein M. 1995. "Islam and Politics in Somalia." *Journal of Islamic Studies*: 6(2) 189-221.
- Adebajo, Adekeye. 1996. "Rich Man's War, Poor Man's War." *The World Today*: 52(8/9) 222-225.
- Agazi, Tekeste. 1983. "Agrarian Reform in Tigray: A Case of the Land Reform in the District of Adi-Nebried." Occasional Papers on Tigray No.1. London: Friends of the Tigray in the UK.
- Ahmad, Aisha. 2009. "Taliban and the Islamic Courts Union: How They Changed the Game in Afghanistan and Somalia?" *Policy Perspectives*: 6(2) 55-72.
- Ahmed, Hussein. 2007. "Reflections on Historical and Contemporary Islam in Ethiopia and Somalia: A Comparative and Contrastive Overview." *Journal of Ethiopian Studies*: 40(1/2) 261-276.
- Akcinaroglu, Seden. 2012. "Rebel Interdependencies and Civil War Outcomes." *Journal of Conflict Resolution*: 56(5) 879-903.
- Alvarado, Steven Elias, and Douglas S. Massey. 2010. "In Search of Peace: Structural Adjustment, Violence, and International Migration." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*: 630, 137-161.
- Anderson, David M. and Jacob McKnight. 2014. "Kenya at War: al-Shabaab and its Enemies in Eastern Africa." *African Affairs*: 114(454) 1-27.
- Anderson, David M. and Jacob McKnight. 2015. "Understanding al-Shabaab: clan, Islam and insurgency in Kenya." *Journal of Eastern African Studies*: 9(3) 536-557.
- Anonymous. 1975. "A Revolutionary Working Class Party Declared in Ethiopia." *Review of African Political Economy*: 4, 99-100.



- Anonymous. 2002. "Government recognition in Somalia and regional political stability in the Horn of Africa." *Journal of Modern African Studies*: 40(2) 247-272.
- Anonymous. 'Somali woman stoned for adultery'. BBC News online. 18 November 2009. [<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/africa/8366197.stm> – accessed 9 March 2018].
- Anyanwu, John C. 2014. "Oil Wealth, Ethno-Religious-Linguistic Fractionalization and Civil Wars in Africa: Cross-Country Evidence." *African Development Review*: 26(2) 209-236.
- Arjona, Ana. 2009. "Social Orders in Warring Times: Armed Groups' Strategies and Civilian Agency in Civil War." Paper presented at "Mobilisation for Political Violence: What Do We Know?" workshop: Oxford, UK.
- Arjona, Ana. 2016. *Rebelocracy: Social Order in the Colombian Civil War*. Cambridge University Press.
- Barnes, Cedric, and Harun Hassan. 2007. "The Rise and Fall of Mogadishu's Islamic Courts." *Journal of Eastern African Studies*: 1(2) 151-160.
- Beckett, Ian F.W. 2001. *Modern Insurgencies and Counter-Insurgencies: Guerrillas and their Opponents since 1750*. London: Routledge.
- Berman, Eli, and David D. Laitin. 2008. "Religion, Terrorism, and Public Goods: Testing the Club Model." *Journal of Public Economics*: 92(10) 1942-1967.
- Berman, Eli, Jacob N. Shapiro, and Joseph H. Felter. 2011. "Can Hearts and Minds Be Bought? The Economics of Counterinsurgency in Iraq." *Journal of Political Economy*: 119(4) 766-819.
- Blimes, Randall J. 2006. "The Indirect Effect of Ethnic Heterogeneity on the Likelihood of Civil War Onset." *Journal of Conflict Resolution*: 50(4) 536-547.
- Bloom, Mia M. 2004. "Palestinian Suicide Bombing: Public Support, Market Share, and Outbidding." *Political Science Quarterly*: 119(1) 61-88.
- Boas, Morten. 2009. "Making Plans for Liberia – a Trusteeship Approach to Good Governance?" *Third World Quarterly*: 30(7) 1329-1341.
- Boas, Morten. 2011. "Liberia and Sierra Leone: Dead Ringers? The Logic of Neopatrimonial Rule." *Third World Quarterly*: 22(5) 697-723.

- Bradbury, Mark, Adan Yusuf Abokor, and Haroon Ahmed Yusuf. 2003. "Somaliland: Choosing Politics over Violence." *Review of African Political Economy*: 30(97) 455-478.
- Bruton, Bronwyn E. 2010. "Somalia: A New Approach" *Council on Foreign Relations Special Report No. 52*.
- Bryden, Matt. 1999. "New hope for Somalia? The building block approach." *Review of African Political Economy*: 26(79) 134-140.
- Bryden, Matt. 2014. "The Reinvention of al-Shabaab: A Strategy of Choice or Necessity?" Report for the *CSIS Africa Program*.
- Bueno de Mesquita, Ethan. 2010. "Regime Change and Revolutionary Entrepreneurs." *American Political Science Review*: 104(3) 446-466.
- Buhaug, Halvard. 2006. "Relative Capability and Rebel Objective in Civil War." *Journal of Peace Research*: 43(6) 691- 708.
- Cain, Kenneth L. 1999. "The Rape of Dinah: Human Rights, Civil War in Liberia, and Evil Triumphant." *Human Rights Quarterly*: 21(2) 265-307.
- Caplin, Jessica. 2009. "Failing the State: Recognizing Somaliland." *Harvard International Review*: 31(1) 9-10.
- Chenoweth, Erica. 2010. "Democratic Competition and Terrorist Activity." *Journal of Politics*: 72(1) 16-30.
- Clark, Jeffrey. 1992/93. "Debacle in Somalia." *Foreign Affairs*: 72(1) 109-123.
- Clayton, Govinda. 2013. "Relative Rebel Strength and the Onset and Outcome of Civil War Mediation." *Journal of Peace Research*: 50(5) 609-622.
- Cliffe, Lionel and Robin Luckham. 1999. "Complex Political Emergencies and the State: Failure and the Fate of the State." *Third World Quarterly*: 20(1) 27-50.
- Collier, Paul, and Anke Hoeffler. 1998. "On Economic Causes of Civil War". *Oxford Economic Papers*: 50(4) 563-573.

- Collier, Paul, and Anke Hoeffler. 2004. "Greed and Grievance in Civil War." *Oxford Economic Papers*: 56(4) 563-695.
- Collier, Paul, Anke Hoeffler, and Dominic Rohner. 2009. "Beyond Greed and Grievance: Feasibility and Civil War." *Oxford Economic Papers*: 61(1) 1-27.
- Connell, Dan. 2001. "Inside the EPLF: The Origins of the 'People's Party' and Its Role in the Liberation of Eritrea." *Review of African Political Economy*: 28(89) 345-364.
- Council on Foreign Relations. 2018. "Al-Shabab in Somalia." Online. found at: <https://www.cfr.org/interactives/global-conflict-tracker#!/conflict/al-shabab-in-somalia> [accessed on 26 February 2018].
- Cunningham, David, Kristian Skrede Gleditsch, and Idean Salehyan. 2009. "It Takes Two: A Dyadic Analysis of Civil War Duration and Outcome." *Journal of Conflict Resolution*: 53(4) 570-597.
- Desta, Yemane. 2009. "Does the EPLF (Eritrean People's Liberation Front) qualify to be a learning organization? A modern systems theory perspective." *Journal of Organisational Transformation and Social Change*: 6(1) 5-28.
- Dorman, Sarah (2003), 'Eritrea's Nation and State-Building: Reassessing the Impact of the Struggle', Working Paper 105, Presented at the Conference on Globalization and Self-determination, London, 4 April 2003.
- Duyvesteyn, Isabelle. 2005. *Clausewitz and African War: Politics and strategy in Liberia and Somalia*. Taylor & Francis.
- Elbadawi, Ibrahim, and Nicholas Sambanis. 2000. "Why Are There So Many Civil Wars in Africa? Understanding and Preventing Violent Conflict." *Journal of African Economies*: 9(3) 244-269.
- Ellis, Stephen. 1995. "Liberia 1989-1994: A Study of Ethnic and Spiritual Violence." *African Affairs*: 94(375) 165-197.
- Engel, Stefanie, and Ana Maria Ibáñez. 2007. "Displacement Due to Violence in Colombia: A Household-Level Analysis." *Economic Development and Cultural Change*: 55, 335-365.
- Englehart, Neil A. 2007. "Governments Against States: The Logic of Self-Destructive Despotism." *International Political Science Review*: 38(2) 133-153.

- Fazal, Tanisha M. 2014. "Secessionism and Civilian Targeting." Doctoral dissertation, University of Notre Dame.
- Fearon, James D. 2004. "Why Do Some Civil Wars Last so Much Longer Than Others?" *Journal of Peace Research*: 41(3) 275-301.
- Fearon, James D. and David D. Laitin. 2003. "Ethnicity, Insurgency, and Civil War." *American Political Science Review*: 97(1) 75-90.
- Fjelde, Hanne. 2009. "Buying Peace? Oil Wealth, Corruption and Civil War, 1985-99." *Journal of Peace Research*: 46(2) 199-218.
- Förster, Till. 2015. "Dialogue Direct: Rebel Governance and Civil Order in Northern Côte d'Ivoire." In Ana Arjona, Nelson Kasfir, and Zacharian Mampilly eds. *Rebel Governance in Civil War*. Cambridge University Press.
- Fortna, Virginia Page. 2013. "Efficacy and Legitimacy Costs: Toward a Theory of Rebel Groups' Use of Terrorism in Civil Wars." Presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Studies Association, San Francisco, CA.
- Gilkes, Patrick. 1995. "The Battle of Af Abet and Eritrean Independence." *Northeast African Studies*: 2(3) 39-51.
- Grynkewich, Alexis G. 2008. "Welfare as Warfare: How Violent Non-State Groups Use Social Services to Attack the State." *Studies in Conflict and Terrorism*: 31(4) 350-370.
- Guevara, Ernesto. 1969. *Guerilla Warfare*. New York, NY: Vintage Books.
- Hansen, Stig Jarle and Mark Bradbury. 2007. "Somaliland: A New Democracy in the Horn of Africa?" *Review of African Political Economy*: 34(113).
- Hansen, Stig Jarle. 2008. "Private Security & Local Politics in Somalia." *Review of African Political Economy*: 35(118) 585-598.
- Hansen, Stig Jarle. 2013. *Al-Shabaab in Somalia: The History and Ideology of a Militant Islamist Group*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

- Harff, Barbara, and Ted R. Gurr. 1988. "Toward an Empirical Theory of Genocides and Politicides: Identification and Measurement of Cases Since 1945." *International Studies Quarterly*: 32 357-371.
- Harnisch, Christopher. 2010. "The Terror Threat from Somalia: The Internationalization of Al Shabaab." A Report by the Critical Threats Project of the American Enterprise Institute.
- Harris, David. 1999. "From 'Warlord' to 'Democratic' President: How Charles Taylor Won the 1997 Liberian Elections." *Journal of Modern African Studies*: 37(3) 431-455.
- Hart, Jason. 2006. "The Politics of "Child Soldiers"." *Brown Journal of World Affairs*: 13(1) 217-226.
- Hedru, Debessay. 2003. "Eritrea: Transition to Dictatorship, 1991-2003." *Review of African Political Economy*: 30(97) 435-444.
- Hegre, Havard. 2004. "The Duration and Termination of Civil War." *Journal of Peace Research*: 41(3) 243-252.
- Hegre, Havard, Gudrun Ostby, and Clionadh Raleigh. 2009. "Poverty and Civil War Events: A Disaggregated Study of Liberia." *Journal of Conflict Resolution*: 53(4) 598-623.
- Hoehne, Markus. 2006. "Political Identity, Emerging State Structures and Conflict in Northern Somalia." *The Journal of Modern African Studies*: 44(3) 397-414.
- Hoehne, Markus. 2009. "Mimesis and Mimicry in Dynamics of State and Identity Formation in Northern Somalia." *Africa: Journal of the International African Institute*. 79(2) 252-281.
- Holtermann, Helge. 2016. "Relative Capacity and the Spread of Rebellion: Insights from Nepal." *Journal of Conflict Resolution*: 60(3) 501-529.
- Horowitz, Donald. 1985. *Ethnic Groups in Conflict*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Huang, Reyko. 2016. *The Wartimes Origins of Democratization: Civil War, Rebel Governance, and Political Regimes*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Human Rights Watch. 1991. "Evil Days: 30 Years of War and Famine in Ethiopia." An Africa Watch Report.
- Human Rights Watch. 1994a. "Human Rights Abuses by the Liberian Peace Council." HRW Report: 6(3).

Human Rights Watch. 1994b. "Easy Prey: Child Soldiers in Liberia." HRW Report.

Human Rights Watch. 2002. "Liberian Refugees in Guinea: Refoulement, Militarization of Camps, and Other Protection Concerns." HRW Report: 14(8).

Human Rights Watch. 2005. "Youth, Poverty, and Blood: The Lethal Legacy of West Africa's Regional Warriors." HRW Report: 17(5).

Human Rights Watch. 2012. "No Place for Children: Child Recruitment, Forced Marriage, and Attacks on Schools in Somalia." HRW Report.

Humphreys, Macartan, and Jeremy Weinstein. 2006. "Handling and Manhandling Civilians in Civil War." *American Political Science Review*: 100(3) 429-447.

Humphreys, Macartan, and Jeremy Weinstein. 2008. "Who Fights? The Determinants of Participation in Civil War." *American Journal of Political Science*: 52(2) 436-455.

Ibáñez, Ana Maria, and Carlos Eduardo Vélez. 2008. "Civil Conflict and Forced Migration: The Determinants and Welfare Losses of Displacement in Colombia." *World Development*: 36, 659-676.

Ingiriis, Mohamed Haji. 2012. "The Making of the 1990 Manifesto: Somalia's Last Chance for State Survival." *Northeast African Studies*: 12(2) 63-94.

International Crisis Group. 2002. "Liberia: Unravelling." Africa Briefing Paper No.10.

International Crisis Group. 2003a. "Tackling Liberia: The Eye of the Regional Storm." Africa Report No. 62.

International Crisis Group. 2003b. "Liberia: Security Challenges." Africa Report No. 71.

International Crisis Group. 2006. "Can the Somali Crisis Be Contained?" *Review of African Political Economy*: 33(110) 752-758.

Jackson, Ashley and Abdi Aynte. 2013. "Al-Shabaab engagement with aid agencies." *Humanitarian Policy Group*: 53.

- Jaye, Thomas. 2003. "Liberia: An Analysis of Post-Taylor Politics." *Review of African Political Economy*: 30(98) 643-686.
- Johnson, Martha C. and Meg Smaker. 2014. "State Building in De Facto States: Somaliland and Puntland Compared." *Africa Today*: 60(4) 3-23.
- Johnston, Patrick. 2004. "Timber Boom, State Busts: The political economy of Liberian timber." *Review of African Political Economy*: 31(101) 441-456.
- Johnston, Patrick. 2008. "The Geography of Insurgent Organization and its Consequences for Civil Wars: Evidence from Liberia and Sierra Leone." *Security Studies*: 17(1) 107-137.
- Jones, Seth G. 2014. *A Persistent Threat: The Evolution of al Qa'ida and Other Salafi Jihadists*. RAND Corporation.
- Kahler, Miles, and David A. Lake. 2004. "Governance in a Global Economy: Political Authority in Transition." *PS: Political Science and Politics*: 37(3) 409-414.
- Kaihko, Illmari. 2015. "'Taylor must go' – the strategy of the Liberians United for Reconciliation and Democracy." *Small Wars & Insurgencies*: 26(2) 248-270.
- Kalyvas, Stathis N. 2006. *The Logic of Violence in Civil War*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Kalyvas, Stathis N., and Matthew A. Kocher. 2007. "How "Free" is Free Riding in Civil Wars? Violence, Insurgency, and the Collective Action Problem." *World Politics*: 59(2) 177-216.
- Kaptein, Lidwien. 2012. *Clan Cleansing in Somalia, the Ruinous Legacy of 1991*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Kasfir, Nelson. 2004. "The Creation of Civil Administration by Guerrillas: The National Resistance Army and the Rwenzururu Kingdom Government in Uganda." Paper presented at the 2004 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Chicago, September 3<sup>rd</sup>.
- Kasfir, Nelson. 2005. "Guerrillas and Civilian Participation: The National Resistance Army in Uganda." *Journal of Modern African Studies*: 43(2) 271-296.

- Kasfir, Nelson. 2015. "Rebel Governance – Constructing a Field of Inquiry: Definitions, Scope, Patterns, Order, Causes." In *Rebel Governance in Civil War*, edited by Ana Arjona, Nelson Kasfir, and Zachariah Mampilly. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Keller, Edmond J. 1992. "Drought, War, and the Politics of Famine in Ethiopia and Eritrea." *Journal of Modern African Studies*: 30(4) 609-624.
- Keller, Nora. 2013. *Mobilizing Through Terror: The Problematic Relationship Between Terrorism and Ethnicity in Conflict Situations*. Columbia University.
- Kieh Jr, George Klay. 2004. "Irregular Warfare and Liberia's First Civil War." *Journal of international and Area Studies*: 11(1) 57-77.
- Kieh Jr, George Klay. 2009. "The Roots of the Second Liberian Civil War." *International Journal on World Peace*: 26(1) 7-30.
- Kimenyi, Mwangi S., John Mukum Mbaku, and Nelipher Moyo. 2010. "Reconstituting Africa's Failed States: The Case of Somalia." *Social Research*: 77(4) 1339-1366.
- Kisangi, Emizet F. 2003. "Conflict in the Democratic Republic of Congo: A Mosaic of Insurgent Groups." *International Journal on World Peace*: 20(3) 51-80.
- Lacina, Bethany, and Nils Petter Gledistch. 2005. "Monitoring Trends in Global Combat: A New Dataset of Battle Deaths." *European Journal of Population*: 21, 145-166.
- Lewis, I.M. 2004. "Visible and Invisible Differences: The Somali Paradox." *Africa: Journal of the International African Institute*: 74(4) 489-515.
- Lidow, Nicholai Hart. 2016. *Violent Order: Understanding Rebel Governance through Liberia's Civil War*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Little, Peter D. 2012. "On the Somalia Dilemma: Adding Layers of Complexity to an Already Complex Emergency." *African Studies Review*: 55(1) 191-195.
- Longman, Timothy. 2002. "The Complex Reasons for Rwanda's Engagement in Congo." In Clark, John ed. *The African Stakes of the Congo War*. New York, NY: Palgrave.
- Mampilly, Zachariah Cherian. 2011. *Rebel Rulers: Insurgent Governance and Civilian Life During War*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.



- Mampilly, Zachariah Cherian. 2015. "Performing in the Nation-State: Rebel Governance and Symbolic Processes." In *Rebel Governance in Civil War*. Edited by Ana Arjona, Nelson Kasfir, and Zachariah Mampilly. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Masters, Jonathan, and Mohammed Aly Sergie. "Al-Shabaab." CFR Backgrounders, Council on Foreign Relations, 13 March 2015 [<https://www.cfr.org/backgrounder/al-shabab> – accessed 1 March 2018]
- Matsuoka, Atsuko and Sorenson, John (1998) "After Independence: Prospects for Women in Eritrea" Eritrean Relief Association of Canada: Toronto, Canada.
- McAuliffe, Padraig. 2014. "The Prospects for Transitional Justice in Catalyzing Socioeconomic Justice in Postconflict States: A Critical Assessment in Light of Somalia's Transition." *Northeast African Studies*: 14(2) 77-110.
- McDonough, David S. 2008. "From Guerrilla to Government: Post-Conflict Stability in Liberia, Uganda and Rwanda." *Third World Quarterly*: 29(2) 357-374.
- McGovern, Mike. 2005. "Rebuilding a Failed State: Liberia." *Development in Practice*: 15(6) 760-766.
- McGregor, Andrew. 2014. "Are Corruption and Tribalism Dooming Somalia's War on al-Shabaab Extremists?" *Terrorism Monitor*: 12(4).
- Mekonnen, Daniel R. 2013. "Contested Versions of Collective Memory in Postindependence Eritrea." *African Conflict and Peacebuilding Review*: 3(2) 151-170.
- Menkhaus, Kenneth. 2002. "Political Islam in Somalia." *Middle East Policy*: 9(1) 109-123.
- Menkhaus, Kenneth. 2005. "Somalia and Somaliland: Terrorism, Political Islam, and State Collapse." In Rotberg, Robert ed. *Battling Terrorism in the Horn of Africa*. Washington D.C.: The Brookings Institute.
- Menkhaus, Kenneth. 2006/2007. "Governance without Government in Somalia: Spoilers, State Building, and the Politics of Coping." *International Security*: 31(3) 74-106.
- Menkhaus, Kenneth. 2008. "Somalia: Governance vs. Statebuilding." in Charles T. Call and Vanessa Wyeth eds. *Building States to Build Peace*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Menkhaus, Kenneth. 2009. "Somalia: 'They Created a Desert and Called it Peace(Building)'." *Review of African Political Economy*: 36(120) 223-233.

- Menkhaus, Kenneth. 2014. "State Failure, State-Building, and Prospects for a "Functional Failed State" in Somalia." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences*: 656-154-172.
- Metelits, Claire. 2009. "The Consequences of Rivalry: Explaining Insurgent Violence Using Fuzzy Sets." *Political Research Quarterly*: 62(4) 673-684.
- Mkandawire, Thandika. 2002. "The Terrible Toll of Post-Colonial 'Rebel Movements' in Africa: Towards an Explanation of the Violence against the Peasantry." *Journal of Modern African Studies*: 40(2) 181-215.
- Mohamed, Mohamed. "Somali journalist: 'I saw my boss shot dead'." BBC News online. 19 June 2009. [<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/africa/8103703.stm> – accessed on 9 March 2018].
- Montalvo, José G. and Marta Reynal-Querol. 2005. "Ethnic Polarization, Potential Conflict, and Civil Wars." *The American Economic Review*: 95(3) 796-816.
- Moran, Mary H. and M. Anne Pitcher. 2004. "The 'Basket Case' and the 'Poster Child': Explaining the End of Civil Conflicts in Liberia and Mozambique." *Third World Quarterly*: 25(3) 501-519.
- Mukherjee, Bumba. 2006. "Why Political Power-Sharing Agreements Lead to Enduring Peaceful Resolution of Some Civil Wars, and Not Others?" *International Studies Quarterly*: 50(2) 479-504.
- Muller, Jerry Z. "Us and Them: The Enduring Power of Ethnic Nationalism." *Foreign Affairs*: 87(2) 8-35.
- Murphy, William P. 2003. "Military Patrimonialism and Child Soldier Clientalism in the Liberian and Sierra Leonean Civil Wars." *African Studies Review*: 46(2) 61-87.
- Nega, Berhanu. 2010. "No Shortcut to Stability: Democratic Accountability and Sustainable Development in Ethiopia." *Social Research*: 77(4) 1401-1446.
- Nemeth, Stephen. 2013. "The Effect of Competition on Terrorist Group Operations." *Journal of Conflict Resolution*: 58(2) 336-362.
- Olson, Mancur. 1993. "Dictatorship, Democracy, and Development." *American Political Science Review*: 87(3) 567-576.

- O'Neill, Bard E. 2005. *Insurgency & Terrorism: From Revolution to Apocalypse (Second Edition)*. Washington D.C.: Potomac Books.
- Parkinson, Sarah Elizabeth. 2013. "Organizing Rebellion: Rethinking High-Risk Mobilization and Social Networks in War." *American Political Science Review*: 107(3) 418-432.
- Pateman, Roy. 1990. "Liberte, Egalite, Fratenite: Aspects of the Eritrean Revolution." *Journal of Modern African Studies*: 28(3) 457-472.
- Paul, Christopher, Colin P. Clarke, and Chad C. Serena. 2014. *Mexico is not Colombia: Alternative Historical Analogies for Responding to the Challenge of Violent Drug-Trafficking Organizations, Supporting Case Studies.*. RAND Corporation.
- Peclard, Didier, and Delphine Mechoulan. 2015. "Rebel Governance and the Politics of Civil War." Working Paper 1: Swisspeace.
- Pellegrini, Lorenzo and Reyer Garlagh. 2008. "Causes of corruption: a survey of cross-country analyses and extended results." *Economics of Governance*: 9(3) 245-263.
- Pool, David. 1980. "Revolutionary Crisis and Revolutionary Vanguard: The Emergence of the Eritrean People's Liberation Front." *Review of African Political Economy*: 7(19) 33-47.
- Pool, David. 1993. "Eritrean Independence: The Legacy of the Derg and the Politics of Reconstruction." *African Affairs*: 92(368) 389-402.
- Record, Jeffrey. 2007. *Beating Goliath: Why Insurgencies Win*. Washington, D.C.: Potomac Books Inc.
- Regan, Patrick M. and Daniel Norton. 2005. "Greed, Grievance, and Mobilization in Civil Wars." *Journal of Conflict Resolution*: 49(3) 319-336.
- Reid, Richard. 2005. "Caught in the Headlights of History: Eritrea, the EPLF and the Post-War Nation State." *Journal of Modern African Studies*: 43(3) 467-488.
- Reno, William. 1995. "Reinvention of an African Patrimonial State: Charles Taylor's Liberia." *Third World Quarterly*: 16(1) 109-120.
- Reno, William. 1997. "War, Markets, and the Reconfiguration of West Africa's Weak States." *Comparative Politics*: 29(4) 493-510.

- Reno, William. 2000. "Clandestine Economies, Violence and States in Africa." *Journal of International Affairs*: 53(2) 433-459.
- Riggan, Jennifer. 2016. *The Struggling State: Nationalism, Militarism, and the Education of Eritrea*. Temple University Press.
- Riley, Stephen. 1997. "State Collapse and Social Reconstruction in Africa." *India International Centre Quarterly*: 24(4) 145-155.
- Rock, June. 1999. "Relief and Rehabilitation in Eritrea: Lessons and Issues." *Third World Quarterly*: 20(1) 129-142.
- Salehyan, Idean, David Siroky, and Reed M. Wood. 2014. "External Rebel Sponsorship and Civilian Abuse: A Principle Agent Analysis of Wartime Atrocities." *International Organisation*: 68(3) 633-661.
- Sawyer, Amos. 2005. "Liberating Liberia: Understanding the Nature and Needs of Governance." *Harvard International Review*: 27(3) 18-22.
- Sawyer, Amos. 2008. "Emerging Patterns in Liberia's Post-Conflict Politics: Observations from the 2005 Elections." *African Affairs*: 107(427) 177-199.
- Schlichte, Klaus, and Ulrich Schneckener. 2016. "Armed Groups and the Politics of Legitimacy." *Civil War*: 17(4) 409-424.
- Segers, Kaatje, Joost Dessen, Sten Hagberg, Patrick Develtere, Mitiku Haile, and Jozef Deckers. 2009. "Be Like Bees: The Politics of Mobilizing Farmers for Development in Tigray, Ethiopia." *African Affairs*: 108(430) 91-109.
- Seroo, Didier, and Samuel Kofi Woods. "Interview with Samuel Kofi Woods of Liberia." *African Affairs*: 99(394) 97-111.
- Sesay, Max A. 1996. "Civil War and Collective Intervention in Liberia." *Review of African Political Economy*: 23(67) 35-52.
- Simons, Anna. 1994. "Somalia and the Dissolution of the Nation-State." *American Anthropologist*: 96(4) 818-824.
- Sorenson, John. 1991. "Discourses on Eritrean Nationalism and Identity." *Journal of Modern African Studies*: 29(2) 301-317.

- Staniland, Paul. 2012. "States, Insurgents, and Wartime Political Orders." *Perspectives on Politics*: 10(2) 243-264.
- Staniland, Paul. 2014. *Networks of Rebellion: Explaining Insurgent Cohesion and Collapse*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Steele, Abbey. 2017. *Democracy and Displacement in Colombia's Civil War*. Cornell University Press.
- Stewart, Megan A. 2017. "Civil War as State-Making: Strategic Governance in Civil War." *International Organization*: 72(1) 205-226.
- Stubbs, Richard. 1989. *Hearts and Minds in Guerilla Warfare: The Malayan Emergency, 1948-60*. Oxford University Press.
- Tadesse, Medhane and John Young. 2003. "TPLF: Reform or Decline?" *Review of African Political Economy*: 97 389-403.
- Tanner, Victor. 1998. "Liberia: Railroading Peace." *Review of African Political Economy*: 25(75) 133-147.
- Terpstra, Niels, and Georg Frerks. 2017. "Rebel Governance and Legitimacy: Understanding the Impact of Rebel Legitimation on Civilian Compliance with the LTTE Rule." *Civil Wars*: 19(3) 279-307.
- Terrorism Research. (2009). Differences between Terrorism and Insurgency. Retrieved May 5, 2017 from <http://www.terrorism-research.com/insurgency/>.
- Tull, Denis M. and Andreas Mehler. 2005. "The Hidden Costs of Power-Sharing: Reproducing Insurgent Violence in Africa." *African Affairs*: 104(416) 375-398.
- Tuso, Hamdesa. 1997. "Ethiopia: New Political Order. Ethnic Conflict in the Post Cold War Era." *Africa: Rivista trimestrale di studi e documentazione dell'Istituto italiano per l'Africa e l'Oriente*: 52(3) 343-364.
- Vinci, Anthony. 2006. "Greed-Grievance Reconsidered: The Role of Power and Survival in the Motivation of Armed Groups." *Civil Wars*: 8(1) 25-45.
- Walls, Michael. 2009. "The Emergence of a Somali State: Building Peace from Civil War in Somaliland." *African Affairs*: 108(432) 371-389.

- Warner, Jason, and Caleb Weiss. 2017. "A Legitimate Challenger? Assessing the Rivalry between al-Shabaab and the Islamic State in Somalia." *Combating Terrorism Center Sentinel*: 10(10).
- Warner, Jason, and Ellen Chapin. 2018. "Targeted Terror: The Suicide Bombers of al-Shabaab." *Combating Terrorism Center Report*.
- Webersik, Christian. 2004. "Differences That Matter: The Struggle of the Marginalised in Somalia." *Africa: Journal of the International African Institute*: 74(4) 516-533.
- Weinstein, Jeremy. 2007. *Inside Rebellion: The Politics of Insurgent Violence*. Cambridge, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Wimmer, Andreas. 2012. *Waves of War: Nationalism, State Formation, and Ethnic Exclusion in the Modern World*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Woldemikael, Tekle Mariam. 1991. "Political Mobilization and Nationalist Movements: The Case of the Eritrean People's Liberation Front." *Africa Today*: 38(2) 31-42.
- Wood, Reed M. 2010. "Rebel Capability and Strategic Violence Against Civilians." *Journal of Peace Research*: 47(5) 601-614.
- Wood, Reed M. and Jacob D. Kathman. 2015. "Competing for the Crown: Inter-rebel Competition and Civilian Targeting in Civil War." *Political Research Quarterly*: 68(1) 167-179.
- Woodward, Lucinda, and Peter Galvin. 2009. "Halfway to Nowhere: Liberian Former Child Soldiers in a Ghanaian Refugee Camp." *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*: 99(5) 1003-1011.
- Yihdego, Zeray W. 2007. "Ethiopia's Military Action against the Union of Islamic Courts and Others in Somalia: Some Legal Implications." *International and Comparative Law Quarterly*: 56(3) 666-676.
- Young, John. 1998. *Peasant Revolution in Ethiopia: The Tigray People's Liberation Front, 1975-1991*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Zelege, Mamo, and Bayou Ayana. "Interview with Ethiopian Peoples Revolutionary Party." *MERIP Reports*: 45, 21-22.

Zimmerman, Katherine. "Al Shabaab's History with Humanitarian Assistance." *Critical Threats*, 27 July 2011 [<https://www.criticalthreats.org/analysis/al-shabaabs-history-with-humanitarian-assistance> - accessed on 9 March 2018].

Zimmerman, Katherine. "Al Shabaab and the Challenges of Providing Humanitarian Assistance in Somalia." *Critical Threats*, 8 September 2011 [<https://www.criticalthreats.org/analysis/al-shabaab-and-the-challenges-of-providing-humanitarian-assistance-in-somalia> – accessed on 9 March 2018].

## **11 Vita**

Harriet is a candidate expecting to graduate in May 2018 with a Master of Arts in Political Science, with a specialization in International Relations. Harriet completed her undergraduate degree at the University of Nottingham in the United Kingdom, with a joint honours degree in Politics and American Studies. During this time, her focus was on international relations and United States foreign policy. Her undergraduate thesis concentrated on President Obama's failure to fulfil his campaign promise of closing the Guantanamo Bay prison. Following graduation from Louisiana State University, Harriet hopes to begin a career working with non-governmental organisations in the humanitarian or development sectors.