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Abstract

Liberal peace-making may not always be the best way to ensure peace in conflicting societies. Academia have always tended to only look to western peace-making processes which have made policy limited in the cultural understanding of societies way of functioning, trying to implement what may work in “Western” but not necessarily the host countries context. In addition, fewer have looked how these two contrasting ways of conducting peace-making affects legitimacy. In this thesis, I examine how Mac Ginty’s (2008) “liberal peace versus traditional peace-making” affects level on legitimacy as conceptualized by Levi et al. (2009), within the case of Somalia. The hypothesis was confirmed; That use of traditional peace-making processes has a positive effect on legitimacy. To conclude, the recommendation for further research was to explore the grey-zones between liberal peace and traditional peace-making to further explore its possibilities.
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1.0 Introduction

As written in the introduction by Nahla Yassine-Hamdan and Frederic S. Pearson (2014) in their comprehensive work on Arab practices of conflict resolution, “There is no one-size-fits-all”. There is a great need for the continuous exploration of what role traditional peace-making mechanisms look like and how they can be used in the road towards peace. How could they be used? What lessons can be learned? What are the potential risks with using traditional practices? These are all questions that have been asked and opened up for new angles and possibilities.

Previous research on the peace-making process has traditionally been western-centered in academia, which in its turn have made the way peace-making is seen as a template way of solving conflicts – all based on what the “west” considers is the most efficient way to solve conflicts. In literature, we can see that the importance of the local, or bottom-up approaches, have been given attention within humanitarian aid (Easterly, 2006), but also how “acceptance strategies” within security studies has been adopted by NGO’s to increase the security by adapting to the communal norms (Childs, 2013). Arguably, both considers the local context and how it has to be considered in the development process forward. Indeed, the argument that foreign intervenors or parties cannot impose unknown and foreign procedures during peace negotiations without consider the grassroot situation does not seem too far-fetched.
There are various examples of how authors have tried to use traditional peace-making in different ways. Some on the local sphere (Abu-Nimer, 2001, 1996; Isike and Uzodike, 2011), others by drawing from the local and applying on the greater international scene within conflict resolution (Gellman and Vuinovich, 2008; Mac Ginty, 2008; Sabrow, 2017). However, there is lack of research on how legitimacy in the peace process is affected by the use of traditional peace-making processes. Hence, the purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between peace building which use traditional peace-making mechanisms and levels of legitimacy.

This thesis will first present various other cases on the field of the “local” in peace-making. Thereafter, follows a description of the theory used to clearly explain the causal chain between the variables. But also, to give a clear picture on the definitions assessed in this study. Then, we will introduce the selected research design, operationalization of variables and finally the case selection. After, there will be a presentation of the results, followed by an analysis and discussion. To conclude, the study will be summarized with recommendations for further research. In the end, the overall purpose is to understand the role traditional peace-making has in legitimacy throughout the peace-building process, how traditions can play a role in compliance with peace-efforts and eventually a more durable peace.
2.0 Theory

2.1 Previous research

What have previous researchers and authors discussed on the topic of interest? What has research so far concluded on the “local”? Due to lack for clear definition of what is traditional, the literature mentioned in this section with also bring up writings on culture in negotiations, the “local” and traditional. Often, “traditional” is intertwined or considered the same as local, indigenous, cultural or community centered practices (Galvanek and Planta, 2017: 3), which is why I will bring up previous studies which uses the other terms than “traditional” for now.

To begin in 1995, John Paul Lederach underlined the importance of “culturally appropriate approaches to conflict management” (Yassine-Hamdan and Pearson, 2014:1). Albeit not the first on noting on the possible potential of the local, in his case the culture, he made an important link to culture’s role in terms of conflict management. Moreover, Kevin Avruch (1991:14-16) formulates in his book “Culture and conflict resolution” what he calls “six inadequate ideas about culture”. There, he identifies critiques to the ideas that culture is homogeneous, considered an individual act rather than a circumstantial phenomenon, always evenly shared among a group, that an individual can possess one single culture, that culture is synonymous with custom and lastly, that it is timeless. Avruch (1991:16) makes a key point, that together, these mutually
reinforce each other, but more so, are used in politics as a mean to invoke nationalist ideas. Here, the important matter is that it becomes a tool of escalating conflict rather than working positively in conflict transformation. But on the other side of the coin is a potential benefit, that the use and understanding of culture can also be the way forward to conflict transformation and de-escalation. A little later during the nineties, Abu-Nimer (1996: 35, 36) explored the differences between the “West” versus the “Middle East” and what conclusion he could draw, formulating the idea of different assumptions underlying the different approaches between the regions. In 1999, William I. Zartman contextualized this further by drawing on cases from Africa. He concluded that even though the conflicts of today are different and might be not what these traditional mechanisms present where used for in the beginning, the incompatibilities in core of conflicts, are still African issues and hence “resistant to international methods” (Zartman, 1999: 4), since they are ignorant to the traditional setting of the conflicts. All these responded to the critique that academia on conflict resolution was primarily written from the “West” point of view.

Simultaneously as the argument to why these mechanisms are beneficial for conflict resolution, researchers also started to explore the different characteristics of various conflict resolution mechanisms drawn from different cases (Abu-Nimer, 1996: 49, 50; Ahorsu and Ame, 2011: 6; Gellman and Vuinovich, 2008: 127; Zartman, 1999: 224, 225). For instance, Gellman and Vuinovich (2008: 135-137) stated the importance of the mediators’ authority and the concept of dignity in the case of Israeli-Palestinian negotiations, which strongly differentiates between the two. In addition to Abu Nimer’s (1996: 44) argument, they make the main argument
that assessing local practices of peace-making into international negotiations in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict is beneficial for peace since it assures the underlying interests in a way western peace-making does not (Gellman and Vuinovich, 2008: 139). Similarly, Ahorsu and Ame (2011: 29) explores how communal conflict can be more effectively solved though what they call “mediation with a traditional flavor”, meaning the use of traditional ways of solving conflicts, integrated with some western practices. Albeit their argument being centered around “Eve philosophy” in Ghana, Togo and Benin, it makes good point that commitment to processes increased parties willingness to negotiation (Ahorsu and Ame, 2011: 6, 7, 29).

If one looks the other way, and asks the question “why the more generalized, say, “western” models does not work?” During the same year as Gellman and Vuinovich (2008) published their paper, Roger Mac Ginty (2008) contributed to the debate by claiming that the template model for peace-making, which goes hand in hand with liberal peace theory, “fails to deliver” the aspired peace. This is due to it being too generalized, ignoring contextual differences and needs for peace (Mac Ginty, 2008: 143-145). Some scholars have even go further and claimed the interventionist peace-building approach adopted by the united nations, amounts to a post-colonial rationality still existing among interventionist states (Vivienne Jabri, 2013: 8, 9). Moreover, there has been comments on the

---

1 Mac Ginty (2008:143) refer to the “liberal peace to be the concept, condition and practice” where the international community “promote their version of peace through peace-support interventions” and argues that the phrase is effective in its description as a “conceptual vehicle for the interrogation of internationally supported peace-making”. This is also what I will refer too when I use the term “liberal peace-making”.
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dangers of romanticizing all indigenous practices since it might reinforce toxic hierarchies present in conflicting societies (Mac Ginty, 2008: 157, 158). For instance, the structures within the already existing processes within conflicting societies can be part of what prevents a certain group’s wellbeing (Sanauddin et al., 2015) and in addition, it could ignore the root issue which led to the conflict in first place (Abu-Nimer, 1996). Later on, Mac Ginty and Richmond goes a step further and identifies a “local turn” within the practice of peace-making. The two authors admit their conclusion is an uncomfortable fact for the international community, but their point is nevertheless on point in identifying the turn which has occurred:

“The ‘local turn’ in the study of peace and conflict can be understood within the context of critical approaches. It is a recognition of the diffuseness of power (even the ‘normative’ power of the UN, donors, and the EU) and its circulation, of the importance of culture, history and identity, the significance of local critical agency and resistance, of the unintended consequences of external blueprints, and of rights and need in everyday contexts.” (Mac Ginty and Richmond, 2013: 769)

One has seen that the liberal peace agenda, as it also might be called, will strive to implement its way and in the process itself, raise the risk of violence (Autesserre, 2017: 123).

Moreover, Hanna Leonardsson and Gustav Rudd (2015: 824) picked up a few years later after Mac Ginty and Richmond (2013). They conducted a review on existing literature where they concluded the local turn can be divided into two approaches. The first being the “effective approach” and the other being the “emancipatory approach”. They are divided in the way they perceive the role of the local. Whereas the effective approach
underline “the sub-national arena as an actor” in the peacemaking process, the emancipatory approach is underlining the importance of the “everyday events” and to integrate local agencies into the way to peace (ibid: 824). When Séverine Autesserre analyzed the local further in 2017, she identified a key issue where local peace-making supported by international actors had higher risk of failure. This even though the local approach had higher success of peace than the opposite (Autesserre, 2017: 126).

Altogether, these authors touch upon important aspect of the subject matter, however they miss out on the potential importance of legitimacy in the peace-making process, even though they touch upon it briefly. One who gets closer, is Geoffrey Swenson (2017: 34, 35) who concludes that if a peacemaking process is to work, it has to be aligned with the legitimate legal order in the society it strives to change. Otherwise, any implementation will fail since there will be pluralistic legal orders concurring with each other, undermining whatever is introduced to a former conflicting society (ibid: 35).

In Billerbeck and Gippert’s (2017: 273, 274) comprehensive review on legitimacy in conflict studies there are few links made to traditional peacemaking. Albeit “the local” being mentioned various times, it is usually in relation to the actors involved or local legitimacy among audiences. Nevertheless, they make important points considering the “audiences of legitimacy, the sources of legitimacy, and legitimation” by visualizing how these emerges, changes and matter between various actors in the context of peace and conflict studies (ibid: 282). To summarize their conclusion, they find “that legitimacy functions in less explicit and often counterintuitive ways” within empirical findings. Hence, it could also be said to be
“scarce” albeit numerous parties working to increase it in practice (ibid: 283).

Arguably, one can see a clear gap here, where the legitimacy brought by using traditional peace-making is rarely touched upon. But on the other hand, the legitimacy-debate is almost as oblivious towards the potential role of traditional conflict-solving mechanisms as a source for legitimacy. Could, potentially, traditional peace-making be one of the “counterintuitive ways” or sources which brings legitimacy? Billerbeck and Gippert (2017: 277, 280) does talk about different actors on the local, national and international level as well as institutions. One finding, is that use of force and effectiveness is crucial on the way towards legitimization. However, use of force can undermine the host-nations sense of legitimacy for the intervener, but lack of effectiveness will also do so (ibid: 281). In the end, their work made a considerate contribution to the debate on legitimacy, but still miss the potentially important source of traditional practices within conflicting societies.

To summarize, this captures what this study will explore, relating to the research question at hand; How does use of traditional peace-making affect legitimacy in the peace-process?

2.2 Causal chain

The theoretical claim in this study is that when the peace-making process is based on traditional peace-making practices (X), parties involved will find the peace-making process more legitimate (Y).
What are the theoretical arguments behind the causal chain presented above? First of all, there will be careful conceptualization and definition of what constitutes traditional peace-making versus Mac Ginty’s (2008: 145) “Western” peace-making. Thereafter, an explanation of legitimacy and its relation to traditional peace-making will be explained.

*Traditional peace-making versus the “Western” peace-making*

To begin with, traditions and culture is important in peace-making. Along with “emancipatory approach” within the local turn in peace-making, (Leonardsson and Rudd, 2015: 831-833), I state that the importance of including traditional peace-making methods in the peace process to ensure local agency. Local agency is ensured by incorporating “everyday practices”, which could be formulated as “the way people make their lives the best they can, manipulating with whatever tools and tactics are at their disposal the surrounding natural, social, economic and political structures, local and global, that empower or constrain their lives” (Ibid: 833). In this study, my argument reminds of this one, albeit slightly different. Instead of viewing “everyday practices” as the key factor to include in peace-building, I further specify traditional peace-making to be the main component to include in the peace-making process. Mac Ginty (2008: 145, 146) explains traditional peace-making to be rooted in “long-established practice and local custom”. He makes a fair conceptualization of the subject, and carefully notes that albeit it constitutes considerable possibilities, one should be careful in romanticising the practices excessively. Same goes for the equation of Western peace-making, which “should not be automatically disregarded as imposed, harmful and culturally inappropriate” (Mac Ginty, 2008: 149, 150). Moreover, he makes the point that in many cases,
these local conflict resolution mechanisms have not succeeded in preventing eruption of conflict. However, Avruch’s (1991: 14-16) key point plays role here; that even though culture and traditions can be used to escalate conflict, it can also be a tool for the opposite.

We have seen in the section on previous research that there is a clear need of definition on what constitutes traditional peace-making. One could mildly mark on the fact that a clear definition of what “the local” constitutes has many variations. Researchers has discussed this multi-dimensional coin of a concept for some time now. To call it “traditional peace-making” as done in this study is usually not the normal case and ultimately, there is not a phrase which one could argue constitutes the norm in this context. This was brought up in the introduction, where it was noted that traditional is often intertwined or seen the same as indigenous, cultural or local (Galvanek and Planta, 2017: 5). Katja Seidel (2017: 485) commented on the issue that what is considered local is still largely “unspecified” and others define traditional peace-making as “long-established practice and local custom” (Galvanek and Planta, 2017: 21), and carefully notes that these practices are not universal but “context-specific”. I will draw from their definition by defining traditional peace-making as long-established practice and local custom within the conflicting context. I will also distinguish traditional from purely religious practices since traditional can be inter-religious and not only limited to a certain faith as seen in the cases used by Abu-Nimer (1996: 41) and Gellman & Vuinovich (2008: 127). The former exemplifies how a traditional peace-making process, where the conflicting parties was Christians and Druze where led through mediation by a Muslim (Abu-Nimer, 1996: 41). The latter explains the practice of a Sahla, which traditionally has been a, originally Arab, conflict-solving
mechanism used by both the Jewish and Palestinian population in Israel (Gellman and Vuinovich, 2008: 129, 130). The term traditional peace-making will be used because of three reasons. First, Mac Ginty’s (2008: 145) choice of words in his work on the “indigenous peace-making” provides a sufficient conceptualization of what constitutes, what he calls, indigenous peace. He defines it as “conflict-management techniques that are based on long-established practice and local custom” (ibid: 145, 146). In this thesis, I will draw from Mac Ginty’s definition, but instead of using indigenous the term traditional will be adopted. Hence, the definition will be formulated as following: “Traditional peace-making are conflict-management techniques and methods based on long-established practice and local custom”.

Why should traditional peace-making and not “Western” peace-making create incentives for higher legitimacy? One reason is due to the reason that traditional mechanisms provides local agency more effectively. Swenson (2017: 7) It is not merely something artificially implemented without connection to the conflicting parties, but are part of something which is legally normative. Even though his article which primarily turns to policy recommendations for international interventions and rule-of-law implementations, he catches the issue at hand perfectly: Any implementation, reform or policies, must be aligned with the people’s view of what is legally legitimate (Swenson, 2017: 30, 35). What is Swenson’s (2017: 2) argument behind this statement? He explains that when there is legal pluralism within a host state, the concurring “systems” will undermine each other, and hence will any implementation fail. Arguably, this is applicable in the context of traditional peace-making and will be part of the theoretical argument in this study. Ultimately, I claim that artificially implementing a “western” way of solving conflicts, the so-called liberal peace theory
discussed earlier, would just produce an illegitimate outcome. Swenson’s (2017:5) argument also applies to the peace-making process, not merely implementation of foreign rule-of-law promotions by foreign intervenors. Hence, I will argue that traditional practice has to constitute an integral part of the peace-making process, otherwise it will not have legitimacy among the conflicting parties and hence the peace agreement reached will be undermined. Agreeing with Mac Ginty’s writings on the liberal peace which defines the liberal peace as: “the concept, condition and practice whereby leading states, international organizations and international financial institutions promote their version of peace through peace-support interventions, control of international financial architecture, support for state sovereignty and the international status quo” (Mac Ginty, 2008: 143). This approach to peace-making, as we have seen, is controversial.

Legitimacy and traditional peace

First one needs to ask the question; what is legitimacy? In this thesis, I will draw from Levi et al.’s (2009: 356, 357) conceptual model on legitimacy. Legitimacy is key in securing compliance with policies, laws and rules, which all can be argued are important parts in peace-making and re-establishing a peaceful society and a new government’s success (ibid: 355). They describe it as a two-step process where value-based legitimacy creates behavioural legitimacy, where the first step is a consequence out of “trust-worthiness of government and procedural justice”. When it comes to the former one, they conclude three component which amounts to a “trust-worthy government”; government performance, leadership motivations, administrative competence. The primary one is in their model foremost focused on provision of goods and securing social welfare. The second,
leadership motivations considers the trustworthiness of leaders and are based on “personal traits, histories, and identities” (ibid: 358). Lastly, administrative competence constitutes considerate source of legitimacy if successful; namely if government is viewed as honest in addition to authority in implementing rule of law and policies. Levi et al. (2009: 359) also underlines procedural justice as an important component of legitimacy, since procedures are dependent on its citizens to experience them normatively consistent. Tom R. Taylor (2006: 377) stated in his piece on legitimacy and psychology that legitimacy occurs “when people view their authority as being appropriate and proper, with the consequence that they feel obligated to defer to the decisions made by leaders with legitimacy and the policies and rules they create” (Ibid: 393). In essence, this means that it gives the authorities an addition tool for support when power and “deterrence strategies” fails to do so. Moreover, he makes the claim that when a “new government comes into being”, legitimacy must be established otherwise it will not succeed (ibid: 377, 382), which self-evidently makes it crucial as a component in peace-building. Here, Taylor (2006: 378) further specifies to a number of “justifications”, which is what makes a social system accepted according to the norms within the context. In this study, I consider traditional peace-making processes to be this integral component which creates this legitimization, which ultimately leads to greater commitment to the peace-making process. I will draw from Taylor (2006: 393) definition on legitimacy and define it as following:

Legitimacy occur when people view their authority as being appropriate and proper, with the consequence that they feel obligated to defer to the decisions made by leaders with legitimacy and the policies and rules they create.
2.4 Hypothesis

To conclude the theoretical argument, the hypothesis is formulated as following:

Hypothesis: *That use of traditional peace-making processes will have a positive effect on legitimacy of peace-making process.*
Traditional peace-making will have a positive effect on trustworthiness of government and procedural justice, which ultimately leads to higher legitimacy of peace-making process. Consequently, and according to theory put forth above, this thesis’ claim would expect the following to be applicable in the case of liberal peace-making as described by Mac Ginty (2008); namely, that liberal peace-making will lead to lower levels of legitimacy.

2.5 Scope conditions

This section will explain the limitations to the theory used in this study (Powner, 2015: 24). Notably, this study is limited to peace-making within states. This is due to the fact that the cases will be selected on the subnational level, and hence one must note that it could not be applied between inter-state conflicts.

Another important note to make, is how the selected cases might affect the scope of theory. Swenson (2017) conducts his study on the case of Afghanistan, a highly clan-based society where the clan’s authority has in some ways been the only “present” form of governance in a state where the government itself might have had loose authority in the outer regions. This of course affected his study, in the same way the selected cases in this thesis do here.

Moreover, the study will focus on peace-making within a five-year span of the process, which of course also could affect the applicability of the theory proposed.
3.0 Research design

So far, we have presented the theory on which this thesis relies on. Now, there will be a presentation on the case selection, method of choice and then operationalization of the variables. Lastly, there will be a table which visualizes the expected observable indicators which have been deducted from the presented theory.

3.1 Methods and case selection

*Structured focused comparison*

To test the relationship between the variables, I will conduct a qualitative case study through a structured focused comparison. Despite the potential interest in doing a quantitative study on the topic, one could argue a qualitative study is more fitting for the goal at hand and allows for a more detailed examination of the causal argument within the cases. I will formulate a pre-established set of questions which will be asked neutrally to both cases. This will allow for a careful examination of the results and later analysis (Powner, 2015: 105).

Cases will be examined between a five-year time frame, from the beginning of peace-process/intervention.
Table I: Questions for structured focused comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Independent variable: Traditional peace-making versus “Western” peace-making** | i. Were the peace-making conducted in an internal or external process?  
ii. Was the peace process implemented according to the normative legal landscape?  
(1) How was the structure of the peace-making process?  
(2) How was leadership conducted? If negotiations,  
(3) How was mediation conducted between former combatting parties? |
| **Dependent variable: Legitimacy** |  
D1: Government | i. Was the new government considered as legitimate?  
(1) Effective solving of disputes  
(2) Emerging concurrent legal procedures |
| D2: Leadership | ii. Was leadership’s legitimacy established?  
(1) Credible commitment from leaders |
| D3: Administrative structure | iii. Where administrative structure legitimized?  
(1) Capacity to implement rules and regulations: Disarmament and security |
| D4: Procedural justice | iv. Procedural justice  
(1) Fair peace-process according to legal norms  
(2) Citizens influence on peace process: Self-ownership |

Operationalization of variables

Illustrated above are the questions which will be used when conducted the structured focused comparison of the two cases. The independent variable will be coded as a dichotomous variable to fit the thesis’ purpose. However, there will be detailed description of each case peace-process to in greater detail be able to account for the causal chain within the data.
Legitimacy has been operationalized as four separate dependent variables, and further categorized as ordinal variables, where the exact differences between each category is not precise (Powner, 2015: 83, 84). I will order the data found of each dependent variable as 3-1, representing (3) high legitimacy, (2) low legitimacy, (1) contested legitimacy. Here, the higher the score equals higher legitimacy, and a case which score 12 would constitute a case with high legitimacy in all listed components as visualized above.

Something which could have raised the validity of these measurements are of course if the data collected could have been gathered from first-hand sources from interviews. However, I believe these indicators, which one can find in the following section, are properly formulated to indeed explain what is expected to be found according to the theoretical argument.

**Table II: Observable indicators deducted from theory**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variable</th>
<th>Traditional peace making</th>
<th>Liberal peace-making</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Mac Ginty, 2008: 140,)</td>
<td>Internal process</td>
<td>External intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Ibid: 144)</td>
<td>Traditional means:</td>
<td>“Western” peace-making:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Peace-making based on long-established tradition and custom</td>
<td>1. Humanitarian intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Leadership formed in relation from traditional leaders and practice</td>
<td>2. Leaders decided by the international community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Mediation based on custom</td>
<td>3. Mediation conducted according to Western norms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3.2 Case selection

The choice fell on a between-case design (Powner, 2015: 105). However, a prominent criticism within research on “the local” have argued that “local” is usually considered the same as national. By taking this critique with me into this thesis, the level of analysis will be drawn from within the same state, conducted on a sub-national level, albeit different regions to still amount to a between case-study. William Zartman published in 1999 his book on “Traditional Cures for Modern Conflicts” which contains various cases of conflicts where traditional methods of peace-making has been used. It lists various cases; Traditional practice’s in Igboland in Nigeria, the conflict between Ghana and Togo, the “fulbe” practice in Senegal, Niger and Northern Nigeria, Lebanon, Palestine, South Africa and Somalia (Zartman, 1999: vii, viii:). I will choose strategically according to how
similar the cases are and ensure there is a difference of the independent variable, this method is called Mill’s method of agreement (Powner, 2015: 105). Inevitable, selecting cases from a purely strategical stance comes with certain disadvantages and constitutes a weakness in this thesis. First of all, I will ensure that the case is a case of intra-state conflict. Hence, the case of Ghana and Togo fall short. Also, I want to ensure that a humanitarian intervention was conducted under the selected timeframe within a certain region of the state. Somalia fulfills these two criteria’s (Clarke and Herbst, 1996). In addition, Autesserre (2017: 118) stated in her study on “the local”, that Somaliland amounts a to an exceptional example where the peace-making process did not have actors intervening but instead an internal peace-process based on traditional values.

Moreover, by taking my cases from within one state I can control that certain political and social aspects are as similar as can be at the start of the selected timeframe. The selected control variables to ensure a more reliable result are; shared history, shared identity, colonial history.

To ensure that the region of Somaliland and South Somalia is compatible with the goal of this thesis. I have control for the following components: Shared history, shared identity and their colonial history. Arguably, in 1991 when the civil war erupted following the overthrowing of the Siad Barre-regime (UCDP, 2017), both regions stood at the same starting point. The landscape in Somalia is considerably similar throughout the country, with two major rivers in the South and higher mountains in the north (The World Factbook, n.d.). Albeit some research has argued that this could potentially constitute a reason for higher likeliness of conflict in mountainous areas, others have stepped back on this statement to take a more
careful approach (Linke et al., 2017: 532). Arguably, the slight difference in terrain could amount to some differences, but not constitute a sufficient cause to doubt the result. When it comes it identity in Somalia, the answer becomes more complex. Somalia has for a long time been a clan-based society. Overall, 85% of the population are Somali, whereas the remaining 15% are a mix of Bantu-people, Arab and “non-Somalis” (The World Factbook, n.d.). The clan system constitutes a fundamental structure of the whole Somalian society (Yoshimura, 2009: 7, 8). Here we can see that it has not, historically, been less important in Somaliland or South Somalia. Hence, we can rule out that its different identities could constitute a confounding variable. Lastly, Somalia has been under colonial rule. Here, Somaliland was under the British protectorate while the rest of Somalia was under the Italian rule (The World Factbook, n.d.), which could constitute a potential contributing factor when the two colonial powers operated differently. Somaliland was colonized around 1840s by Britain and South-Central Somalia was colonized 50 years later, but part of the most Southern parts of Somalia was then part of British Kenya. They both remained under colonialization until the 1960s when the United Nation declared that the nation was going to gain independence and become one unified nation (Haldén, 2008: 21, 22).

Due to lack of time and space in this thesis, Puntland as a region will not be included. Of course, including this region could have constituted an interesting case when the process there combined both liberal peace-making om addition to the traditional peace-making process.

3.3 Sources of data
First of all, in an ideal world the material and data collected for this thesis would have been collected from first hand sources. However, the case and resources at hand limits the data collection to rely on second-hand sources. More specifically, I will rely in various case studies written on the Somalian peace-building process, books published in addition to reports written by NGO’s operating in the context. Second and third-hand sources are of course not optimal. Legitimacy is a complex concept and as done by Sabrow (2017), interviews is one of the more reliable ways to collect data on the phenomena selected. Nevertheless, this thesis will not be able to conduct such a data collection, and will hence have to rely on second- and third-hand sources. This open up for the potential issue of biases and not completely neutral information. Along with the critique introduced earlier, much written on Somalia is written by “Western” authors and academics, who might not fully grasp the context in accordance with its true reality. Moreover, biases can also be present through the information presented in these sources; maybe the interviewed persons alter the information somehow? Maybe there is information “falling between the chairs” due to interpretation errors or language barriers? Of course, these are all important issues to bear in mind when reading this. The reports used are drawn from UN sources, such as Ref World and the United Nations official websites for peacekeeping missions. In addition, some data is gathered from United Instituted of Peace and the Uppsala Conflict Database Program. These are arguably credible sources which hold great legitimacy when it comes to the research on peace and security, hence useful sources for this thesis.
4.0 Results and analysis

The data collected will now be presented case by case. To begin with, the reader will receive an explanation of the traditional legal landscape of Somalia and thereafter a historical recap of the situation prior to our selected timeframe. Then, the data collected on Somaliland will be brought forth followed by the findings on South-East Somalia. Each section will begin with a throughout description of the peace-building process of each case, then follow by the data found on the dependent variables.

The traditional structure of Somalia

The traditional structure in Somalia can at the surface be explained as three-fold. First, there is the social structure, meaning the clan system. Then, the judicial and political part, which are the elders. Lastly, are the customary laws, called the xeer. The clan-based society works through kinship which are determined through “agnatic (patrilineal) lineage” (Yoshimura, 2009: 7), which is based on the male’s heritage as done in a patrimony. Hence, a person’s lineage determines the persons place in the social order in traditional Somali society (Pham, 2013: 4, 5). Within this society one can categorize different groups, but also within one lineage there is subcategories; clan families, clans and mag-paying groups. The first one is considered the “upper limit of clanship” but “can count up to 30 generations to a common ancestor” (Yoshimura, 2009: 7, 8). Moreover, the clan family limits usually down to the 20 generations closest to the
common ancestor, whereas the “primary lineage” goes even closer and only accounts to them who are within the ten closest generation from the common ancestor. In the “top” are what they call the “mag-paying group” who are key when it comes to being able to pay “the mag” if need is there. The mag could be translated to “blood depts” and is the currency which the members pay for if someone in their clan are indebted by his or her actions on another clan’s cattle, territory or overall property (ibid: 8, 9). Due to the group’s centrality in the political and social contract between the clans, they are per definition key actors for the customary law – the xeer. The oday, which the elders also are called, are key in upholding that “the terms of the xeer are honored”. There are sub-division between the elders as well, where different elders hold different authority (ibid, 2009: 10, 11). The most important body of elders is named “guurti or akhyaar” (Menkhaus, 2000: 186). Some have more of a representational role within the xeer than actual political influence while other holds greater decision-making influence. In addition to being very limiting for women and minorities in Somalia, this system is “in conflict with both international human rights standards and Islamic Sharia law” (Yoshimura, 2009: 10, 11).

A short historical recap prior to 1991

In 1991, rebel groups overthrew the former Siad Barre regime in Somalia. The regime had been ruling Somalia since 1969 when it replaced the former clan-system with “scientific socialism”. However, discontent was prominent (UCDP, 2017). Somalia found itself in conflict with Ethiopia, experiencing clan-based conflict across the broader albeit peace-making efforts between the states. The army did not support the government’s efforts make peace and hence, rebels broke out of the army (Taub, 2014).
Towards the end of the 1980s and then beginning of the next decade, rebels succeeded in overthrowing the government. This escalated violence clan-based armed groups and prompted a civil war (UCDP, 2017).

4.1 Results

**Somaliland: Traditional peace-making:**

i. *Intervention versus traditional peace-making*

In May, 1991, Somaliland declared itself independent from the rest of Somaliland, something which today is still disputed (Dirir Abdi, 1996). While doing so, the Somali National Movement, from now on called SNM, kicked out the armed forces and took the lead themselves (Menkhaus, 2000: 188). When ONUSOM II was underway in 1993, Somaliland opposed it’s planned presence in their territory, which authorities considered “needless and superfluous”. Also, they formulated a communiqué to the UN during the Borama Conference which declined any intervention or implementation of an interim government when they already had sorted their internal affairs themselves (Renders, 2012: 121 - 123). Nevertheless, the UN kept undermining the peace-process in Somalia by inviting illegitimate representative to their “peace process” which focused more on top-down organized unification on Somalia than actual stability and peace (ibid: 125, 126).

i. *The peace process in relation to the normative legal landscape*

In contrast to the Barre regime, the SNM decided to lift up the traditional identity as a key feature throughout the process and into its new
constitution. Elders became an integral part of the new political sphere throughout the peace-process. The SNM codified in the law that the elders were responsible to ensure that the xeer was followed among the clans as well as “to encourage and safeguard peace”. By doing so, the guurti became “the formal structure of the Somaliland state” (Renders, 2012: 91, 92). The guurti, became the upper house of the government in Somaliland (HISP, 2015: 52). During 1991 and 1993 there were 16 traditional peace conferences in Somaliland, all based on traditional peace-making processes. The elders of various factions represented and negotiated agreements when new problems arose (Renders, 2012: 91, 92, 93, 107). The most prominent cases visible within the case of Somaliland are the Burao conference, followed by the Borama conference. The Burao conference was held already in 1991, here, the elders met “under the shade of the acacia trees” and agreed to declare independence. Then, in 1993, was the Borama conference held. With 500 representatives, elders from Somaliland’s clans, the conference succeeded in electing a president, formulate and approve a charter, but maybe most importantly, initiative the demobilization of the militias of various clans (Ismail, 2003: 276). Here, we can see that the leadership was strictly according to traditional norms and values. The elders were part of the formation of the peace-making process and followed through the formation of Somaliland. Moreover, one could observe that throughout the peace-making efforts within Somaliland, elders also got the role of mediators between clan conflicts and disputes.

**Legitimacy score**

1. *Were the new authorities considered as legitimate?*
Many of the conflict which continued to play an obstacle to peace within Somaliland was territorial disputes and unpaid debts between the clans. Of course, this played a wider role in peace-process regionally within Somaliland. A proof of the elders’ effectiveness, where that they successfully could invoke “the Somali principle of balaydbalay”. This concept exists as a mechanism which exist so parties can “get a clean slate”. The idea is that grievances should be overruled by handing back what’s stolen in terms of land and property, but at the same time should the mag, blood-depts, be forgotten. This was recalled successfully and through this process they established a fundamental resolution process for future dispute resolution (Forti, 2011: 18). Disputes over land in Somalia are not something rare, primarily due to the landscape (Norton, 2008: ). Nevertheless, the use of traditional mechanisms would establish this custom as “a widely-accepted framework for future negotiations” (Forti, 2011: 18).

While the traditional peace conferences where occurring, the UN stepped in by inviting politicians from the two regions Sool and Sanaag to participate in their reconciliation meetings. When this came to light, the elders from Sool and Sanaag addressed the issue to UNOSOM II and concluded that no representatives from their districts were allowed. In the end, this was ignored by the UN who reached out to local leaders, not holding traditional legitimacy, from Warsengeli and Dhulbahante was “lured into attending an alternative meeting in Garowe”. Meanwhile, the traditional process within Somaliland was occurring in the city of Erigavo. This corrupted the peace-process, created disputes outside the established framework which had been agreed upon in Burao. This a prominent case of when the a concurrent legal authority started to challenge the traditionally
initiated peace-making process within Somaliland, however it did not halt the overall progress (Renders, 2012: 124-126).

**ii. Was leadership’s legitimacy established?**

Between 1991 and 1993, conflict over resources was widespread in Burao, Berbera and Hargeisa. The fighting occurred between the following clans; Habar Yunis, ‘Idagalle, Habar Awal/Saad Muse against Habar Awal/Issa Musa and Habar Ja’lo. The traditional guurti which had been establish to solve the conflict failed since there were not an easy way around the state-resource-sharing problem. The clans fighting had all relations to the first president of Somaliland, Abdirahman Tuur, or other people in his government since all belong to subclans of the Isaaq clan. This prompted the two latter into opposition claiming the government had incentive to not trust them with common-pool resources (Renders, 2012: 93, 96, 97). Due to all factions being part of the Isaaq, the government could not provide sufficient trust when using Isaaq-elders, when different leaders had different connection to the factions. However, instead of relapsing into conflict, the government could enforce peace through choosing elders from the Gadabursi-clan, which stood outside the conflict but still held the authority traditionally needed and good relation with Isaaq (ibid, 97).

By early transfer of power from the SNM to the guurti, all factions experienced higher trust to authorities where the risk of one faction monopolizing the power got decreased. In addition, the long conferences often provided sufficient room for people to be heard and discussion for “injustices and possible remedies”, which made people feel included and
heard. This in end, gave the process higher legitimization and commitment from parties and their leaders where reliable (Ridout, 2012: 151, 152, 153).

iii. Where administrative structure legitimized?

By again incorporating the elders into the process, the authorities of Somaliland introduced a two-key system for the disarmament process where elders of each clan-affiliated militia would be in control of one key each. Hence, if weapons where to be accessed, consent of all parties was needed (Renders, 2012: 128). Moreover, a tax-system could be established after the Borama conference, albeit “not a major source of revenue”, it indicates legitimization (Ibid: 135, 170)

iv. Procedural justice

As stated previously, the length and the structure of the negotiation provided sufficient room for various clans and subclans to feel heard. This was because the length ensured the elders could return to their group and ensure different issues were properly discussed before decisions where taking. In addition, the closeness of the negotiations, not being held outside of Somaliland but within its territory, facilitated participation. Evidently, this provided a sense of procedural justice for the clan-members.

The elders, which could attend the conference since they were held in Somaliland, were often returning to their clans to discuss issues brought forth and hence people got to participate through their elders. In all, this was argued to increase self-ownership of the process (Ridout, 2012: 150-153).
**South-East Somalia**

### i. Humanitarian intervention

UNOSOM I was initiated first as an observation mission in 1991, followed by US-initiated UNITAF which was only mandated to secure humanitarian assistance and then lastly, UNOSOM II which held the broadest mandate of the three and focused on re-building Somalia (Dobbins et al., 2003: 58). At the beginning of 1990s, war was erupting throughout South-Central Somalia. Clan-based conflicts where at the heart of the conflict (Menkhaus, 2003: 409, 410). In the end of 1991 the US had deployed forces to Somalia with Operation Restore Hope, followed by above mentioned UN-led UNOSOM I and UNOSOM II. In addition, there were neighboring states present which made efforts to “broker peace accords among the Somali”, for instance Kenya, Ethiopia and Egypt. In total, between 1991 and 1995, we could see seventeen national-level and twenty local-level initiatives more or less sponsored by the UN (Clarke and Herbst, 1996: 42, 43).

The forces had the right to use the means necessary to ensure that humanitarian recourses and supplies would be able to reach its goal within South Somalia. However, this evolved and was not immediately the case between 1991 -1995. UNOSOM I, being an observer mission, contrasted itself from the US initiated UNITAF-intervention which was an UN-approved enforcement mission. These two was followed by UNOSOM II which were a peace-building mission with more muscles than its predecessor (Adibe et al., 1995:31-39).
ii. *Was the peace process implemented according to the normative legal landscape?*

Peace-making efforts in South-Central Somalia was hence not conducted in a traditional manner. Ken Menkhaus (2003) even described the peace-making efforts as “little of nothing to do with traditional conflict management” and said they were “typically were held in posh hotels in distant regional capitals”. The UN persuaded a top-down approach throughout the peace-making efforts. In December 1992 they invited the fighting warlords of separate clans to negotiate in Addis Ababa (Paffenholz, 2006). The meeting in Ethiopia’s capital was the first out of many international UN-sponsored peace initiatives which in the end were very unsuccessful. Instead of having community representatives in the delegations, “several hundred Somali community leaders attended as observers” (Clarke and Herbst, 1996: 46).

Instead of relying on traditional leaders through the peace-making methods, the UN relied on the warlords as representatives of the people of Somalia. By the time of 1993 and the Addis Ababa talks, the factions had raised to a number of 15 (Menkhaus, 2010: 5).

Mediation was conducted in a Western manner, the UN provided foreign mediators instead of local “elders”. Between 1991 and 1995 there were two major international peace efforts conducted by the UN, the Djibouti-talks and the Addis Ababa National Reconsolidation Talks. But there were also other initiatives, such as the “Nairobi informal talks” in 1994 and the Egypt-initiated Cairo (Menkhaus, 2012). Altogether, the mediation efforts were conducted by focusing on integrating South-Somalia with
Somaliland, in the process misreading the political culture since, lacking neutrality and hence being biased towards certain groups. To conclude, external mediators were lacking the capacity needed and the understanding of the political culture (Menkhaus, 2012).

Legitimacy score

v. Were the new authorities considered as legitimate?

At the time being, one can say there where two bases of power in South-Central Somalia; the same “political authorities which were rooted in traditional forms of peace-making” as where found at the time being in Somaliland but also armed factions. In this situation, those armed were the ones in power and also the ones the UN chose to cooperate with to improve security. In 1992, the mission went from a peace-keeping mission to a peace-enforcement mission (Brons, 2001:)

Local, self-initiated peace efforts emerged to solve some local issues aside of the UN rule-of-law efforts (Clarke and Herbst, 1996: 60). In South-Central Somalia one can observe, as done in Somaliland, a regular occurrence of rural conflicts based on land or access to resources (Keating and Waldman, 2018: 86). In all, one could observe that the only successful peace initiatives in Somalia emerged on the sub-national level. Elders could here operate with each other to stabilize dispute. A previous problem which had occurred with the warlords being leaders of various factions, was that elders experience difficulties communicating with the usually younger warlords which did not share the same knowledge as they did. However, local reconciliation processes outside of Mogadishu succeeded
somewhat by doing so, but they had to be community-based since the cases which were led by armed factions, even though they were local, did not reach the same effectiveness (Clarke and Herbst, 1996: 50-60).

**vi. Was leadership’s legitimacy established?**

At the first meeting in Addis-Abeba, the leaders present agreed to the following: “Cessation of hostilities, complete and rapid disarmament of militias, peaceful restoration of stolen property, and the establishment of a process by which a transitional national council (TNC) would be established to serve as the repository of Somali sovereignty until national elections were held” (Clarke and Herbst, 1996: 45, 46). However, there was not much progress detected on the commitment from leaders present at the meeting. UN peacekeepers was still attacked by an armed faction operating in Mogadishu (Renders, 2012: 121, 122). Neither warlord committed to the agreement as expected, but considered the conferences as a tool to increase their power and status (Clarke and Herbst, 1996: 43)

**vii. Where administrative structure legitimized**

The disarmament efforts committed by the UN and US troops were not as effective as aspired. Prior to the Addis Abeba conference, the disarmament initiatives by UNITAF was firstly considered “benign”. This meant the armed faction could more or less hide the arms at home, and that the US mission would not push further disarmament as long as the weapons was not out on the streets. Another issue was the humanitarian relief operators, in short HROs, present in Somalia was relying on local security personnel which carried arms. However, these security guards could
simultaneously help HROs as well as being part of the armed violence. This created a blurred line between disarmament and securing the humanitarian supply relief. Then, in wake of the Addis Ababa conference and ONUSOM II was initiated, a more conceptualized and detailed plan for disarmament got adopted. A four-step plan was adopted, and it laid the foundation for some success in the beginning of the 90-day period following the conference in Ethiopia. However, the security situation between the different militias and UN troops was deteriorating. The interveners could not secure the arm storages and different armed factions started to “test the resolve of the UNOSOM forces”. Consequently, the UNOSOM troops regulated their ROE. To summarize that regulation, it gave the troop unlimited use of force on armed Somalis, despite location, time or action. This heavily escalated the violence and the disarmament process was terminated when US troops decided to withdraw from Somalia. In the aftermath the mandate was decreased and capacities declined severely (Adibe et al., 1995: 76-95).

viii. Procedural justice

The process implemented by the UN was not only ineffective, but also made no sense in the political culture of South Somalia. For instance, the low-profile negotiations conducted by the international community, did not at all provide the same legitimacy a traditional process would have. Also, this did not leave room the traditional leaders of the xeer. The view of the UN in Somalia escalated so far that the population started to consider the intervening forces as “an occupation army” (Clarke and Herbst, 1996: 43, 44). After the Addis-Abeba conference, where consensus was reached that “bottom-up” decision-making was key, the leaders, in this
case the warlords of the armed factions present, added an appendix reversing this consensus and giving themselves the right to elect representatives, not the communities or the traditional elders. Consequently, this severely undermined the legitimacy of their authority among the Somali communities (Clarke and Herbst, 1996: 46). Also, Somali citizens experienced the intervenors to not listen to their experience or views, undermining the important status of elders and the communities. This eventually developed to a severe series of attacks on UN personnel in Mogadishu and local publications criticized the UN to not cooperating with the nationals (Brons, 2001: 234, 235).

4.2 Analysis

Now, we will analyze the results found in light of the causal argument. Below, there will be a summary of the results in short to facilitate the analysis and clearly state the most important findings. This is followed of a more extensive analysis of the data found in relation to the theoretical framework.

Table IV: Summary of results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X:</th>
<th>Somaliland</th>
<th>South-Central Somalia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional versus “Western” peace-making</td>
<td>Internal process</td>
<td>External intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traditional means:</td>
<td>Humanitarian intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Peace-making based on long-established tradition, the <em>guurti</em> was formalized as the form of negotiation</td>
<td>1. UN mission, US intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Leadership formed in relation from traditional elders</td>
<td>2. Warlords prioritized before elders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Mediation based on custom, use of elders in the <em>guurti</em></td>
<td>3. Mediation conducted according to Western norms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y: Legitimacy</td>
<td>Somaliland</td>
<td>South-Central Somalia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legitimate structure of authority:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Functioning problem-solving mechanisms for minor issues of conflict</td>
<td>i. No national problem-solving plan was successfully implemented by the UNOSOM I/II, UNITAF.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Concurrent legal procedures</td>
<td>ii. Local, traditional initiatives, only successful case of reconciliation was the UN supporting the process but not being directly present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legitimacy score:</strong></td>
<td><strong>High legitimacy (3)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Low legitimacy (2)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leadership:</strong> Trustworthiness based on credible commitment from leaders and representatives</td>
<td>Elders received legitimacy through their normative authority, also commitments became credible due to the lengthy discussions</td>
<td>Warlords represented the people of Somalia during international negotiations, vague credible commitments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legitimacy score:</strong></td>
<td><strong>High legitimacy (3)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Contested legitimacy (1)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administrative structure:</strong> Capacity in implementing rules and regulations: Disarmament initiatives</td>
<td>Elders could through negotiation establish procedures to do successful disarmament of armed factions.</td>
<td>Some effectiveness initially, then escalating difficulties due to change of ROEs, eventually failure and withdrawal of US troops which severely weakened.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legitimacy score:</strong></td>
<td><strong>High legitimacy (3)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Contested legitimacy (1)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Procedural justice:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Perception of fair peace-process according to legal norms</td>
<td>i. Formalized negotiation processes along with the historically legitimate peace-making process in Somalia</td>
<td>i. Completely overlooked the traditional peace-making structures, conferences where held far away, no elders as representation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Citizens influence on peace-process</td>
<td>ii. Citizens could through elders raise their views, get information along the process, hence experiencing higher possibilities to influence, the lengthy process facilitated extensive discussion without overlooking important matters</td>
<td>ii. The people of Somalia experienced themselves ignored with presentation which was not experienced as legitimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Self-ownership</td>
<td>iii. Low self-ownership due to exclusion of local communities and instead inclusion of fighting factions</td>
<td>iii. Low self-ownership due to experience of being de-connected from peace conferences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legitimacy score:</strong></td>
<td><strong>High legitimacy (3)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Contested legitimacy (1)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tot. legitimacy score:</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To begin with, one can state that we found much higher legitimacy in Somaliland’s peace-process than in South-Central Somalia. We also found a strong support in the findings for over theoretical argument. Furthermore, one can observe how relying on the *guurti* quickly established and formalized the conditions for which negotiations were set to occur. It also made clear who the leaders for various clans and communities were. The choice by the UN to call on armed leaders during negotiations was shown to be devastating for the peace process since they did not hold much authority in the communities outside their currently armed capacity. In Somaliland they relied on long-established practice and local custom, and throughout its more normatively accepted process, people experienced greater trust and obligation to follow through being more connected to the process itself through their elders and the geographical closeness. In contrast, the peace-process in South-Central Somaliland was not successful, and the very peace interventions conducted by the UN and the US had by the end of our timeframe had to terminate their missions and UNOSOM II had by 1995 downscaled so much it could not enforce much of its goals at all.

Why was this the case? Throughout the mission there was no sense of legitimacy between the people of Somalia which could compare itself to the one we observed in Somaliland. By choosing the warlords based on their new-won power through armed capacities, the UN and US limited their reach to the people severely. In addition, we found that the local initiatives taken on a much lower level within South-Central Somalia was the only observable cases of some success, however, not for the humanitarian interventions peace-building project since them as well to the Somaliland process, relied on little support from the international community (except of maybe financial). In Somaliland, one could see how the
interventions decision to intervene with local communities in Sool and Sanaag undermined the traditional peace-process. Through picking leaders which, again, did not hold any traditional legitimacy, a dispute of leadership and belonging of the region emerged. Arguably, these two cases support our hypothesis even more when clearly visualizing how a concurrent legal procedure introduced in one case became a failure but the other constituted the only success.

When it came to the use of elders, they received high legitimacy due to their traditional position. Compared to the “younger” warlords, one could see that through both peace processes, the former was more successful. The warlords became more disconnected from the communities and did not commit to their commitments. A clear case of this was the aforementioned Addis-Ababa Peace Conference where we could see that the rushed time, non-fitting choice of leadership, and distance from the actual communities where the peace was supposed to be enforced, did not create a positive outcome at all. The commitments were deemed credible for the former and not the latter. On that note, one also could observe how the leadership affected the capacity to implement the decisions made. Here, I checked specifically for disarmament initiatives and we found two distinguishing features between the cases. In Somaliland, the elders could through their negotiation reach an agreement where a two-key security system had been established. In the other case, the UN-approached faction leaders could not find an agreement with the UN mission which later during their disarmament procedures escalated the conflict and undermined their legitimacy albeit some effectiveness in the early stages. One could hence argue, that the incorporation of the elders what not only crucial for the disarmament process due to organization matters, but also
when it comes to trust among the parties. The elders did not only play a key role for the communities and clans, but could also be effective as negotiators for the armed forces.

The last component checked for, procedural justice, visualized clearly how the sense of procedural justice correlated with the use of traditional peace-making. In the case of South-Central Somalia, the intervention had left people leaving both unheard by the peace-making forces, but also unrepresented by their leaders which ultimately de-legitimized the peace-making process. Factions did not experience self-ownership of the process and complied “on the paper” to decisions, but not in practice, mostly due to the interventions pressure during the stressed, far-off held, and internationally-supported peace-conferences.

One of the more important findings, arguably, is the findings on how other legal procedures existed simultaneously along the majority implemented process in each context and how these played out. In Somaliland, there was evidence that due to UN involvement in Sool and Sanaag created an alternate leadership which eventually led to an incompatibility over leadership in the communities. However, in the context of South-Central Somalia, the alternate legal frameworks emerging on the local levels remained the only effective peace-making processes were the UN were involved (and there they only had limited involvement in those few cases). Now, I believe there is need to link this back to Levi et al.’s conceptual model of legitimacy which was visualized earlier on figure I. The study examined these four components (legitimate structure of authority, leadership, administrative structure, procedural justice), which together supported value-based legitimacy. Consequently, behavioral legitimacy was
encouraged which ultimately lead to compliance of the peace-making efforts. As stated above, this was supported in the case of Somaliland, and that the legitimacy of the peace-making process assured that the structure was upheld and people complied with the regulation and decisions taken. In all, this followed the expected outcome as the theoretical framework proposed. Mac Ginty’s liberal peace-making and traditional peace-making could be operationalized through Levi et al.’s conceptual model of legitimacy as expected.
Before concluding this thesis and give further suggestions for future research, there are a few notes to make about this thesis.

As Zartman (1999) writes, “empirical generalization” is possible to assume by concluding that traditional conflict resolution mechanisms has always existed, prior to, throughout, and after colonialization. They exist everywhere. Hence, one could dare to argue that this idea would be applicable in more than the selected cases, albeit a more quantitative measure of the concepts would be needed to strongly make that claim. The contextual specify in these cases can hence constitute a weakness and limit generality.

The purpose of this study was to examine the role traditional peace-making processes and how it affects levels of legitimacy. It was conducted in contrast to an examination to liberal peace-making which facilitated examination of the causal argument in a more comprehensive manner. The result supported the hypothesis since the findings proved great evidence from the empirical cases. Relating back to the research problem at hand—the lack of studies on the relationship between legitimacy and traditional peace-making, we can now see how this study has fulfilled this gap. However, it does as well open up for more suggestions to what one should examine further, and in greater detail. Partly, one can note that an examination of cases including Puntland would have been further profitable for the nuancing of this study. Puntland differs slightly from both Somaliland
and South-Central Somalia, sharing many attributes with both. Hence, their hybrid mixture of liberal peace-making and traditional peace-making would maybe have offered a slightly different discussion on legitimacy than the one concluded in this thesis. Also, the peace-making process is not always as “black and white” as seen in these cases. In addition, an examination on more local peace-making process could have nuanced the question at hand as well. As we have seen, there where cases within South-Central Somalia where traditional conflict resolution within a context where humanitarian intervention occurred. Making a study and using even more localized or communal conflicts would hence be a clear recommendation for further research on the area, in addition to cases where the line between liberal and traditional peace-making is vague. Lastly, this thesis underlines a few policy implications; the bottom-line being that bottom-up, traditional peace-making is the basis of legitimacy and that muscles (as UNITAF and UNOSOM II in this context), might undermine the local peace-processes by not understanding the normative legal landscape and hence do more harm than good.
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