International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews

The Somalia War: United States Mediation 2012-2022

Timidi, Emmanuel Tamaramiebi[1], Akposeimukumo Tounaregha[2]

[1]Nigeria Maritime University Okerenkoko, Delta State, Nigeria
Phone: +234 7037174078, E-mail: miebitimidi@gmail.com
[2]Department of History and International Studies, University of Africa Toru- Orua, Bayelsa State, Nigeria

ABSTRACT

Somalia has been plagued by internal wars for nearly three decades. There have been numerous foreign and internal initiatives to terminate the war or, at the very least, to lessen the effects of the war. This work, on the other hand, investigates the Somalia conflict and how it has impacted the state. When evaluating the function of the United States of America. Various international organizations, including the AU, IGAD, and the UN, have sought to end the war using a combination of force and diplomacy. However, because the battle is still ongoing, these approaches have not been as effective as intended. The goal of this research paper is to critically examine mediation from the aforementioned perspective. The study will employ realist theory to support its claim that local actors' resistance to external intervention in Somalia prevented it from taking hold quickly because they saw it as a threat to their sense of national security. The materials for this descriptive study will come from secondary sources, including books, journals, articles, the internet, etc. These sources' information will be qualitatively examined.

Keywords: War, Mediation, Defense and Somalia

Introduction

According to the World Bank, the war in Somalia is caused by clannism, which has resulted in chaos and clashes over power and natural resources (World Bank, 2005). Because of the nature of the dispute, reconciliation is difficult to achieve. There has been no central government in Somalia since the fall of the Barre Regime. Anyone who has come to prominence since the government has strived to amass as much riches and power for personal advantage. Since then, anarchy has served as a means of avoiding the search for a successor. As a famine-stricken country that relies heavily on international aid for food, the desire to profit from this food has also served as a motivator for gaining power. Being a famine stricken state that mostly relies on foreign aid for food, the quest to profit from this food has also been motivating for getting power. The existence of al-Shabaab terrorist group that has fought to make Somalia theocratic state has stalled the process of realizing peace.

Since there is no central government in Somalia, there exists a lot of piracy within its territorial waters. The same has affected various states that make use of the seas in trade. The effects of piracy have realised great revenue for the pirates hence the practice of piracy has not only been a cause but also a result of the conflict in Somalia. (Elmi&Barise,2010:43). The war has been for ammunition and weapons as well as for arable land and livestock.

The Nation's State

Somalia was designated a failed state from 2008 and 2011 as a result of the country's large ongoing civil hostilities. The war has had an impact not only on the country but also on its neighbors. Because of the war's destructive and violent nature, many people have been homeless, and thousands more have been forced to become refugees. Despite the efforts of neighboring states and international community agencies to assist Somalia, the solutions obtained have not lasted long. Furthermore, most states that have made the effort have done so to protect their unique interests and, once meeting them, have walked away from them. Furthermore, due to the complexity of the matter, resolution has proven challenging. As a result, numerous military units have crossed the Somalia border in an attempt to restore peace and calm. Despite the fact that the same has been somewhat successful, the dispute has not been resolved. The military group has just halted the activity of the tribes involved in the conflicts. The current calm is a result of military intervention, not dispute resolution. The conflict is still going on.

Statement of Problem

Despite the fact that Somalia is made up of a shared ethnic group and religion, the war in Somalia appears to be never-ending (Brown, M. 1996, 17). The quantity of actors is increasing, but so are their talent and expertise. The conflict is no longer fought over who has the most wealth, but over who has the greatest power. The involvement of Al-Qaeda in the war is also producing considerable conflict in Somalia's neighboring countries. As a result, its neighbors and the international community have become increasingly interested in finding peace or determining how much profit can be made while the

war continues. In some cases, the interference has emboldened and enraged Somalia's militant groups. For example, the Somali al-Shabaab have repeatedly assaulted their neighbor, Kenya, amid allegations of Kenyan Army meddling in their activities in their country (Abbink, J. 2006, 5). This article aims to determine the current situation in Somalia and the likelihood of US mediation in achieving a sustainable and permanent peace.

Aims and Objectives of the Study

This study aimed to investigate external interference, looking at the role of the USA in the Somalia War between 2010 and 2022 as a reference point. The specific objectives are:

1. Investigate the extent the War in Somalia harmed the state?

2. Investigate the impact of the United States of America mission in Somalia War?

Review OF Related Literature

Effort is made in this chapter to review extant literature with a view to ascertaining what other scholars have not captured – either partially or completely.

Starting with theoretical framework.

Theoretical Framework

This study is built on the realist approach. In its broadest sense, realism encompasses classical realism (often referred to as realism), Neorealism, and neoclassical realism. This study can most appropriately be analyzed using classical realist theory, associated with scholars such as Hans Morgenthau. The theory is preoccupied with two essential questions: What accounts for State behaviour? What produces and accounts for the dynamics of international system? (Morgenthau, 1973). The answers are sought both at the State and systemic levels. Realist thought is based on the international system, the defining characteristics of which are anarchy, the absence of legal authority. The international system is anarchic since each State is sovereign, thus lacking a supranational government; and there is no higher legal authority than the state. States therefore have to rely on their capabilities to ensure their survival. In the realist perspective, States' actions are determined by their national interest. National security represents the greatest and most immediate need of the state (Dougherty &Pfaltzgraff, 2005). Morgenthau (1973) argues that political leaders think and act in terms of interest defined as power.

Further, a world in which sovereign States compete, survival constitutes the minimum goal of foreign policy and the core national interest. It is when survival has been assured that a State may pursue lesser interests. The instability in Somalia has serious security implications not only for the continent of Africa, but the entire world. It is a threat to international peace and security and has disrupted economic activities.

Morgenthau also stresses the autonomy of political sphere, that political actions must be judged by political criteria. In regard to a policy, realists would for instance ask, "How does this policy affect the power of the nation?" The assumption that power is the most important concept in explaining and predicting State behavior is central to the realist theory. In power struggle, nations follow policies designed to preserve the status quo, or imperialistic expansion, or gain prestige. Analysis of intervention in Somalia reveals that both maintenance of status quo and gaining prestige applied. This is in tandem with the realist assumption that political policy as aimed at keeping power, increasing power, maintaining power, and demonstrating power.

The Somalia intervention reveals that all these apply with regard to the States that intervened in Somalia. Over the past two decades the nature of the Somali crisis and the international context within which it occurred have been constantly changing. It has mutated from a civil war in the 1980s, through State collapse, clan factionalism and warlords in the 1990s, to a globalised ideological conflict in the first decade of the new millennium. As Somalia's strategic importance to the West declined, the foreign aid that had sustained the State was withdrawn. Suffice it, therefore, to aver that external intervention in the Somalia conflict not only prolonged it further, it equally influenced the nature of the conflict towards a direction it might not have otherwise taken.

Mediation

Mediation has become a powerful tool for dispute resolution. The study is based on the belief that the use of mediation is greatly expanding, and on the assumption that the nature of mediation is changing as a result of this growth. It argues that it is no longer sufficient to construct mediation as if it were neither a monolithic process, nor mediators as if they were a homogeneous group. Nor is it sufficient to examine understandings of mediation practice in dichotomous fashions. Instead, it holds that one way to further understand the changing form of mediation is to examine, in an integrated way, the ways mediators conceptualize and give meaning to their work, and take into consideration the ways contextual factors impact on these understandings.

This is a procedure in which the parties meet with a mutually chosen impartial and neutral individual who supports them in resolving their issues.

The United Nations (UN) Guidance for Effective Mediation describes mediation as a voluntary process "whereby a third party assists two or more parties, with their consent, to prevent, manage or resolve a conflict by helping them to develop mutually acceptable agreements".

(Ross, 1989; Kressel and Pruitt, 1989; Tyler, 1989; Bush and Folger, 1994; Kolb, 1994; Riskin, 1996). Furthering our knowledge about mediation and provides a "snapshot" of those working as mediators, why they do this work, and the social meaning they attribute to mediation. In some instances mediation practitioners take a micro perspective and view mediation as a pragmatic problem-solving process (Moore, 1986). Others associate mediation

with macro political functions believing that it can transform oppressive social structures (Warhaftig, 1982). 8 See Richard Abel, The Politics of Informal Justice, 1982; Richard Hofrichter, Neighbourhood Justice in Capitalist Society: The Expansion of the Informal State. 1983; Roger Matthews, Informal Justice, 1988; and, Laura Nader, "Harmony Models and the Construction of Law", 1991:41-59. 12 Furthermore, those who work as mediators differ in their personal characteristics, their backgrounds, their training, and their operational philosophies. As a consequence of this growth many long-held views of mediation are being challenged. At this point in time mediation does not have a coherent set of core features. This may be due, in part, to the fact that mediators ground their approach to mediation in ideological views of what should happen and why. In many instances their ideologies contradict each other. Two ideologies currently dominate the mediation discourse -- individualistic and relational. An individualist view, upon which the settlement approach is based, sees the world as made up of separate beings of equal worth, but different needs, whose human nature it is to seek satisfaction of their needs and desires. A relational framework, views the world as made up of persons with diverse needs and desires but who possess a common form of consciousness that connects them to each other. Transformative models of mediation are based on this ideology (Bush and Folger, 1994)

War

Generally War is seen as an armed confrontation between states or nations. Nations go to war for a variety of reasons. It has been stated that a nation will go to war if the benefits outweigh the disadvantages and there is no other mutually accepted solution.

Cicero describes war generally as "a contention by force"; Hugo Grotius adds that "war is the state of contending parties, considered as such"; and Thomas Hobbes comments that war is also an attitude: "By war is meant a state of affairs, which may exist even while its operations are not continued;"

War is a means to an end, a weapon that can be used for good or bad purposes; some of these purposes for which war has been used have been accepted by humanity as worthwhile ends; indeed, war performs functions that are essential in any human society; it has been used to settle disputes, uphold rights, and remedy wrongs: and these are unquestionably functions that must be served... (Eagleton, 1948)

The idea of peace and war as a bipolar continuum is diametrically opposed to the view of a distinct and clear-cut borderline existing between the two states, implying a boundary-transgression in the shift from one state of affairs to the other. According to Brodie (1973), "war depicts human violence in its most intense form, but it is not si War is a means to an end, a weapon that can be used for good or evil; some of the purposes for which war has been used have been accepted by humanity as worthwhile ends; indeed, war performs functions that are essential in any human society; it has been used to settle disputes, uphold rights, and remedy wrongs: and these are unquestionably functions that must be served… Human violence is implied. It's something different entirely, with a distinct and fairly unique configuration. This configuration's properties encompass a wide range of phenomena, including the following: First, since antiquity, conflicts have tended to have a clear and sharp beginning and an equally clear and abrupt ending, with numerous ceremonials engaged in both the initiation and termination of war.

According to international law, war can only take place between sovereign political entities, i.e. States. Thus, war is a mechanism of resolving conflicts between units of the highest tier of political organization. The majority of those concerned with war as a sociopolitical phenomenon have also adopted as their basic premise that there is a fundamental difference between domestic conflicts, for which there are usually mechanisms for peaceful resolution, and international conflicts, which occur in anarchy. Wars have been shown to directly involve State institutions such as the foreign office and the military forces. Because war is fought in an international environment, the stakes of war may be the life or death of a state (Aaron, 1966).

Many students, independent of their professional background as political scientists, historians, sociologists, psychologists, or military analysts, share this general perspective on war as an international or inter-state phenomena. The school of political realism holds that nation-states can only realize their national interests by displaying their willingness to fight and by using wars of various magnitudes as a tool of national policy to attain legitimate purposes (Lider, 1977; Nobel, 1977).

Von Clausewitz (1911) described war as "an act of violence intended to compel our opponents to fulfill our will," and he stressed the continuity of violence with other political means elsewhere: "War is nothing more than a continuation of political interplay using a variety of other means.""

Sorel (1912) talked about war as a "political act by which States, unable to resolve disagreements concerning their obligations, rights, or interests, resort to armed force to determine which is the stronger and may thus impose its will on the other."

Kallen (1939) states that " war may be described as an armed contest between two or more sovereign institutions employing organized military forces in the pursuit of specific ends, the significant term in the definition is 'organized'." He goes on to say that this structure of conflicting armed forces extends behind the combat lines and, in contemporary warfare, tends to encompass all civilian enterprises, such as industrial, productive, and commercial, as well as social interests and individual attitudes.

Wallace (1973) considers war to be "the sanctioned use of lethal weapons by members of one society against members of another. It is carried out by trained persons working in teams that are directed by a separate policy-making group and supported in various ways by the non-combatant population".

"Mass or total war may be defined as a type of armed conflict between large nation-states in which populations and resources are rationally and extensively organized for conquest; it is important to note that populations are mobilized both in terms of activities and psychological states: the former implies comprehensive military and civilian conscription; the latter implies the systematic development of belligerent and hostile attitudes toward the enemy." Ashworth (1968)

Deutsch and Senghaas (1971): "By 'war' we mean actual large-scale organized violence, prepared and maintained by the compulsion and legitimacy claims of a State and its government, and directed against another State or quasi-State, i.e. a relatively comparable political organization".

Defense

Whether it's national defense, a football team's defense, or a defense lawyer, defense is concerned with safeguarding something or battling an opponent. Defense is the polar opposite of offensive. It has to do with guarding against a wide range of threats: Defense in the military means defending a country from attack**.**

Webster's definition of defense means or method of defending or protecting oneself, one's team, or another. The nation's air and ground defenses.

Defense mechanisms

 According to Anna Freud, are "unconscious resources used by the ego" to reduce internal stress. Patients frequently develop these unconscious methods to reduce internal conflict, notably between the superego and id. Clinicians utilize psychodynamic therapy to assist patients become more aware of their own unconscious processes. Patients develop their self-awareness and gain a fresh perspective of their own behaviors by detecting and identifying these processes. This activity highlights main defensive mechanisms to help clinicians better understand their patients during patient contacts, as well as the role of the inter professional team in their care.

Methodology

The descriptive methodology was picked for the purpose of this study. This technique allows the investigator to pick up the unintentional actions of the variables that are the subject of the study without affecting them in any way. In utilizing this design in the study, the researcher observes the independent variable (Somalia War) and dependent variable (Mediation) at the same time because the impact of the previous on the latter is ongoing during this research. The data accumulated for this study are based majorly on secondary, sources which comprise journals, textbooks, newspapers, unpublished theses, research projects, and the internet. These were widely used to organize the relevant statistics to present a reliable and veritable work. The method of collecting data for this research is the qualitative approach which entails logically breaking down the data gathered to draw inferences about the connection between the variables which are of concern to the researcher. This was done to arrive at a legitimate argument and make salient deductions.

Area of the Study

The area for this study is Somalia. Officially the Federal Republic of Somalia, it is a country located in the Horn of Africa. It is bordered by Ethiopia to the west, Djibouti to the northwest, the Gulf of Aden to the north, the Guardafui Channel and Somali Sea to the east, and Kenya to the southwest. Somalia has the longest coastline on Africa's mainland, and its terrain consists mainly of plateaus, plains and highlands. Climatically, hot conditions prevail year-round, with periodic monsoon winds and irregular rainfall. Somalia has an estimated population of around 14.3 million, and has been described as the most culturally homogeneous country in Africa (Ismail,n 2010). Around 85% of its residents are ethnic (Ismail, 2010) Somalis who have historically inhabited the northern part of the country. Ethnic minorities are largely concentrated in the southern regions. The official languages of are Somali and Arabic Most people in the country are Muslim with the majority being Sunni

Results

War in Somalia and the State of defense

Somalia is the world's prototypical failed state: fourteen successive internationally recognized governments have been unable to impart stability since the early 1990s. The country now presents the international community and the United Nations a complex set of challenges: piracy off its coastline threatening international commercial routes; a security vacuum filled by domestic jihadist groups with links to Al Qaida; an internal conflict that is fuelled in part by regional powers and finally one of the world's worst humanitarian crisis. The humanitarian situation has followed a downward trajectory along with political and security prospects. Nearly half the population relies on external assistance and more than 2 million are displaced within the country's borders or in neighboring states. Both the world's largest internally displaced settlement (roughly 500,000 people displaced right outside Mogadishu), and the world's largest refugee camp (in Dadaab, Kenya) are products of the Somali security crisis. While political developments in early 2009 presented an opportunity for a reduction in the level of violence and greater stability, the past twelve months have been marred by frequent attacks with a high number of civilian casualties, as well as slow progress on the political front. The dimensions of the conflict are at once local – with the resurgence of clan-based politics and warlord – and global, with the international community's rhetoric eager to associate Somali Islamists with Al Qaida. Government control remains confined to a few blocks in Mogadishu, and talks of reconciliation between various groups often does not translate into freedom.

There has been an upward spiral in the Somali conflict since early May 2009. The Islamist Al-shabaab militant faction lashed out at the TFG forces and took control of over two thirds of Mogadishu to add to large chunks of territories which they and their allies captured earlier on across Central and Southern Somalia and almost overthrew of the TFG. The Al-Shabaab advanced close to the presidential palace on many occasions and exchanged gunfire with pro-government forces. In a recent attack at the airport in Mogadishu during the 50th celebration of the national army of Somalia, fighting erupted when Al-Shabaab militants attacked. In counter attacks by the government forces and African Union peacekeepers, a lot of civilians were killed and others wounded (www.asmarino.com/news). As the battle raged on militant Islamic fighters have been capturing some towns. It has become a cycle of

militants capturing a town and later having it recaptured by the government forces and vice versa. Attacks have also being targeted at the presidential palace at various times like that carried out by the insurgents on 27th May, 2009 where mortars were fired at the presidential palace killing 7 civilians and 2 government soldiers (www.english.aljazeera.net/nes/africa/2009/06). This shows the extent of the weakness and fragility of the transition government. The fragility of the transition government is further seen in the number of pro government officials' death toll since May 2009. Notable ministers and officials like the security minister were killed. The security minister was killed in June 2009 in a suicide bomb attack that also killed Somalia's ambassador to South Africa and 9 others (www.rain.org.za/us_death_squad-roam_the_globe). The insurgent's side has not been bereft of casualties as well. Saleh Ali Saleh Nabhan, a senior Al-Qaeda operative suspected to be behind the attacks on U.S. embassies in Kenya and Tanzania well as being a major force brokering a merger between Al-Qaeda and Al-Shabaab, was killed in a raid by covert forces in Southern Somalia in September 2009. Sheikh Hussein Ali Fidow who was a senior Shabaab leader was reportedly killed alongside Nabhan (www.nytimes.com/2009/05/18/world/africa). Casualties have continued on all sides to the conflicts and yet, the conflict keeps intensifying on a daily basis.

The conflict in Somalia also manifests in rivalry between the different Islamic factions. All the factions are battling for supremacy. This has led to intense gunfire exchanges between the various groups. Countless number of deaths has been witnessed as a result of the fighting. Any group that succeeds in a specific area and captures a city or town drives the other group away. This shows that the struggle is not just against the transition government or by various clans. It has descended into an all out war where the need to radically Islamize the nation seems to be the driving force for the continued struggle by the AlShabaab group. This may not be unconnected to their close ties with Al-Qaeda. The rivalry between the factions also show some cracks within the walls of some factions. For instance, a former warlord and opposition leader Sheikh Yusuf Indahaadde defected to the government's side in apparent disarray among militant ranks (www.wardheernews.com/articles_2010/jan/IAG). This is an advantage for the transition government as the information gathered from him will be of immense security advantage to them. The conflict between the rival factions of which the AlShabaab and Hizbul Islam are the main groups intensified towards the end of 2009. However, It is not shocking as the two main groups were formed by a coalition of disparate clerics, clan groups, Islamists, criminal and militia networks with divided interests (www.washingtonpost.com). Till date, the two sides have been fighting against each other on one hand, and against the transition government on the other hand.

Plate1: Photo of truck bomb explosion that killed more than 300 in Mogadishu

Source: Simon 2017

Plate 2: Al-shabaab terrorists in Somalia

Internally displaced persons in Somalia

Source: Ajazeera, 2022

United States Mediation in Somalia

The increase in US military involvement in the fight against Al-Shabaab corresponded with new operational and legal guidance for US operations in Somalia. On 22 May 2013, President Obama issued the 'Presidential Policy Guidance' (PPG), which established the operating procedures for action "against terrorist targets outside the United States and areas of active hostilities, including Somalia". The PPG remained classified until litigation by the American Civil Liberties Union forced its disclosure in 2016.

 Notably, the guidance asserts that individuals can be targeted only if "the individual's activities pose a continuing, imminent threat to U.S. persons", and sets out minimum necessary conditions for any lethal action, including: "(a) near certainty than an identified HVT [high valued target] or other lawful terrorist target other than an identified HVT is present; (b) near certainty that non-combatants will not be injured or killed; (c) [REDACTED] and (d) if lethal force is being employed; (i) an assessment that capture is not feasible at the time of the operation; (ii) an assessment th at the relevant governmental authorities in the country where action is contemplated cannot or will not effectively address the threat to U.S. persons; and (iii) an assessment that no other reasonable alternatives to lethal action exist to effectively address the threat to U.S. persons." The PPG governed all strikes in Somalia until after the end of President Obama's second term. However, in October 2016, the New York Times reported that the administration had "quietly broadened the president's authority for the use of force in Somalia by allowing air strikes to protect American and African troops" fighting Al-Shabaab. Strikes no longer required that Americans be under direct threat. The paper further reported that, in an effort to bolster the legal basis for air strikes and other counterterrorism operations in Somalia, the administration classified Al-Shabaab as a party to the armed conflict governed by the AUMF. The reported re-articulation of Al-Shabaab's connection to Al-Qa'ida appears to have been confirmed in a letter from President Obama to the Speaker of the House of Representatives in December 2016, which stated that that US forces were countering the "the terrorist threat posed by al-Qa'ida and its Somalia-based associated force, al-Shabaab" (emphasis added). Previous letters to Congress consistently referred to "alQa'ida and associated elements of al-Shabaab".

In 2011, the USA launched its first drone strike in Somalia against Al-Shabaab, which controls large swathes of south-central Somalia, including of the Lower Shabelle region which surrounds the capital, Mogadishu. Between 2011 and March 2017, air strikes were infrequent. American airpower was originally used only to target "high value targets" (HVT, i.e. known 'terrorists' who the administration argued posed a threat to the USA) and were justified initially as part for the global war on Al-Qa'ida and associated forces, and then, beginning in 2016, to support operations by the African Union Mission in Somalia (AMISOM), a United Nations (UN) and African Union-authorized peace enforcement force based in the country. In March 2017, President Donald Trump issued a directive designating parts of Somalia an "area of active hostilities" (AAH), after which the number of reported air strikes increased dramatically

The directive has not been made public, but reports indicate it weakened the protections afforded to civilians in Somalia, increasing the likelihood of their death or injury in US military operations. Previously, under the 2013 'Presidential Policy Guidance' (PPG), which established the operating procedures for action "against terrorist targets outside the United States and areas of active hostilities" and governed all air strikes in Somalia until the AAH directive, for an air strike to be approved in Somalia, there needed to be "near certainty" that the target – "an identified HVT or other lawful terrorist target" – was present and civilians would not be killed or injured. Now, the content of the directive supersedes the PPG and reportedly gives US forces the greatest latitude to carry out strikes as is allowable under the USA's interpretation of IHL. As a result, those planning or deciding an attack are, according to the USA's own standards, permitted to target anyone who they are 'reasonably certain' is formally or functionally a member of a non-state armed group, regardless of whether he or she is directly participating in hostilities. Civilian fatalities and injuries are now permissible if they are lawful under

Plate 4.5.1: US airstrike targets Al-Shabaab military base in Somalia, 2018

United States soldiers in Somalia
Source: bbc.com

Conclusion

Several peace-building techniques have been implemented in the country. However, support for these processes has been very low, with clan chiefs preserving their own interests over national objectives. There is no agreement on how power should be distributed among the clans because each clan wants a lion's share, which is impossible to obtain. Unlike other previously troubled republics, Somalia has a single ethnic group made up of five families, and the country is founded on a single religion. However, because the ethnic group is built on five clans, each tribe is vying for leadership, and none appears to be aiming to unite all clans for a single objective.

Furthermore, if the plan for a power-sharing government is pushed on them due to a lack of a decision, the opposition may be able to derail it or even paralyze it.

Furthermore, since the al-Shabaab's formation, the faith of Islam has been exploited to polarize the state. As a result, if the same religion is utilized to foster peace, it may work because practically all Somalis adhere to it. The religion has also devised conflict resolution methods that it has embraced in the hope of resolving the issue. Finally, because the state is one via religion, culture, and ethnicity, it is a state whose unity is easily attained through realization and acceptance of the oneness. Minor divides are the work of persons seeking to polarize the country. As a result, if the Somalis come to this knowledge and deal with anyone attempting to polarize them, they will easily establish a powerful government.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, it is recommended that:

1. The international community can assist Somalia in moving away from militarization of Somali society and toward tackling the core causes of conflict, notably marginalization, clan discrimination, crippling corruption, and pervasive impunity.

2. To reduce violent conflict and improve stability, the Somali government and international actors can encourage the federal government and federal states to step up efforts to formalize the constitution and reach an agreement on an acceptable resource distribution between the federal government and the federal states. It is critical to include civic society, especially women, in constitutional debates.

3. The international community can also assist in the sponsorship of broad-based society dialogues about justice, accountability, and reconciliation in Somalia to guide the formalization of the constitutional and other political processes. Beyond al Qaeda, such procedures might involve the creation of disarmament, demobilization, justice, accountability, and reconciliation mechanisms for Somali armed players.-Shabab

REFERENCES

Aaron R. (1966) Peace and war; a theory of international relations. Praeger, New York

Ashworth A. (1968) The sociology of trench warfare, 1914-1918. Brit. J. Sociol. 19, 4, p. 407-23.

Brown, M.E., 1996. The International Dimensions of Internal Conflict. *Center for Science and International Affairs*. Havard. pp. 12-52

Brodie B. (1973) War and politics. Cassell, London

Dougherty, A. &Pfaltzgraff, J. (2005). *Contending Theories of International Relations*. New York

Elmi, A.A. &Barise, A. (2016). The Somalia Conflict, Root Causes Obstacles and Peace-building Strategies. *Institute for Security Studies, Volume 15*, pp. 32 – 54.

Eagleton C. (1948) International government. Ronald Press, New York.

Folger, J., and Bush, R.(1994), "Ideology, Orientations to Conflict and Mediation Discourse," in J. Folger and T. Jones, New Directions in Mediation: Communication Research and Perspectives. Newbury Park: Sage Publications

Ismail, A.A. (2010). *Somali State failure: Players, Incentives and Institutions*. Juba:

The Renowned Press.

Kolb, Deborah M. (1994), When Talk Works: Profiles of Mediators. San Francisco:

Kressel, K., Pruitt, D., and Associates, Mediation Research. Centre for Negotiation and Conflict Resolution at Rutgers, State University of New Jersey, 1989

Morgenthau, H.J. (1973). *Politics among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*. New York:

Riskin, Leonard, (1996)"Understanding Mediator Orientations, Strategies and Techniques: A Grid for the Perplexed," Harvard Negotiation Law Review, Vol. 7, pp:25-35

Tyler, Tom R., (1989) "The Quality of Dispute Resolution Procedures and Outcomes:

Sorel G. (1912) Reflections sur la violence. Rivière, Paris.

Wallace M. (1973) War and rank among nations. Heath, Lexington, Masslems and Possibilities," Denver University Law Review, Vol. 66, No. 3, pp: 419-436

United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (2017) Somalia: 2018 Humanitarian Needs Overview retrieved on February 22, 2020, from https://www.humanitarianresponse.info/system/files/documents/files/20 *172911_somalia_humanitarian_needs_overview_2018.pdf*.

United Nations Security Council, Resolution 2431 (2018), S/RES/2431 (2018). *https://www.un.org/press/en/2018/sc13439.doc.htm.*