Ethnic Prejudice and Discrimination of the Somali Minority Groups

-The Image Of The Other As An Enemy

Author: Abdihakim Barre Warsame

Supervisor: Dzenan Sahovic

Semester: Spring 2020

Subject: Masters in peace And Conflict Studies, 30hp

Abstract

This study aims to investigate how the mechanisms of discrimination, othering, prejudice and enemy imaging work in conflict and non-conflict zones.The study further explored if the informants stories differ when in conflict zones. Enemy images theories were used as the theoretical base to investigate how the Somali majorities construct the enemy image of the Somali minorities (The Somali Bantus and the occupational groups). The aim and research questions are answered through a comparative case study that focuses on interviewing two Somali minority groups (occupational groups and the Bantu Somalis) who have the experience and lived both in Somalia (conflict context) and Somaliland (non conflict context). The results of the study show that the majority of Somali clans use the delimitation between "them and us" a set of values that separate the two groups and characterize the minority groups as slaves and people of low social, economic, and political status. The majority groups perceive the minority groups as a threat to their assets and core values. This is what has been described as "our" and "their" essence, and the final aim, which is to legitimize violence, is clear in the data. While on the other hand, the majority groups referred to themselves as superior. The results indicated that there were no differences and only similarities in the narratives of the minority groups living in both conflict and non-conflict zones. This was an interesting discovery which was against the known and expected ideal. This thesis also suggests other ways of looking at the concept of enemy images suggesting further areas of research where deemed necessary.

Keywords: Enemy Images, Challenges,Minorities, Majorities, Clans.

Acknowledgment

Contents

1 Introduction

This study examines the mechanisms of the construction of enemy images and how enemy imaging contributes to discrimination and violence in conflict and non-conflict zones of Somalia and Somaliland, respectively. The construction of enemy images is the basis on which the majority groups perceive the minority groups in Somalia and Somaliland as an enemy, thus propagating discrimination and violence. According to Staub (1992), enemy images are negative stereotypes or thought of as beliefs about individuals or groups that are determined by individual internal variables, external societal contexts, and in-group–out-group dynamics. This study will be relevant in revealing which mechanisms are used to construct enemy images and how stereotyping, prejudice, and othering contribute to enemy image construction among the Somali populace resulting in discrimination and violence and thus come up with recommendations for interventions that can mitigate these vices. Somalia and Somaliland are chosen for this study because the two zones have an ethnically similar populace and are geographically neighbouring one another; however, Somalia is a conflict zone. At the same time, Somaliland is a non-conflict zone that will aid in comparing and contrasting the experience of enemy image construction within the two contexts (conflict and non-conflict zones).

Somalia and Somaliland are strategically located in the horn of Africa. They share a common myth of origin, language, religion, and similar customs, mainly related to pastoral nomadism and camel husbandry (Hoehne, 2015:794). Somalia has experienced civil unrest and destruction of social infrastructure for the past three decades, while Somaliland has had relative peace, good governance, and sustainable development. The Somali populace's cultural setting is based on a clan system whereby the majority clans dominate over the minority clans (Zoppi, 2018:52-69). As a result, the socio-political system is also based according to this cultural hierarchy founded on clans. Under this system, the four major clans, including the Hawiye, Rahanweyn, Dir, and Daarood, form the majority groups. In contrast, the Bantu, and the occupational groups (Yibir and

Gaboye) form the minority groups. (Alasow, 2010:51-62).

Although Somalia is a conflict zone while Somaliland is a non-conflict zone, in both zones, ever since the eruption of civil war in 1991, there has always been tension in one way or another between the majority and the minority groups (Prunier 1995). Minority groups have suffered from marginalization, exclusion from economic, social and political life, cultural acts of violence, and abuse of their right to education and sustainable development. Minority members have also been subjected to hate speech, which has served to perpetuate stereotypes, prejudice, othering, and enemy imaging (Hoehne, 2015:801). These various forms of discrimination and stereotyping have been passed on through oral history, increasing the negative attitudes towards the minority Somalis.This suffering in the form of discrimination and violence experienced by the minority groups living in both Somalia and Somaliland compelled the researcher to pick interest in studying how the majority groups construct enemy images of the minority groups. Therefore, this thesis will apply a structured comparative framework of analysis using enemy images and other related concepts as the theoretical base to find out how the majority groups construct the image of minorities as enemies in Conflict and non-conflict contexts.

The choice of a comparative framework is basically because we want to investigate whether or not the experience of the minority groups regarding enemy imaging is similar or different when living in two social settings distinguished by the presence and the absence of armed conflict. In other words, this study will compare the livelihood of the minority groups in conflict and non-conflict zones. It will also be interesting to discover which factors be it religious, political, or social differences that divide this homogeneous community of the Somali populace so that the majority groups construct enemy images of the minority groups.

1.1 Research Problem And Relevance

The minority groups living in both Somalia and Somaliland, which are herein referred to like conflict and non-conflict contexts respectively, face widespread human rights violations through violence, discrimination, prejudice stereotyping, and enemy imaging created by the majority groups. Segregation, discrimination, and violence against minorities are encapsulated in the well-known Somali sayings Looma ooyaan, and Looma aaraan, meaning no one will weep for you, and no one will avenge for you (Hoehne, 2015:801).

According to the United Nations' Office for Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (UNOCHA, 2019), the minority groups make up to 32 percent (4.8 million people) of the Somali population, which is estimated to have grown to 15 million Somalis. Thus the minority represents a significant population of the Somalis who are at risk of violence and discrimination as a result of enemy imaging. All people belonging to this minority group, such as the Bantu and the occupational groups, are at risk of these vices, indicating that the level of enemy imaging remains high at or above 32 percent of the Somali population.

It is important to note that under ideal circumstances in most conflict zones such as Somalia, the minority groups are expected to experience much more violence and discrimination than when they are living in a non-conflict zone such as Somaliland where relative peace and social inclusion are expected to be experienced. However, despite the presence of relative peace in Somaliland, minority groups continue to experience violence and discrimination. Therefore, it is essential to know how the majority groups construct enemy images of the minority that result in violence and discrimination.

Some scholars argue that ethnic discrimination, prejudice, othering, and conflicts do not follow a simple logic of where conflicts lead to more ethnic prejudice and discrimination or vice versa. Still, it is a complex phenomenon in its own right. Some of the examples of problematic interactions between ethnic discrimination and conflicts have many different facets. One of the challenges conflicts pose to societies is that violent

conflicts or other related political tensions can increase the level of discrimination in societies (Alcorta, Swedlund and Smits, 2020:253).

The construction of an enemy image of the minority groups by the majority groups remains the co-founding factor for the discrimination, abuse, and human rights violation of the minority groups in both Somalia and Somaliland. Enemy image construction is a prerequisite in preparedness for a war that's to fight and kill. An enemy image is here defined as a specific form of a negative stereotype (Stein, 1996). According to Staub (1992), enemy images play an essential role in the maintenance and reinforcement of hostility and antagonism between sections of the population leading to different forms of conflicts. Lederach and Orsini(1998), argued that transforming such conflicts demands more in-depth knowledge of the feelings and the relationships of the different parts, something I expect my study will contribute to the existing knowledge. However, my interest in this research is to understand how the various mechanisms of discrimination, othering, prejudice, and enemy imaging work in conflict and non-conflict zones.

Somalia and Somaliland are good examples of countries dealing with these challenges. Somaliland enjoyed a long period of peace after declaring its independence from Somalia in 1991, while different forms of conflicts have engulfed Somalia since 1991 (Anton, Donald, Shelton, and Dinah, 2011). Therefore, this study will investigate how the majority groups construct the enemy image of the minority groups and whether or not the minority groups' experiences differ in Somalia (Conflict context) and Somaliland (non-conflict context).

1.2 Research Objective and Research Questions

This study aims to investigate how the mechanisms enemy of images construction work both in conflict and non-conflict zones.This study will further explore if the informant's stories differ when in conflict zones. The aim and research questions will be answered through a comparative case study that focuses on interviewing two Somali minority

groups (occupational groups and the Bantu Somalis) who have experienced and lived both in Somalia (conflict context) and Somaliland (non-conflict context).

To achieve our objectives, I have articulated two main research questions that would function as the guideline for our investigation.

1.What do the informants narrate regarding their situation on how the majority, groups construct the image of the minority groups as an enemy image?

11. What are the differences and similarities of the informants narratives while living in Somalia (conflict context) and Somaliland (non-conflict context)

1.3   Background and Somali Clan Structure

This section on the background of the study is designed to familiarize the readers with the background information about Somalia and Somaliland relevant to this study. The section will also briefly cover the clan structure of the Somalis, as well as shed some light on the majority and minority groups in the country.

The Somali territory, which geographically lies in the horn of Africa, is divided into two zones, which are Somaliland in the north and Somalia in the south. This territory is a former colony of both Britain and Italy. Somaliland was a British colony that constituted an independent state for less than a week in 1960 before choosing to unite with a neighbouring ex-Italian colony to form a single Somali state. Although Somaliland has never been internationally recognized as an independent state, when the Somali government collapsed in 1990, Somaliland took advantage of the collapse to renew its claim to statehood, and declared independence in May 1991. Somaliland has emerged as peaceful and prosperous and has been legitimated by several reasonably democratic elections and a relatively effective administration (Mantzikos, 2010: 679). According to Lewis (2008), Somaliland statehood, which is herein referred to as a non-conflict zone or context, is the product of an evolving negotiation between different actors, including politicians, business people, and military men. The success of Somaliland was built on the founda-

tions of clan-based reconciliation between Isaaq and other clan families of the northwest. Despite the critics of the power-sharing model in Somaliland, it has installed a comparatively stable government and held a series of elections that have been declared relatively free and fair by international observers (Walls, 2009: 371).

On the other hand, looking to the case of Somalia, which is herein referred to as a conflict zone or context, is a country that has suffered a political and humanitarian disaster for the past three decades. The country has been cited as a failed state due to political, economic, and social challenges. According to Robert (2002), who uses the term "failed state" for Somalia to describe a territory that is tense, deeply conflicted, dangerous and bitterly contested by warring factions and harbouring non-state actors and war-lords. Despite the international efforts to stop the conflict, some parts of Southern Somalia remains in the hands of a rejectionist jihadi group, al-Shabaab, which continues to launch deadly terrorist attacks in the capital of Mogadishu (Menkhaus, 2017: 133).

When comparing the two zones, its quick to noted that Somaliland had enjoyed peace and stability while Somalia has endured three decades of civil war. However, both zones face legendary corruption levels because the acting governments are not accountable for any resources or revenues.

Lastly, it is very crucial to address the clan structure of the Somali community since this study aims to understand and compare the discrimination and stigmatization which the Somali minority groups experience in both Somalia and Somaliland. Although outside observers and the international community might think that the clan system is negligible in both zones, it is a very sensitive and remains a vital element of politics throughout the territory. This has had catastrophic results for international policy towards Somalia, which has more often than not been characterized by a failure to understand the intricacies of Somali society and politics. The clan structure has remained socially and politically crucial in Somalia before and after the civil war broke out in 1991. The last constitutional reform done by the Somali government and the international community

was based on a power-sharing model named 4.5. This means that all the four significant clans had to get equal powers' share while minorities, in this case, were given half of what the majority groups got. The majority groups customarily named the nobles, belong to four patrilineal clan families made up of the Daarood, Hawiye, Dir, and Rahanweyn (Digil and Mirifle).In contrast, the minority groups are mainly Bantu (Jareer), The Benadiri, and the occupational groups. The majority groups, mostly nomadic pastoralists, have continued to dominate modern government, politics, the economy, and urban life since independence from colonial rule in 1960. The minority have little participation in the socio-economic and political issues of the territory.

In this thesis, we focus on the Somali minority groups of the Bantus and the occupational, cultural caste groups. These groups are chosen since they represent the largest and the most "othered" and discriminated groups. The Bantu are the largest ethnic minority in Somalia and distinguished from the rest of the Somali population by their appearance. The occupational caste groups are noble groups who were defeated and had fallen after a war against another group or descendants of the first inhabitants of the horn of Africa.

Therefore, it's with such a background that clan-based differences create fundamental animosity between the majority and minority clan groups. The study is interested in investigating how the majority groups construct the image of the minority groups as an enemy image in both Somalia and Somaliland. These two study areas (Somalia and Somaliland) were chosen because they provided the most suitable location and state of affairs where both perspectives of conflict and non-conflict contexts of Somalia and Somaliland, respectively. The chosen areas can be studied, compared, and contrasted through narratives and experiences from inhabitants who have lived in both locations at one point in their lives. Also, another intention for choosing these two study areas is for the fact that both Somalia and Somaliland are neighbouring each other and share a common populace that has a similar ancestry, language and religion and a large portion of the minority groups' population has lived in both areas at one point of their lives. This

is good for the study since it seeks to compare and contrast the experience of the minority groups while living in Somalia and Somaliland as regards how the majority groups construct enemy images.

Map of somalia and Somaliland, Source, Somali gov website.

1.4 Disposition

This thesis is organized into seven chapters. The introductory chapter introduces the topic, the research questions, and a background section that gives the reader a historical background of Somalia and Somaliland.The background also briefly covers the clan

structure of the Somali community.

The second chapter discusses the previous research done on enemy image construction. The third chapter covers the theoretical base and the related concepts chosen and provides a comprehensive picture of the theoretical concepts. The sections also include the operationalization of the theoretical concepts.

The fourth chapter provides a detailed discussion of the methodological approach, applicability of the method, and the ethical considerations of the study. It also contains the research design, the material, selection of interviews, data collection, and data analysis.

The fifth chapter discusses the empirical findings concerning the theoretical framework and answers the research questions. This chapter also contains a comparative analysis section discussing whether there are differences or similarities between the two regions (Somalia and Somaliland). The last two chapters are the discussion chapter that gives personal reflections, discussions, and the conclusion chapter that finalizes the thesis.

2 Previous Research

This section provides a review of related literature from different authors, and prior studies did as regards the construction of enemy images.

According to Pettersson (2009), for an image to be defined as an enemy image, some critical criteria must be fulfilled. Pettersson further suggests that the enemy image has to be the hegemonic concept of stereotyping and dehumanizing. Harle (2000) argues similarly to define an enemy image; there must be a clear distinction between the own and the others (the enemies). In this regard, to define the enemy, we need to describe these groups and find out what values are said in this group to inhabit. From a psychological point of view, "an enemy image refers to a set of beliefs or to the hypotheses and theories that an individual or group is dangerous to another individual or group and are convinced

that such beliefs are valid. (Ottosen, 1995).

In other words, an enemy image is a "culturally influenced, very negative, and stereo-typed evaluation of the' other" (Staub:1992). This image can be reinvigorated and rein-forced via written words, such as newspapers, magazines, media images (TV, movies), or political leaders' speeches that further worsen the stereotypical negative traits. Begin-ning with the definition of enemy images, the idea of "us" and "them" as the enemy can be defined simply by saying the other is fundamentally different from "us" (Harle, 2000: 5). In this definition, the other has to be perceived in some ways; for example, the "other" represents the injustice, and the wrong, while "we" serve the justice and the good. For an enemy image to be created, there must be two opposing sides that is "we" and "them," or "us" and "them." A good example is for the "other" to function as a social order; one must tell the difference between those who commit a crime and those who follow the law (Harle, 2000, 5). However, the vital point to bring into the discussion here is not all "others" are enemies, or the differences between "us" and "them is not enough to define the enemy as the threat (Harle, 2000; 13-15).

A good number of scholars agree that societies accept enemy images. One reason why societies or we accept an enemy image has been explained by the evolutionary psychology theory, which is the "survival of the fittest." For us human beings to survive, we need to belong to a particular group. Not only surviving but also there is what we call paranoid path in this case, which is to be suspicious, fear, and distrust of the outsider. The paranoid that we possess as human beings and this psychological life is being dominated by fear and hatred of strangers (Post; 1999: 338). Many have also explained this idea by arguing that once we feel insecure and fear, we build stress, and finally, we will need to act to secure ourselves from these urgent threats (Vergani and Bliuc, 2015:7-20).

An enemy image cannot consist only in feelings of dislike or antipathy; it always in-volves the possibility of violence and destruction. It is a matter of existence and survival. Political or religious groups or nation-states can hold enemy images. However, the group

must be comparatively large and well organized so that it can spread and propagate coherent beliefs from the head to the lowest of the hierarchy and, on the other hand, create independent future visions or threats (Ahnaf, 2006)

In summary, the construction of the enemy image can be founded due to two fundamental factors: the evolutionary and paranoid paths. Yet, both aim at ensuring the survival of a specific group away from the danger posed by another group. Under evolutionary mechanisms, for one group or species to continue existing, it has to distinguish the other group as an enemy such as in "predator-prey relationships," where the stronger group or species becomes the predator. In contrast, the weaker ones become the prey, thus creating hostility between the two species for purely survival reasons. However, for paranoid psychological behaviour of fear of one group towards another is mainly based on suspicion, which could be true or not that one group could be dangerous towards the other. These factors are mainly suitable for the construction of enemy images, especially among groups or species, with fundamental differences between the groups or species involved. Such differences, together with actual or perceived danger, set the platform for the construction of an enemy image. However, there is limited knowledge of the mechanism used in the construction of an enemy image between two homogenous groups that share similar ancestry, language, and religion. Therefore, this study will examine the mechanism of enemy image construction between two homogenous groups in the Somali populace, whereby one is the majority, yet the other is the minority. Furthermore, the study will compare and contrast whether or not this mechanism of enemy image construction is consistent in both conflict and non-conflict zones of Somalia and Somaliland, respectively.

3 Theory

In this chapter, the construction of enemy images is discussed and other related concepts such as othering, Prejudice and stereotyping will be discussed.

3.1 Construction of Enemy Images

This study will adopt a theory on the construction of enemy images presented by Steiner (2016), which revealed that four components constitute the construction of enemy images. These four components are; Delimitations between "us" and the enemy/enemies, "Our" and "their" essence, which deals with characterization of an enemy, Assets, and threats, and lastly, legitimate response (Steiner, 2016:5).

The first component here makes a distinction between "us" and "them" who are "we" and who are "they." The delimitation here is not always specific, and it creates space for more than only one of " us." For example, the government, the nation, or religion. The enemy can also be more than one, external and internal. The second component works as a way of creating a clear characterization between us versus them. The characterization is not always explicit, and to describe a group as violent, one can, for instance, say: "they kill" and read between the lines that they are violent. The characterization can be presented as "we are democratic verses they are undemocratic," "we are peaceful verses they are violent" (Steiner, 2016:10).

Keen (2004), states that in modern nations, every war appears to be the war of defense against the threatening, murderous aggressor (Keen, 2004:47). The third component in constructing the enemy image is our assets and their threats. Assets, in this case, can vary from time to time. It can be religion, culture, or democracy. An example is our assets can be threatened by their beliefs, occupations, and other actions (Steiner, 2016: 12-13).

To succeed in the enemy image construction, the in-group and the out-group identity

fears and stress need to be brought to the people, and this plays a role in constructing the image of the enemy. It is often easier for a group of people to agree on whom is not considered to be one of their peers than to establish the positive criteria for membership of the collective in the first place (Petersson, 2009). The marginalized are, therefore, essential for the construction of the in-group termed as the US.

The final component of constructing the enemy image is a legitimate response. This component gives answers which have the legitimate response to act, who are the target groups, and which actions are acceptable. (Keen, 2004:117). Construction of enemy images plays an essential role in the maintenance and reinforcement of hostility and antagonism between sections of the population. When it comes to the level of national entities, enemy images play a role in the perpetuation and intensification of conflict between countries (ibid). In more extreme ways, enemy images are also being used to depict the other as an urgent threat towards "our" values and assets. The function of enemy images is to legitimate hostile actions and in Galtung's understanding of cultural, structural, and direct violence (Galtung, 1990). Enemy images are thought to be prerequisites for violence and war (to fight and kill) (Luostarinen, 1989: 270).

3.2 Enemy Imaging And Prejudice

Ethnic prejudice directed at ethnic minorities may be initiated among majority groups and vice versa. This classification implies a distinction between in- and out-groups. Research conducted by Tajfel and Turner (1986) revealed that individuals distinguish themselves from others by looking for group differences. Because people need to create and maintain a positive self-image, which is partially based on group memberships, they tend to evaluate the in-group as positively as possible. Viewing the in-group favourably could be a strategy for maintaining their positive perception of their group. How strong the association between viewing the in-group favourably and evaluating out-groups negatively is, depends on the extent to which individuals identify themselves with their in-group

and on the competition between different groups.

Prejudice can be termed as a negative attitude and can be defined as antipathy based on false and obstinate generalization (Fishbein,2002). Dovidio, and Hewstone (2011), contends prejudice as an attitude with cognitive components of beliefs. Prejudice enhances collective self-esteem. When it comes to the difference between prejudice and enemy images, Pettersson (2009) argues that there is a very short distance between them. Dovidio and Hewstone (2011), further raise enemy images and prejudice and explains prejudice as an attitude with cognitive components of beliefs, dislike, and negative behaviour towards the targeted group. According to the author in this research study, prejudice aims to enhance collective self-esteem by depicting "us" as superior and the "other" inferior. When it comes to the difference between prejudice and other concepts of enemy images, Petersson (2009) argues: "There is a short distance between banal prejudices on the one hand, and fully flagged scapegoat and enemy images, on the other."

In Summary, prejudice serves as a basis for generating negative knowledge, attitude, and perception of one group over the other. This study will reveal how prejudice is used to enhance collective self-esteem and depict "us" as superior and the "other" inferior. This form of prejudice is a fundamental factor in delimitation and characterization of the minority groups from the entire Somali populace resulting in discrimination and violence.

3.3 Enemy Imaging And Othering

Othering is the process by which one group reproduces and reinforces distinctions, dominance, and subordination against those without power. Othering may occur when one group emphasizes a commonality while belittling the lack of that commonality in the other (Williams, Maggie, and Jenny, 2017: 23). An excellent example of othering between societies belies the social construction of race. Processes of othering between societies or groups can often be tied to cultural presumptions and physical traits. For ex-

ample, the process of othering might occur through clothing. Othering normalizes unfair treatment of the othered group, which can be built around specific clothing, skin, color, or other characteristics as clues for discrimination.

According to Harle (2000), it is obvious that linguistic and other cultural differences are recognized and constitute the basis of the identity of "us" the difference is "definitional," and it does not appear as a hostile between "us" and "them." Harle further discusses that to define the other, we need to argue that the other is different from us, thus, projecting more negative traits. Finally, othering and enemy imaging are very close concepts. Still, scholars like Vuorinen (2012) argue that contrary to enemy images, othering does not create hostile relations between groups, while the enemy is threatening and creates a hostile relationship between groups and societies. The phenomenon of othering emerges from the study of sociology. The main consequence of this image is the division. Depending on whether the enemy is in the out/ or in-group, it can lead to either exclusion or inclusion (Steiner 2016: 26).

Contrary to enemy images, othering does not necessarily create a hostile relationship (Harle:2000:11). Vuorinen states that the main difference between the enemy and the other is that an enemy is considered to be threatening while the other is deemed to be unthreatening (Vuorinen: 2012:3). Defining othering here will be an essential departure point of the literature review. Othering is a process where a group or an individual who does not follow the norms of the in-group or deviates from the in-group in some aspects is identified. Indeed, othering is intended to define the other as fundamentally different from the in-group or US. The phenomenon of othering emerges from the study of sociology. The main consequence of this image is the division. Depending on whether the enemy is in the out/ or in-group, it can lead to either exclusion or inclusion. In contrary to enemy images, othering does not necessarily create a hostile relationship between them and us. Vuorinen states that the main difference between the enemy and the other is that an enemy is considered to be threatening while the other is seen to be

unthreatening.

Summing up, the relevance of othering in the mechanism of enemy image construction is that it facilitates delimitation. It acts as the point of divergence from which a single group splits into fractions labeling as "us" and the "others." This study will reveal how othering has been used in the construction of enemy images of the minority groups in Somalia and Somaliland whereby we shall investigate and identify who is referred to as "us" and who is the "other" and what characteristics are associated with "us" versus those of the "other."

3.4 Enemy Imaging and Stereotyping

The stereotype is a misperception of a belief or an idea that one group of people have towards the other, mainly based on the outside look of that group or person, which could be partially true or untrue. According to Pettersson(2009), negative stereotypes are centrally creating the borderlines that help collectives of people define who they are. It is often easier for a group of people to agree on whom is not considered to be one of their peers than to establish the positive criteria for membership of the collective in the first place (Petersson, 2009). The marginalized are, therefore, essential for the construction of the in-group Us.

There are several conceivable motivational grounds for why some groups and individuals are excluded. It can, for example, be racism, chauvinist nationalism, and rigid localism, or the interaction of all of these. Concerning this, it is unclear on what grounds are minorities excluded from majority communities. However, the stories that people tell each other daily are pivotal for marking the borders between Us and Them. In these stories, stereotypes play a crucial role in organizing perceptions and ideas about Others, and hence they also inspire individual and collective action.

According to Pettersson (2009), a stereotype is a frozen image that conveys very simplified beliefs about individual characteristics based on ascribed group belonging. When

it comes to stereotypes that are characterized as enemy images, it is wholly negative. These stereotypes are more far-reaching than the more commonly encountered negative stereotypes of strangers, who are depicted as different and deviant in some respects but not necessarily seen to represent a significant threat to the community. Yet, enemy images do develop from the ground prepared in every day by these less dramatic, but negative stereotypes.

Steiner(2016), contends that there is a difference in degree, not in kind. The origin of stereotypes comes from cognition theory, and the primary function of stereotypes is simply perception, which can thus lead to misperception or perception. Petersson (2009) in similar argues that the stereotype is often fixed, and clear image of a collective where an individual initially from the group is automatically believed to represent traits and have the same characteristics as the whole group. A stereotyped image can be negative or positive. The notion stereotypes originate from cognition theory, and the primary function of stereotypes is to simplify perception, which in its order leads to perception and misperception (Zur,1991: 236).

Stereotypes are relevant in generating beliefs and ideas which might be true, partially true, or outright false. Therefore, this study will examine how stereotypes are essential in guiding the perception of majority groups towards minority groups by exposing the beliefs of the majority groups based on the outward look versus the true image of the minority groups and how these mistaken beliefs are used to create enemy images of the minority.

3.5 Summary of the theoretical chapter

The construction of an enemy image is the pre-request for conflict since enemy imaging can create divisions through delimitations, characterization, and identification of threats that one group poses to another. This results in justification and legitimization of violent actions between groups that perceive themselves as enemies based on the threat each

group poses on the assets or core values of the other. Stereotyping, prejudice, and othering are essential drivers and catalysts in the construction of enemy images because they set the knowledge, attitude, and perception of one group towards another.

This study aims to investigate how the mechanisms enemy of images construction work both in conflict and non-conflict zones. This study will further explore if the informant's stories differ when in conflict zones. This study will generate new knowledge and understanding for existing and future studies on how majority groups construct an enemy image of the minority groups in Somalia and Somaliland. This knowledge will be used to design interventions to mitigate clan-based conflicts and bring sustainable peace to a territory that has had armed conflicts for the past three decades. The information generated from this study will be used as a basis for policy formulation for partners in peace and conflict management. Also, the information generated will contribute to literature for future scholars and researchers interested in studying topics related to enemy imaging.

3.6   Operationalizing the theoretical framework

The theories presented above in the theoretical framework will be used as a guideline through this study that will be used to answer the research questions posed by this study. Since we have already introduced some ideas that characterize the construction of enemy images, this will give context to how the Somali minorities narrate their everyday lives, which enables us to gain more knowledge of how the majority of Somalis construct the enemy image of minorities. Delimitation, characterization, being a threat to the assets and legitimizing of a response to the threat posed are vital elements in the construction of the enemy image. Basing on these four elements of enemy imaging, four operational questions will be used during data collection through interviews as follows:

1. ***What characteristics are applied to "Us"(minorities) and "Them"? (majorities)***
II. ***Who is included in "Us" (minorities) and who is "Them"? (majorities).***

18

III. *Do "They" pose a threat to "Our" core values or assets?*

IV. *Are violent actions legitimized due to this threat?*

The justification for the selection of these four operational questions is basically due to their potential to capture and generate answers on all the four elements presented in the theoretical framework that contributes to enemy image construction. Question one deals with characterization, question two deals with the aspect of delimitation, question three deals with the issue of posing a threat to the assets and question four reveals why violent actions are legitimized based on the threat posed. Through the narratives of the respondents guided by these four operational questions, the researcher will be able to answer the first research question posed in this study which; what do the informants narrate regarding their situation on how the majority groups construct the image of the minority groups as an enemy image? Therefore, the theoretical framework provides a set of tools to find the elements of enemy image construction. And through interviews, we shall find evidence of delimitation, characterization, a threat to assets, and legitimizing an action based on the threat posed. However, the second research question is not guided by theories but by a comparative analysis that identifies differences and similarities in the informant's narratives while living in Somalia and Somaliland.

4   Methodological approach and material

In this chapter, the methods used in this study is discussed in detail. The decisions regarding different aspects will be motivated, and the chapter will be concluded with a section on the ethical considerations that have been considered.

4.1   Research design: Comparative Case Study

This research study used a comparative case study design. According to Hague and Harrop (2003), a comparative approach broadens our understanding of the political world, leading to improved classifications and giving the potential for explanation and even prediction. In contrast to this, comparative approaches have some difficulties. In any case, many of the problems identified in the literature presuppose that comparative design, the same phenomenon can mean different things in different countries by creating complications and difficulties on how the comparison can be made (Hague, and Harrop, 2003: 364).

The purpose of selecting this study approach was to determine the relationship between two social settings which was Somalia and Somaliland. This study design sought to compare and contrast Somalia and Somaliland, which are conflict and non-conflict zones. This aided in identifying the similarities and differences in the respondents' narratives and experiences while living in both contexts, as well as bringing about a more in-depth understanding of cultural elements involved. This was achieved by asking the respondents using a data collection tool to narrate their experiences, first, while living in Somalia (conflict context) and then when living in Somaliland (non-conflict context) and after that asked to tell the differences and similarities in their experiences as regards enemy image construction in both settings.

This study was also a qualitative based research study. As its name suggests, qualitative research generally is interested in the routine circumstances of everyday life, ad-

dressing questions about the lives of others as a way of understanding their own lives. Qualitative research constructs our symbolic world, individual, and collective meaning. According to Farthing (2016), qualitative research can help answer questions that address how or why things are, especially when it comes to an understanding process-oriented phenomenon. Qualitative research can clarify topics that are yet to be operationalized and possibly provide new insight into familiar problems or issues (Punch,2005:168). Besides, qualitative research captures people's actual lived experiences, which leads to an in-depth and robust understanding of phenomena.

4.2   Interviews Selection

The data collection technique used in this study was individual interviews. These were conducted with the people selected from among the minority groups. The interviews were conducted through skype, telephone, WhatsApp, Imo och Viber, and lasted between 25 to 60 minutes. I believe phone interviews are equally suitable to gather the required data to answer the research question as face-to-face meetings. According to Novick (2008), qualitative telephone interviews have many advantages as a data collection method. Respondents have been described as relaxed on the telephone and willing to talk freely and to disclose confidential information. A similar explanation is given by Opdenakker (2006) and Sweet (2002) that qualitative telephone interviews provide rich, vivid, detailed, and high-quality data. Besides, telephone interviews include decreased cost and increased access to geographically disparate subjects.

This study deployed the snowball sampling technique to identify the sample of the population that was involved in this study. According to Chambis and Shutt (2016), Snowball sampling is a non-probability sampling technique where existing study subjects identify and recruit future-or-other subjects from among their acquaintances or friends. Therefore, the sample group is said to grow in the resemblances of a rolling snowball since one subject recommends another subject with similar characteristics and

experience, and so on until a sizeable sample is obtained. In due course of data collection using this technique, the study managed to identify 16 respondents who were willing to participate in the study voluntarily. These had lived in both Somalia (conflict context) and Somaliland (non-conflict context) and belonged to the minority groups. This sample was sufficient to generate the required qualitative data to answer the research questions brought forth by this study. This sample consisted of 8 people from Somaliland, and 8 people from Somalia and all were within the age range of 40-60years. This age group was considered relevant because they had the experience of living in both zones and were able to give a detailed narrative of their which younger people wouldn't have been able to do. Also, during the selection process, no individual above 60 was reached or recommended through the snowball sampling process. Among the 8 people selected from each zone, 4 were men, and 4 were women. All the participants were active in the civil society with occupations such as bus drivers, shoemakers, students, house-wives, and casual labourers. Since this study aims to get a deeper understanding of how minority Somalis narrate their experience on how the majority Somalis construct the image of the minority as an enemy image, and if this differs in conflict zones, the questions were well-formulated and clear to suit this context.

Reflecting on other data collection tools that could have been used in this study, such as questionnaires with both open and close-ended questions, would have limited the data collected in this study and would not generate detailed responses required as those gathered using the interview method. Therefore, through the use of the interview method rather than questionnaires, the researcher was able to obtain detailed information about the minorities' personal feelings, perceptions, and opinions, and allowed the interviewer to ask for more detailed questions while enjoying a high response rate from the interviewees.

4.3 Semi-structured interviews

A semi-structured interview-guide template was constructed for this master thesis. The choice of semi-structured interviews for this study was chosen to give these selected minority groups a daily basis to express their version of the reality of the different forms of discrimination and prejudice they face.

The interview guide is structured along with three main aspects: the general research interest, one leading question, and several sub-questions to ensure that the research interest is covered. The broad research interests are chosen and raised, much to contribute to the existing research on how these minority groups feel or are perceived by the majority groups. Therefore, the general research interests are Everyday life and society (Interaction with the others), the conflict (Comparing the participant's narratives on their situation while living in Somaliland (non-conflict context or Somalia (conflict-context) and lastly the general background (Experiences of "the other).

To answer the research questions and meet the research interest, one leading question is raised to guide the interview. The first guiding research question is related to the primary general interest, and so forth. Finally, additional sub-questions are formulated to support data collection. The interview guide is based on the literature review, the research questions, and the analytical framework chosen to analyse the findings of the study. Also, as argued by Berry(2002), the questions should be easily formulated, short, and concrete, giving both positive and negative responses, which is considered in this study.

The chosen structure for this study makes the interviewing process flexible. The flexibility of this interview method allows me to ask the question in another way if I see that my respondent has misunderstood the question or maybe does not know precisely what to answer on this question. It also allows me to either add questions or more questions or even sometimes skip some of the questions if I see it is also answered.

As a researcher, In case needed, sub-questions can be asked, and even there is a

possibility of asking unplanned questions to understand further and investigate the interviewees' responses to some of the questions.

4.4   Ethical Considerations

Participation in this study was voluntary. According to Kvale and Brinkman (2009), conducting semi-structured interviews, ethical norms and values need to be considered. Participants of this study were thoroughly briefed about the study and explained that their participation was purely voluntary. They had a right to decline participation or to pull out of the study at any given time. However, those who volunteered to participate in the study were asked to sign an informed consent form declaring their willingness to be involved in the study.

Participants' identities were protected in the course of reporting the findings from the study by eliminating their names. All the information collected from the interviews was treated with the utmost confidentiality and only used for the academic purposes of this thesis. As regards the aspect of confidentiality, the interviewees' real name or identity was protected and is anonymous. According to Berry (2002), interviewees' well-being and confidentiality is an important ethical consideration. The anonymity and confidentiality of the participants of this study were, therefore, preserved by not revealing their real names and identity in the data collection, analysis, and reporting of the study findings instead mentioned by aliases. Some of the study participants had asked the thesis sent to them after it was submitted, which will, of course, be done.

5 Findings And Analysis

This study examines the mechanisms of the construction of enemy images and how enemy imaging contributes to discrimination and violence in conflict and non-conflict zones of Somalia and Somaliland, respectively. This study will further explore if the informant's stories differ when in conflict zones.s. The study further explored if the informant's stories differ when in conflict zones. That is to say, in both conflict and non-conflict zones. To gain a better and more insightful understanding of the informants' stories, I posed two main research questions:

1. What do the informants narrate regarding their situation on how the majority, groups construct the image of the minority groups as an enemy image?

11. What are the differences and similarities of the informant's narratives while living in Somalia (conflict context) and Somaliland (non-conflict context)

The first research question aims to understand the stories told by the informants and identify from the data gathered how the majority groups construct the image of minorities as an enemy image. Related theoretical concepts that will be used to analyze the data are enemy imaging, stereotyping, prejudice, and othering. In contrast, the second question is answered to investigate whether there is any similarity and difference between the informants' stories while in Somalia and Somaliland and not guided by the theoretical framework. The second research question is answered shortly after the analysis by summarising the differences and similarities in the comparative analysis section. As the ethical considerations of this study were strictly considered, all the occupational groups were referred to as OC, while all the Bantu Somalis were referred to as BA. The analysis was guided by the four operational questions suggested in the introduction chapter.

Only 16 respondents (8 men and 8 women) participated in this study, and their narratives are used throughout this report on the findings. This sample of 16 respondents was enough to represent the minority groups, and their narratives were illustrative of what most of the other people belonging to the minority groups living in Somalia and Soma-

liland go through daily. The narratives of the 16, including both men and women, were detailed enough to paint a clear situational picture of the circumstances they face, and most of the narratives had similar responses. Hence even though the researcher could have been able to get more than 16 respondents or quote all what the sixteen respondents have told during the interview, their narratives have been the same, and there was a replication of what other respondents had already reported. Furthermore, to find the respondent's snowball sampling technique was deployed, and the study subjects helped the researcher in nominating the next participant one after another.

5.1 What characteristics are applied to"Us" (minorities)and"Them"(majorities)?

According to the theory of enemy image construction, this second operational question seeks to identify the characteristics that distinguish the minority groups from the majority groups.

According to the narratives from the study, although the Somali populace is homogenous sharing a similar ancestry, religion, and language, there are some characteristics emphasized by the majority groups to distinguish the minority groups from themselves. These characteristics are used as borderline between the minority and majority groups. Most of the interviewees narrated how the majority use verbal abuse and hate speech to portray these characteristics. While the majority groups refer to themselves as having an Arab ancestry, the Bantu minority groups are considered to have an African origin. The term "Jareer" used to refer to the Bantu minority group means an African with thick or kinky hair. Also, the use of an abusive word "Adoon" by the majority groups referring to the minority groups, which literally means slave reveals that while the majority groups consider themselves as the dominant masters, the minority groups are the slaves meant to serve their masters. These are examples of characteristics used to differentiate the minority groups from the majority groups but expressed using abusive terms. A bus driver in Hargeisa, who was part of the interviewee, also continued to express how abuse terms

are used to characterize the minority groups, as shown in the quote below.

> *We are called names like nasab-dhiman, laan-gaab,and BaqtiCune.Hate and*
> *prejudice are the order of the day (OC,telephone interview, March 2020).*

Characterization is aimed at showing that there is a clear distinction between the two groups. The "baqticune" literally means "eater of the dead animal." This is a very harsh and abuse term which he narrator says gets him upset. Given the Muslim background shared by the Somali populace, being called "eater of the dead animal" is a very strong abusive statement, which indicates that you are an outcast because the Islam teaching forbids the eating of halal animals that have not been ritually slaughtered. So when an animal dies from any other cause rather than being slaughtered, it is considered not fit for human consumption. Therefore, when the majority groups insult members of the minority groups as eaters of dead animals, this shows that the majority groups are the good members of the community while enemy imaging the minority groups through characterizing them as eaters of dead animals, as the outcasts who are not fit to be part of the community.

Also, the term "nasab-dhiman" means a tarnished nobility or status of the minority groups. This is a demeaning expression of othering, prejudice, and enemy imaging experienced by the minority groups. It used to categorize the minority groups as people belonging to a low socio-economic class while indicating that the majority groups belong to an upper socio-economic class with great political influence.

Furthermore, the term "laangaab" is used to refer to someone from a weak cultural lineage. So the majority groups consider the minority groups as people belonging to the weak ancestral lineage. Such a term could be used to refer to a group of people without any ethnicity whatsoever. According to Harle (2000), the construction of enemy images emerges when two groups recognise that they are fundamentally different from each other so that characterization between the two groups acts as a divider so that one

group can say that "we" are different from "them". Characterization plays a role of giving differing identities to the two groups in such a way that one group must consider itself as good while the other as bad (Girard, 2013). This is the typical case within the Somali populace where the majority groups portray themselves as the good with good traditions and people of high socio-economic and political class while constructing a negative image on the minority groups as people with bad traditions and low socio-economic class.

The other characteristics used to differentiate the minority groups are based on the physical body appearance whereby most of the Bantu Somalis are dark-skinned with thick hair as compared to members of the majority groups who are light-skinned and have curled hair. Also, the type of occupation done by the minority groups was used to differentiate them from the rest of the population, as reported in the narrative below.

> *They called us Kaba-Tole and Tumaal to insult us (OC, telephone interview, March 2020).*

The terms "kaba-tole" and "tumaal" refer to people who do the occupations of shoe-making and blacksmiths (working with metals) respectively yet these are occupations considered to be done by people of low social status among the Somali population. According to the interviews, although these occupations are regarded as jobs for people of low social class, a large proportion of the minority groups are skilled technicians as compared to the vast majority of nomadic Somalis without any skill belonging to the majority groups. Despite the technological skill of most of the members belonging to the minority groups, majority groups despise these skills to construct a negative image of the minority groups as people doing occupations related to low socio-economic class.

In another interview, the narrator highlights how the majority groups stereotype members of the minority groups.

> *"They call us"Sixirow"and"ummulo-tuug"which is an insult(OC,interviewee,March 2020)*

In the above narrative, it is clear that the majority groups refer to the minority groups as(Sixirow in Somali) magicians or sorcerers as a way to portray a negative image showing that the minority groups are bad within the Somali community and "they" the majority are the good ones. These practices of magic are clearly forbidden within the Somali community, and people who perform them are considered as outcasts in the society but the majority group indicated falsely that such practices are being done and are accepted by the minority groups. This form of stereotyping and prejudice facilitates the construction of enemy images of the minority by characterizing them as bad and ought not to be part of the community.

A lady who participated in the interview showed how the difference in occupation and skills is used as a characterization that distinguishes between the majority and the minority groups.

> *"Minorities do not play any significant role in the social, economic, and political platforms in the country. Most of the minorities are illiterate, and the quality of their livelihood is different from the rest of the community. Most of the minorities work as household helps in major clans homes". (OC, Interviewee, March 2020).*

The quote above indicates a distinction between the majority and minorities along the occupation lines based on the socio-economic class. The minority groups are considered to be skilled in occupations of a much lower social class compared to those in the majority groups that have higher social, economic, and political inferences. The Majority groups consider themselves to be more educated and with higher quality livelihood than the minority groups who are categorized as people with a low-quality livelihood. Furthermore, the concept of characterization as applied to "Us" and "Them" is manifested in a quote from another respondent from the interviews who reported that he was marginalized and mistreated because the majority groups characterized him as belonging to the minority groups and hence was not welcomed to work among the majority groups.

> *"I worked as a bus driver. Life is very hard...I often face discrimination in the society I work and live. The passengers insult me and argue that this is not my profession and instead i would have been a potter and push a wheelbarrow.... This makes me feel bad but can not do anything... Insults against our communities have existed for centuries.. This is our forefathers have even experienced. (BA, telephone interview, March 2020)*

The bus driver who is constantly insulted by the passengers and told that he is better off working as a potter pushing a wheelbarrow rather than a bus driver was categorized as someone worthless and that he is doing a wrong job that he should not be a bus driver because he belongs to the minority groups who are considered for much less worth jobs in the society. The majority groups use this as apparent incompatibility between them and the enemy. According to Aho (1994), the image of the enemy is constructed regarding the out-group being impure that is to be excluded and flashed out from the rest of the society. The majority groups argue that minorities live in a strange situation since their practices are not good. The explicit characterization of "Us" and "Them" comes through defining minority Somalis and calling them magicians and shoemakers. The majority Somalis, on the other hand, are those with good practices that fit in society. A similar explanation is given by Zur (1999), that stereotyping of the enemy is one way to portray its badness and the first essential step used to dehumanize them so violence can be justified against them.

Briefly, through this operational question that sought to find out how the minority groups are characterized, it was revealed that the minorities were mainly characterized as dead animal eaters, slaves, only fit to do odd jobs such as shoemaking, sorcerers, and people of low socioeconomic status while the majority groups considered themselves as nobles with high livelihoods as well as great influence in the social, political and economic circles of the society. This characterization mainly driven by prejudice and stereotyping creates a division between the majority and the minority groups and facilitates the

creation of enemy images of the minority.

5.2 Who is included in "Us"(minorities) and who is "Them" (majorities)?

This operational question is aimed at capturing the narrative of the interviewees and analyse it to pinpoint elements of delimitation, which is the point of divergence from which one homogenous group splits into two fractions and offsets enemy imaging. Delimitation is the term used to refer to an action of fixing a boundary or setting limits between two or more fractions of a similar population. The purpose of delimitation is to create a distinction at the point of divergence so that one group refers to its self as "we" or "us," and the other group becomes "them" or "they." This is expressed in the narrative of one of the respondents as quoted below.

> *"We are called every nasty term in the dictionary-Not only people we meet in the streets, but our neighbours called us Umulo-Tuug... My children face similar problems and are called bad names". (OC, Interviewee, March 2020)..*

According to the narrative above, this member of the minority group refers to their group as "we" being called or nicknamed nasty names. Also, the narrative shows that the interviewee refers to the majority group members as "they." This use of the defining terms "we" and "they" symbolically indicates a division within this community. This categorically shows the element of delimitation whereby the minority refer to themselves as "we" or "us" yet members of the majority groups are referred to as "they" or "them." Analytically considering the fact that in this study only the minority groups' members participated and were answering in the interviews, it is, therefore, logical that they used the terms "we" refers to the minority groups and "they" to refer to the majority groups. But if the study had involved the majority groups' members when interviewing, it is obvious that they would also have used the terms "we" to refer to the majority groups

and "they" to refer to the minority group. So, the use of the terms "we" or "us" and "they" or "them" can be used interchangeably among groups for narration and communication purposes, but the vital aspect in the use of such terms is the display of distinct differences between the two groups. Therefore, for purposes of this study, it has been indicated that the minority groups are included in "we" or "us" while the majority groups are included in "we" or "them."

The narrative above also shows the minority groups are referred to as "umulotuug" and how the interviewee expresses that the term is abusive and makes minority group members feel bad emotionally. The term "umulotuug" refers to delivery-beggar, and it's a term used by the majority groups to describe the people of the Yibir sub-minority group. Delivery-beggars are the Yibir people who beg for blessings from newborn babies after delivery. Among the Yibir people, there is a traditional practice whereby they sing and praise a newborn male child, and they ask the baby to bless them. They believe newborn babies come with blessings and good fortune and offer gifts called "Samaanyo" in the Somali language in exchange for these blessings. However, the majority group despise such beliefs and traditional practices of the minority groups and consider their own to be better than those practiced by the minority groups. For that reason, the use of the term "umulotuug" is a form of a negative stereotype used by the majority groups to set a limit, which divides "them" the majority groups from the minority groups and this is important at the offset of the construction of an enemy image. Peterson (2001) also notes that for the construction of an enemy image, the use of negative stereotypes is essential to maintain a boundary that helps define the people belonging to a specific group. This is also a form of marginalization, which is crucial for the construction of in-groups, which results in groupings of "us" and "them."

According to Steiner (2016), to construct an enemy image, there needs to be a distinction between "us" and "them." This has been evident along the lines of intermarriage between the minority and the majority groups, which is continually problematic throughout

the generations. In this narrative, a lady from the minority group recounts how majority groups have created distinctions between "us" and "them," as narrated below.

"When it comes to intermarriage the majority Somalis say that "wax la yaqaan guurso, wax la yaqaan ha laguu dhalee" they consider that our culture is different and some of them even think we have no equal value, also if we try it is impossible to have a good relationship with them... Especially the case of intermarriage they will never accept us and this has existed for centuries (BA, interviewee)

As regards the issue of intermarriages between the minority and majority groups, the issue is almost a taboo on the side of the majority groups. However, it might be acceptable among minority groups. The majority groups consider the culture of the minority to be inferior and different from theirs. This is another way of delimitation by creating cultural differences that can isolate the minority groups as fundamentally different from the majority groups.Delimitation is facilitated by "othering," which is a process of viewing or treating a person or a group as intrinsically different. The othering of the minority groups is understood by the majority as an undesirable group with inferior cultural norms; hence intermarriage with them is almost prohibited and not supported. Othering of the minority is not merely a status that is achieved but rather a perception that describes how the minority groups' culture and customs are deemed inferior to the majority group's dominance. Othering further stigmatizes the minority groups by portraying their cultural norms negatively. Hence, through othering of the minority groups, the majority groups perceive members of the minority groups as fundamentally different and not worth intermarrying with, and this is the offset of enemy imaging.

Concisely, although the Somali population is homogenous and shares a similar ancestry, language, and religion, there exists a marginalization between the majority and the minority groups. This marginal distinction is caused by "othering," whereby the majority

groups produce and reinforce the differences and dominance over the minority groups. The majority portray and emphasize their traditions as better and superior to those of the minority groups. This concept of "othering" is the point of divergence from which the Somali population divides into two groups, the majority, and minority, after identifying some fundamental differences. But for purposes of this study, the minority who participated in the study and were interviewed referred to themselves as "we" or "us" while referring to the majority as "they" or "them." Therefore, for the academic purposes of this study, the minorities were included as "we" or "us" while the majority were "they" or "them."

5.3 Do "They" pose a threat to "Our" core values or assets?

The majority of Somali clans use historical justifications as a basis for their existence. A significant theme throughout the material is how the enemy is threatening the Somali majority assets. The Somali majority clans refer to the enemies as all those who oppose their ideas and traditional practices. One of the youngest interviewees has recounted that:

> *I still remember when I was in grade five and our class teacher did not know that a minority student is in the class, so he went on with his history lesson of the different majority and minority clans in the country and argued that all the minority clans have different culture and tradition. He specifically mentioned our clan and argued that we are different from the society and belong to an inferior culture… They lack good habits and even eat different bad quality food. I did not raise any question but I was shocked and was morally damaged by his speech. …. They are not also clean… Go and see where they live in Daami (OC, telephone interview, March 2020).*

From the above quote, the majority groups argue that the minority groups have different culture and tradition that is not the same as theirs. The Somali majority groups

see that the minority groups cannot be integrated into society and be one of them. By bringing up the concept of traditional practices, culture, and the food the minorities eat, the majority Somali clans confirm the theory of Laswell mentioned in the theoretical chapter that "us" in this case believe that the beliefs of the enemy are a threat to their assets. These assets can be classified as cultural practices, food, and clan lineage.

From the above quote, the majority group's concept is obvious. The minority Somali clans cannot be one of them but should be disintegrated, isolated, and perceived as an enemy. The Somali majority clans see cultural practices as an essential value/asset, which is threatened by their enemies through their bad cultural practices, which is not accepted in society. This confirms and brings the explanation of enemy image construction by Steiner (2016), that an image depicts the other as an urgent threat towards 'our' most important values and assets. The majority of Somali clans further expressing their strong opposition to accepting the minority Somalis into the society by arguing that they are unfit for the society.

5.4   Are violent actions legitimized due to this threat?

The Somali minorities are the most excluded that suffer the violence of (assumed but not statistically proven) from the majority Somalis (nobles) and are perceived as an outcast in the society mainly by their virtue, custom, different traditional practices and even their physical appearances which invariably contrasted with that of the Somali majority clans. For many years, the Somali minority groups have been the most discriminated against, and enemy imaged groups. The lack of protection, violence, and enemy imaging of these groups was epitomised by the post-civil war concept of "looma-ooyeyaasha" (no one will avenge your death). This implies that they could not expect redress if their rights are violated.

This notion, based on clan discrimination and legitimization of violence, has existed for centuries. According to the interviewees, the Somali minority groups have never

enjoyed equal status within the society, mainly due to the over-simplified myth of homogeneity. One of the interviewees who is an active civil society in Hargeisa's capital has talked about the different forms of violence legitimized against the minorities:

> *"They (majorities),say we are looma-ooyaan,looma-aaraan,we have no power,and the authorities are not helpful "(BA, telephone interview,March 2020)*

The above quote reported by one of the interviewees indicates that violence against the minorities has been legitimized based on the accepted cultural perception of the minority groups as being inferior and unwanted in the society because they are perceived as a threat that can contaminate the society of the majority groups.

According to Steiner (2016), violence against an enemy can be legitimized based on the enemy image created through a set of beliefs and perceptions towards an individual or a group as a natural reaction-process of identifying individuals and groups. Violence is legitimized based on the negative stereotype of the minority groups and the actual perception that the minority has no power or authority to defend themselves, which further motivates the majority groups to use violence against the minority groups.

The majority of groups that legitimize violence based on the perceived threat posed by minority groups can be highlighted from the response reported by another interviewee.

> *"I got married to a man from the majority groups, but my husbands family never accepted. They forced my husband to divorce me.... Some of his relatives have even beaten me.. I got injured once and was taken to a hospital.. the family of my husband argued I can only be save if I leave their son. alone.(OC, telephone interview, March 2020).*

The phrase highlighted by the lady in the above quote "they identified me as a problem, the one tempting their son" reveals that the majority group from which her husband

belonged perceived her as a potential problem and a threat to the entire group and therefore violence against her was legitimized based on such a perception.

The lady was seen as the evil one tempting a son among the majority group, and the use of violence against her was a mechanism to deal away with her because she did not belong to that majority group since the minority group from which she came from was already considered inferior and not worthy of fitting in their society. This is consistent with Keen (2004), who noted that the enemy could be perceived as evil and that dehumanization can go to the extent of legitimizing violent actions against the enemy. The Other (a person from a minority group) is perceived as an abnormal, mad, and delinquent person and a threat to the majority group's culture and core values.

Reflecting on the analysis of the findings basing on the theoretical framework presented by this study, as regards the aspect of delimitation, the majority groups use othering as the basis for delimitation of the minority groups. However, the minority groups feel they belong to a common society that should be inclusive for both the majority and minority groups, and such elements of delimitations should not exist.

The minority groups, despite being characterized as slaves and people of low social status, feel that they should have equal rights and opportunities in the communities in which they live. The minority feel that because they share the same religion and ancestry with the majority groups, religion and ancestry background should be uniting factors to unite the entire Somali community despite the clan differences. And although the majority groups perceive the minority groups as a threat to their core values, on the other hand, the minority groups seem not to have a similar perception towards the majority group and are more welcoming towards the majority group members than vice versa. This, as a result, has created a situation whereby the majority groups have legitimized the use of violence against the minority groups. In contrast, the minority groups are defenseless and feel there is no need to counteract the violence and discrimination they are facing with more violence.

5.5   Comparative Analysis

This section seeks to disclose whether there are any differences or similarities between the informants' narratives regarding enemy imaging while they were living in Somalia, which is a conflict zone and Somaliland, which is a non-conflict zone.

Somalia has been a conflict zone for decades with continuous civil conflict and gross human rights violations based on cultural differences existing among the different clans in the country. On the other hand, Somaliland, although still recognized as part of Somalia by the international community, has enjoyed a sense of relative peace for a considerable period and has been a non-conflict zone where people who fled the continuous conflicts in Somalia went to make a living (Krug,2016). Therefore, in this section, minority-groups informants narrate their experience on enemy imaging as how the majority construct enemy images in both Somalia (conflict-context) and Somaliland (non-conflict context) and whether or not there are any differences and similarities between the two contexts.

According to the respondents in the interview, there were no differences in their experience while living in both Somalia and Somaliland. All the interviewees, both the Somali Bantus and Occupational minority groups, reported similar threats, violence, discrimination, and enemy imaging while living in Somalia and Somaliland. According to a lady in the interview who had moved from Somalia to Somaliland thinking that her situation would improve:

> *"I thought I came to a safe place here in Hargeisa, but the situation was the same as in Mogadishu. I remember when a man asked me to do some washing for him.When I finished he didn't pay me any. . . I just left the place silently, so I don't get more problems". (BA, Interviewee, March, 2020).*

From the quote above, we can deduce that this lady had lived in both Somalia-Mogadishu (conflict-context) and Somaliland-Hargeisa (non-conflict-context). She had

fled Mogadishu due to the violence, discrimination, mistreatment, stereotyping, and prejudice caused by the majority groups onto the minority groups with the hope that the situation in Hargeisa would be different. However, she was forced into a similar situation in Somaliland that she had left behind in Somalia. In yet another report by a young man who had come to Somaliland to study revealed that the situation in both contexts of conflict and non-conflict was similar, as stated in his narrative below.

> "It is hard to find a job in Hargeisa. Some tell me why my parents pay for education, which will not lead me anywhere. . . they always call me bad names, and some even say I am better off staying at home". (BA, Interviewee. March, 2020).

The quote above is of a young man who had left Somalia for Somaliland and was studying in Hargeisa. He reveals the discrimination, prejudice, and insults he withstands at school, yet alone has no hope of finding a job in Somalia due to the conflict and Somaliland due to the stereotyping and discrimination constructed by the majority groups against the minority groups. Hence, his narrative further shows us that there was no difference in experience by the respondents in both contexts.

Despite the relative peace in Somaliland, the perception of the majority groups towards the minority groups as regards enemy imaging remains the same as it is in Somalia. As a result, people from minority groups who have lived in Somalia and fled into Somaliland continue to experience similar dehumanizing forms of mistreatment. They cannot tell whether or not Somaliland is better than Somalia. To throw more light on this perspective, a narrator uncovered this truth that there were no differences in both conflict and non-conflict zones, but instead, both were the same.

> To restore security and peace, human rights violations have to be solved,We face inhuman treatment daily (BA AC, interviewees,March 2020)

This narrative is evidence that minority groups experience similar outcomes in both conflict and non-conflict context. Although Somaliland is considered to have enjoyed peace and stability in the past decades as compared to Somalia, which has had continuous civil unrest in the past three decades, majority groups in both contexts inflict insults, dehumanizing acts, and prejudice onto minority groups. Therefore, minority groups find no peace in Somaliland and Somalia, even though majority groups enjoy the peace and equal human rights in both contexts.

This emphasizes the similarity in experience for the minority groups in both conflict and non-conflict zones. For that reason, the answer to the question as to whether or not there are any differences and similarities between the informants own narratives while living in Somalia (conflict-context) and Somaliland (non-conflict context) was found to be that, there were no differences in the narratives but rather the stories and experiences of the respondents were similar in both contexts. The respondents of minority groups experienced stereotyping, prejudice, insults, discrimination, and violence at the hands of the majority groups in Somalia and Somaliland.

It is reflecting off the results from the comparative analysis showing that there is no difference but rather a similarity in the experience of the minority groups while living in both Somalia (conflict context) and Somaliland (non-conflict context).It is interesting to note that this is a unique discovery from the known facts. Under normal circumstances, it was expected that minority groups living in Somalia with continuous civil conflict would have a narrative revealing more tension, discrimination,enemy imaging, and violence than those living in Somaliland where relative peace has been reported. This was further discussed, and a possible explanation is given in the following section of the discussion.

6   Discussion

This chapter presents the discussion of the findings generated from the study with the support of prior studies done on similar subjects and topics by other scholars as well as relevant literature by other authors regarding the construction of enemy images among groups.

This discussion followed the aim of this research study as well as the research questions posed herein. This study aims to investigate how the mechanisms of enemy image construction work both in conflict and non-conflict zones. The study further explored if the informant's stories differ when in conflict zones. That is to say, in both conflict and non- conflict zones. Therefore, this chapter discusses the two research questions posed by this study: I. What do the informants narrate regarding their situation on how the majority, groups construct the image of the minority groups as an enemy image?

II. What are the differences and similarities between the informant's narratives while living in Somalia (conflict context) and Somaliland (non-conflict context)?

The related theoretical concepts used in the discussion of the results are enemy imaging definitions, construction of the enemy image, stereotyping, prejudice, and othering. Hence, the first research question was guided by these theoretical concepts and operationalized using the framework suggested at the operationalization section presented as four operational questions as follows: First, what characteristics are applied to "Us" (majorities) and "Them" (minorities)? Secondly, Who is included in "Us"(minorities) and who is "Them"?(majorities) Thirdly, do "they" pose a threat to "Our" core values or assets? Fourthly and finally, are violent actions legitimized due to this threat?

6.1   What characteristics are applied to"Us" (minorities)and"Them"(majorities)?

The study revealed that there exist some characteristics among the minorities and majorities that distinctively distinguished the minorities who were referred to as "Us" and

the majorities who were called "them."

Despite the cultural and religious homogeneity of the Somali populace, there are elements within this population that give specific characteristics to a particular group different from others. Hence the study indicated that these differences were vital in creating an enemy image between the two groups.

Similar findings are noted by Steiner (2016), who show that characterization between groups where explicit characteristics are identified to distinguish between groups. This enables members of a particular group to stand out of the rest such that a division is created to the extent that both groups view each other as opponents on different fronts as regards a particular set of values or beliefs. This characterization results in stereotyping where specific traits or characters are associated with a given group, which might be true or not as regards describing the entire group or the wholesomeness of an individual. Therefore, the existence of such characteristics that applies to a certain group to distinguish it from another group propagated the construction of an enemy image because one group relates certain characteristics in the other group that directly or indirectly differentiate the two groups.

The study exposed the fact that is belonging to the Bantu minority group was characterized as belonging to a group of slaves who were the lowest members of the society with limited social and political power. These slaves had to be outcasted from society or not fit into the majority group who characterized themselves as masters with more social and political power. This is basically because of the Somali populace's socio-political system known as the 4.5 formula that gives equal quota to the four major clans and half a point to a cluster of minority clans. Under this system, the four major clans, including the Hawiye, Rahanweyn, Dir, and Daarood, each have 61 representatives to the parliament, making a total of 275 members. At the same time, the Bantu minorities are represented with less than 8 people.

This system gives less social and political power to the minorities, and they can-

not influence major socio-political ventures in the community. On the other hand, the same system gives greater socio-political power to the majority groups, and therefore the minorities are characterized as weak and slaves to the majority groups.

According to the narratives of the minority groups, the majority groups characterized the minority groups as people of low social status with low-level jobs such as wheelbarrow pushers, magicians, household helps, and shoe-makers. This prejudice that is not based on reason or limited experience is attributed to the continuous discrimination of the minorities by the majority groups based on clan differences whereby members from the Bantu clan and the occupational groups which are the minority clan are discriminated from better jobs such as white and blue-collar jobs despite their credible qualifications. Because of this discrimination, children of the minority groups have lost hope in education because, despite proper education and academic qualifications, they cannot get the right jobs or even build careers of their own choice. This discrimination from quality jobs pushes members of minority groups to settle for odd jobs where further discrimination is experienced in the community; because of the jobs the minority groups do, they are referred to as people of low social status.

Another characteristic used to differentiate the minority groups was the colour of their skin and hair, which was reported to be dark-skinned with kinky hair. The description of physical body differences indicates an ethnic difference between the minority and majority groups. This was reason enough to characterize the minority as "us" and the majority with lighter skin complexion and curly hair as "them." This difference in physical body appearance between the two groups was found to construct an enemy image of the minority group whereby the minority group was referred to as dead animal eaters, which is a big insult. By stereotyping the minority group as dead animal eaters based on the colour of their skin and hair, the majority groups use these ethnic characteristics as evidence that the minority groups are the bad ones and separate from them.

Therefore, the characteristics reported in the narratives used to describe the minorities

were being slaves, people of low socio-political status, low-quality type of occupation, and ethnicity of people with dark skins and kinky hair. These were used by the majority ("them") to characterize the minority ("us") as different. These characterizations had implications in the creation of enemy images of the minority through stereotyping and prejudice, which resulted in continuous discrimination, insults, and enmity between the two groups.

6.2 Who is included in "Us"(minorities) and who is "Them" (majorities)?

According to this study, the minority groups who were the study population and participated in the interviews conducted in the study usually referred to the majority groups whom they accused as their oppressors as "them" or "they" while the minority groups (interviewees) used the term "us" or "we" to refer to themselves.

This categorically indicated that there existed a marginal distinction between the two groups, which facilitated the construction of an enemy image between the two groups because both groups viewed the other as fundamentally different from each other without a cause for togetherness.

The findings from this study were consistent with prior studies done by Harle (2000), who also revealed that for an enemy image to be created there must be two opposing sides with distinctive differences which define themselves as "we" and "them" and at other times as "us" and "they."

The minority groups interviewed in this study used the terms "we" and "us" to refer to themselves or their group because in this case they were required to describe their (minorities') experience through a narrative on how they (minorities) felt or were treated at the hands of the majority groups whom they referred to as "they" or "them."

However, if this same interview were conducted among the majority groups, they would also indicate their difference from the minority groups by calling the minorities "them" or "they" as well as referring to themselves the majority as "we" or "us." There-

44

fore, to answer the question of who is included in "Us" and who is "them" in the context of this study; the minority groups herein referred to themselves as "us" or "we" during the description of their narratives and used the terms "they" or "them" to refer to the majority groups.

The study showed that the creation of these two groups of the majority and minorities was triggered by a sense of belonging to a particular group that offset the concept of "othering" among a cluster of people that once shared some uniting factors. Thus othering was an essential departure point where the two groups split from the same cluster of people after realising that some people have some fundamental differences from others, whereby instituting the use of "us" or "we" being different from "they" or "them." However, these differences were not enough to define one group as an enemy of the other.

This is in line with Harle (2000), who denoted that othering was insufficient to define enmity among groups. The social organization of both Somalia and Somaliland, which was at once one entity, is based on some uniting factors that could have brought both the majority and minority groups to live, stay together, and establish these communities in which they live today prior to the divisions.

The uniting factors that brought these two groups together are largely the fact that both share the same nomadic culture and Islamic religion. The people and the land that forms both Somalia and Somaliland were one group and territory respectively prior to the colonial times that divided this territory into two, whereby, the British taking control of Somaliland in the North and Italy ruling Somalia in the south. Although the Somali community was and still is considered one of the most homogenous cultures, there existed some differences within this population, such as tribal differences where some tribes had the majority population. In contrast, others had less, but these did not stop people from coming and living together.

With the coming of the colonialists came the division of the land as well as the people with the majority groups accusing some minority groups of collaborating with the colo-

nialists to take power from the native Somalis and different groups taking up different roles and occupations in the colonial administrations.

In this light, it is essential to note that not all "othering" is the basis of constructing an enemy image. Still, the differences in norms and that feeling of belonging and support for or against a specific aim can be the point of divergence where two groups can break out from a single cluster. Therefore, in this study, two groups of minority referring to themselves as "we" or "us" and the majority referred to as "they" or "them" were created.

6.3   Do "They" pose a threat to "Our" core values or assets?

From the study, it was clear to denote that the majority groups perceived the existence of the minority groups as a threat to their core values. All the Somali clans perceive cultural and traditional values as an essential asset. As a result, any individual or group that does not confirm to the set values or follows another set of values is perceived as a threat to the existing values.

The majority groups based on the characterization of the minority groups, as discussed in the previous section above, use such characterization as a basis to develop a negative attitude towards the minority groups because of having some fundamental differences from them. Hence, the minority groups pose a threat of devaluing and eroding the core values set by the majority in the community. This has conflict implications such as stereotyping and prejudice towards the minority groups who are perceived as an enemy and a threat to the majority's core values, resulting in the discrimination and disintegration of minority groups from the society.

The difference in specific norms and the characterization based on ethnicity and occupation done by the minority groups facilitates negative stereotypes and attitudes within members of the majority groups. This promotes further construction of an enemy image of the minority groups since, in this case, the majority groups consider "them" the minority groups being fundamentally different from "us." Although this form of "othering"

might not necessarily be a threat once the minority groups try to interact with the majority groups such as through intermarriages, this is perceived as a threat to the tradition of the majority groups which regards minority groups as outcastes and people of low social status who are not fit to intermarry with the majority groups.

This is consistent with the Vuorinen (2012), who states that othering might not necessarily result in enmity. Still, the main difference between the enemy and the other is that an enemy is perceived to be threatening while the "other" is deemed to be unthreatening.

Consequently, the differences based on the characterization of the minority groups are perceived as a threat to the core values of the majority groups since the way of life of the minority groups is perceived as low-quality lifestyle characterized with uncleanliness, bad physical appearance with dark skin and kinky hair, poverty, bad food and low occupational status which could erode or pollute and become detrimental to the lifestyle of the majority groups.

6.4   Are violent actions legitimized due to this threat?

The study showed that the majority of groups perceived the minority groups as a threat and had to defend their core values from being devalued and eroded. Minority groups are perceived as a problem that has to be resolve through the use of violent action such as physical fights and domestic violence. This has been legitimized as a defensive mechanism of the majority groups to defend their core values and tradition from being eroded and polluted by the inferiority of the minority groups.

The majority groups perceive intermarriages with minority groups as erosion and pollution of their cultural values. Thus they had to defend their women from being married by men from the minority groups whom they consider as people of low social status unfit to marry their daughters and also prevent their men from marrying women from minority groups because this could pollute their ethnic lineage.

As a result, when such intermarriages occur at any odds, relatives on the side of

the majority group will always use domestic violence to break up such marriages. The spouse from the minority group will always be seen as an evil one to legitimize the use of violence to mitigate the threat to their cultural values that prohibit intermarriages with minority groups.

The study revealed that violent actions are legitimized against the minority groups based on the threat they posed towards the core values of the majority groups, such as a threat to their superiority. Members of the majority groups perceived those of the minority as weak without any social, political, or economic power and any backup help from anywhere. This form of perception builds a negative stereotype among the minority groups who are.

At the same time, as inferior while the majority are superior and thus the majority groups legitimize violent actions against the minority with impunity because "they" the majority groups have the socio-political power to do so without.

In contrast, the minority groups are helpless, and no one can avenge the violence done upon them. However, the role of cultural influence on this form of violence against minority groups cannot be overlooked because over time the minorities have always been stereotyped as weak and helpless and slogans such as "looma-ooyeyaasha" meaning no one will avenge their death have been used as a basis for discrimination and legitimization of violence against them. Therefore, violent actions towards the minority groups were legitimized to protect the majority group's superiority and further construct the image of the minority groups as an enemy towards this superiority.

6.5 Differences and similarities between informants narratives in conflict and non-conflict context

According to the study from the narratives, there were no differences in experiences of the minority groups while living in Somalia, a conflict zone, and Somaliland, a non-conflict zone.

This was mainly because Somalia and Somaliland share homogenous ancestral and historical backgrounds with similar groups of people living in the two territories. The clans of the majority groups, including Darod, Hawiye, Isaaq, Dir, and Rahanweyn, are the same in both Somalia and Somaliland. In contrast, the minority groups of the Bantu, occupational groups, and others remain the same in both territories. The only difference within these two territories comes to the fact that Somalia has experienced continuous civil unrest for the past three decades with gross human rights violations within the populace, lack of social infrastructure, and armed conflicts among the majority groups who continue to fight for political power while Somaliland has been a much more peaceful territory with a functional administration that has been able to defend its borders from armed conflicts and have the proper social infrastructure.

These differences between the two territories have not changed the experience of minority groups within the two regions since the majority groups living within both zones construct an enemy image of these minority groups, resulting in continued discrimination and violence against the minority.

The population involved in this study were some of the minority groups' members who had lived in both Somalia and Somaliland, and most of them had fled from Somalia due to the oppression, discrimination and the armed civil conflict and into Somaliland with the hope of finding a better lifestyle free from discrimination and oppression by the majority groups. However, on arrival into Somaliland, they discovered that the same stereotyping, prejudice, discrimination, and violence they had experienced in the former land was to continue in the new territory.

The minority group members who went to Somaliland continued to face discrimination at work, in communities, and their children were also stereotyped and discriminated at school. This is attributed to the cultural superiority and negative attitude possessed by the majority groups who perceive the minority groups as inferior and people of low social status who could threaten their core values hence have to be eliminated and discriminated

from society through the use of violence. Therefore, the construction of enemy image through stereotyping and prejudice, resulting in discrimination and violence in both Somalia and Somaliland, makes the experience of minority groups similar in both conflict and non-conflict contexts, respectively.

7   Conclusion

This chapter presents the conclusions drawn from the study regarding the construction of the enemy image of the minority groups in Somalia and Somaliland, which are conflict and non-conflict contexts, respectively, as well as the feasible recommendations and suggestions for further studies.

The conclusions are drawn in line with the research questions posed by this study. The majority groups in Somalia and Somaliland have constructed and continue to build an enemy image of the minority population through stereotyping, othering, and prejudice, and this has been the basis on which minority groups have been discriminated against. Their rights violated in these two homogenous zones.

Although "othering" alone did not constitute to the construction of an enemy image among the minority group, it acted as a point of divergence where the minority group which in this study were included as "we" or "us" being different from the majority groups herein referred to as "they" or "them."The characteristics applied to the minority groups to distinguish them from the majority groups included being perceived as inferior people, slaves, people of low socio-political status, low-quality type of occupation, and ethnicity of people with dark skins and kinky hair as well as dead animal eaters. While on the other hand, the majority groups referred to themselves as superior and people of high social, economic, and political status. The majority of groups perceived the minority groups as a threat to their core values and assets due to the strong importance attached to these values. The majority groups fear that the existence of minority groups, when allowed to interact with the majority groups, primarily through intermarriages,

unification, and equal occupational rights, could erode and pollute their core values and culture. Based on the perceived threat posed towards the core values and culture of majority groups by minority groups, the majority groups have legitimized the use of violent action as a defense mechanism to protect their traditions, culture, and core values from being eroded and polluted by the inferiority of the minority groups. The experience of the minority groups in both Somalia and Somaliland, which are conflict and non-conflict context, was similar in both territories described with segregation, discrimination, stereotyping, and prejudice as well as violence against the minority groups with the community, in schools and workplace.

This study has contributed to both academic and existing general knowledge showing how the mechanism of the construction of enemy image works through delimitation, characterization, threats on assets and core values, and legitimizing against minority groups in both conflict and non-conflict zones. There is also a scientific contribution generated by this study showing that unlike the known ideal where conflict zones are known to create more tension than non-conflict zones, this study revealed that there was no difference in the level of discrimination, enemy imaging, violence and mistreatment of minority groups in both conflict and non-conflict contexts.

Community leaders ought to sensitize the masses through the use of mass media on the dangers of negative stereotyping and discrimination of the minority groups as well as educate the masses on the importance of unity and peace in the socio-economic transformation of their territories and the importance of creating of peace by integrating the minority groups into the social system for sustainable socio-economic prosperity. Religious and cultural leaders should use the uniting factors such as Islam religion and the homogenous cultural backgrounds of the Somali people as a converging point bringing people of different clan groups and uniting them for peace and sustainable development preaching a message of unity among the populace. The International community, such as the African Union, should intervene more in advocating for equality of human rights

in Somalia and Somaliland and equity for the minority groups for socio-economic and political success. Minority groups ought to organize themselves and form unions or organizations that can advocate for their rights with a unified voice both locally and internationally.

There is a need for further studies in the area of conflict management in Somalia and Somaliland to generate more knowledge and understanding of the conflicts among these clan groups such that feasible interventions can be instituted. There is also need for further studies in these two areas; the role of leadership and administrations in the construction of the enemy image of the minority groups in both Somalia and Somaliland, as well as, the socio-economic factors that influence the construction of enemy images of the minorities in both conflict and non-conflict contexts.

8 Bibliography

Anton, Donald K., and Shelton, Dinah. (2011). Humanitarian Crises: Armed Conflicts and Other Disasters. In Environmental Protection and Human Rights (pp. 666-778).

Ahnaf, Muhammad Iqbal (2006) The Image of the Other as Enemy, Silkworm books: Chiang Mai.

Alcorta, L., Swedlund, H., Smits, J. (2020). Discrimination and ethnic conflict: A dyadic analysis of politically-excluded groups in sub-Saharan Africa. International Interactions, 46(2), 251-273.

Alasow, O. (2010). Violations of the Rules Applicable in Non-International Armed Conflicts and Their Possible Causes: The Case of Somalia. (1st ed., International Humanitarian Law Ser).

Berry, Jeffrey M. (2002): Validity and reliability issues in elite interviewing. 35th ed. (4).

Chambliss, D.F., and Schutt, Russell, K. (2016), Makin Sense of the Social World. Fifth edition. Sage publications.

Dovidio, J. F., A., Hewstone, M. (2011), Improving intergroup relations throughdirect, extended and other forms of indirect contact. Group Processes Intergroup Relations. Vol, 14, no.2, (pp. 147–160).

Farthing, Stuart (2016), Research Design in Urban Planning. London and New York: Sage publications.

Fishbein, H. (2002). Peer prejudice and discrimination the origins of prejudice (2nd ed.). Mahwah, N.J.: L. Erlbaum.

Galtung, Johan (1990) "Cultural violence" in Journal of Peace Research, no. 3, vol. 27, pp. 291-305.

Harle, Vilho (2000) the Enemy with a Thousand Faces, (Westport: Praeger) pp. 9-23.

Hoehne, M. (2015). Continuities and changes regarding minorities in Somalia. Ethnic and Racial Studies, 38(5), 792-807

Hague, Rod, Harrop, Martin. (2003). Comparative Government and Politics. Place of publication not identified Macmillan Publishers Limited.

Keen, Sam (2004). Faces of the Enemy, Reflections of the Hostile Imagination (3rd ed). (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco)

Kvale, Steinar; Brinkmann, Svend (2009): Interviews. Learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing. 2. ed. Los Angeles: Sage.

Krug, Teresa. "The Trap of International Intervention: How Somaliland Succeeded Where Somalia Failed." The SAIS Review of International Affairs 36.1 (2016): 121-3.

Lederach, J., Orsini, D. (1998). Building peace: Sustainable reconciliation in divided societies. Millennium, 27(1), 185-187. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Loustarinen, Heikki (1989)"Finnish Russophobia: The Story of an Enemy Image" in Journal of Peace Research, no. 2, vol. 26 Sage Publications.

Lewis, I. M. Understanding Somalia and Somaliland: Culture, History, Society. New York: Columbia U, 2008. Print.

Mantzikos, Ioannis. "Understanding Somalia and Somaliland, by Ioan Lewis." African Affairs 109.437 (2010): 679-81. Web.

Menkhaus, K. (2017). Elections in the Hardest Places: The Case of Somalia. Journal of Democracy, 28(4), 132-146.

Novick, G. (2008). Is there a bias against telephone interviews in qualitative research? Research in Nursing Health, 31(4), 391-398.

Oppenheimer, L. (2006). The Development of Enemy Images: A Theoretical Contribution. Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology, 12(3), 269-292.

Opdenakker, R. (2006). Advantages and disadvantages of four interview techniques in qualitative research [Electronic Journal]. Forum: Qualitative Social Research, 7, Article 11. Retrieved August 28, 2007 from http://www.qualitative-research.net/fqs-texte/ 4-06/06-4-11-e.htm.

Ottosen, Rune (1995) "Enemy Images and the Journalistic Process", i Journal of Peace Research, no.1, vol. 32, Sage Publications.

Petersson, Bo (2009)." Hot Conflict and Everyday Banality: Enemy images, scapegoats and stereotypes" in Development, 2009, 52(4), (460–465).

Prunier, G. (1996). SOMALIA: CIVIL WAR, INTERVENTION AND WITHDRAWAL (1990 - 1995). Refugee Survey Quarterly, 15(1), 35-85.

Post, Jerrold M (1999). "The Psych politics of Hatred: Commentary on Ervin Staub's Article" in Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Journalism 5 (4), p. 34.

Punch, K.F., 2005. Introduction to Social Research: Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches, London: SAGE Publications.

Robert I. Rotberg, 'The new nature of nation-state failure', Washington Quarterly 25, 3 (2002), p. 85. For descriptions of Somalia as a failed state.

Staub, E. (1992). The roots of evil: The origins of genocide and other group violence. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Stein, J. G. (1996). Image, identity and conflict resolution. In C. Crocker, F. Hampson, P. Aall (Eds.), Managing global chaos (pp. 93–111). Washington, DC: U. S. Institute of Peace Press.

Sweet, L. (2002). Telephone interviewing: Is it compatible with interpretive phenomenological research? Contemporary Nurse, 12, 58–63.

Steiner, Kristian (2016). "Images of Muslims and Islam in Swedish Christian and Secular News Discourse" I Media, War Conflict,8, 20-45.

Tajfel, H. and Turner, J. C. (1986), The social identity theory of intergroup behaviour. In Worchel, S and Austin, W.G (editors), Psychology of intergroup relations. 2nd edition. (pp 7-24). Chicago: Nelson-Hall.

Vergani, M. and Bliuc, A.M., 2015. The evolution of the ISIS'language: a quantitative analysis of the language of the first year of Dabiq magazine. Sicurezza, Terrorismo e Società= Security, Terrorism and Society, 2(2), pp.7-20

Vuorinen, M. ed., 2012. Enemy images in war propaganda. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Williams, Maggie Griffith, and Jenny Korn. "Othering and Fear: Cultural Values and Hiro's Race in Thomas Friends' Hero of the Rails." Journal of Communication Inquiry 41.1 (2017): 22-41. Web.

Walls, Michael. (2009). The emergence of a Somali state: Building peace from civil war in Somaliland. (Author abstract)(Report). African Affairs, 108(432), 371-389.

Zoppi, M. (2018). Somalia: Federating citizens or clans? Dilemmas in the quest for stability. Journal of Contemporary African Studies, 36(1), 54-70

Zur, O. (1991)." The Love of Hating: The Psychology of Enmity", History of European Ideas, Vol. 13, No. 4, pp. 345-369.

Minorities in Somalia,https://minorityrights.org/country/somalia/ Last accessed 20200518.

8.1 Appendices

Interview Guide Based on those assumptions, a semi-structured interview template is constructed for this master thesis. The template is structured along with three main aspects: the general research interest, General Background, the conflict, Interaction with the other, and lastly Experiences of Violence. For each research interest, one leading question is raised to guide the interview. The first guiding research question is related to the first general interest, and so forth.

8.2 Interview Questions

1.Tell a little about yourself? Year of birth, origin, hobby, work, education, family, and Where in Somalia were you born?

2.How do you feel about being a Gabooye or Jareer in Somalia? Any difference while in Somalia or Somaliland. Why does it make you feel that way?

3.What does it mean to be Gabooye or Jareer, according to you? Why?

4.Do you feel that people are treating you differently (in a certain way) because of your clan?

5.Is it important to keep your traditional practices alive? Do the minorities intermarriage with the majority clans, if yes do you experience any problems?

6.How do you think the picture of minorities is perceived in Somalia/Somaliland? Do you believe that minorities are different in the diaspora than in Somalia/Somaliland?

7.How do you think minorities are living in Somalia/Somaliland? Have you heard about the power-sharing model named 4, 5? What do you think about it?

8.Is there something that represents minorities/Gabooye/Jareer? What do you think is a typical minority?

9.Is there any difference between minorities in Somalia and Somaliland?

10.How is the difference between the old generation of Majority Somalis towards the minorities and what about the new generations?

11 Do you think that the young generations lifestyles have changed compared to the old Generations? Mind-set?

12.How do you define yourself? How do you interact with the locals?

13.How do you feel about the fact that you live side by side with the majority clans? Go to the same school together, associate?

14.Do you have friends from other clans? What do you talk about?

15.What is your experience of the Somali majority groups? Do you like them? Injustice, discrimination on the labor market, etc.?

16.Have you got into any problems with Somali majority clans? How did the government authorities, the police, the judicial system handle the case. What about the rest of the societies? Does stereotypes and discriminations change from time to time?

8.3   Consent Form

Dear Participant, I invite you to participate in a research study entitled "Ethnic prejudice and discrimination of the Somali Minority groups, The Image of the other as an Enemy. Iam currently enrolled Masters in Peace and Conflict Studies at Umea University Sweden, and in the process of writing my Master's thesis. The purpose of the research is to understand how the informants' narrate their everyday life on how the majority groups construct the image of minority groups as enemies. This study will further explore if the informant's stories differ when in conflict zones. The data will remain confidential, anonymous and will be kept under lock and only the researcher will know your individual answers to the interview questions.

I.................. voluntarily agree to participate in this master thesis study.

I am aware based on the ethical considerations considered in this study; I have been informed that I can withdraw from this interview at a part or entirely at any time while the interview is going.

I have a full understanding and awareness of the objective of this study. Besides, I

can ask questions for clarifications in case I have not understood some of the items or statements made during the interview process.

I understand this interview participation involves data in a master thesis for the program Peace and Conflict Studies at Umeå University in Sweden.

I understand that there are no benefits by participating in this master thesis.

I, the undersigned, consent that; the interview will be audio-recorded.

I, the undersigned accept that the information I provide for this research project will be confidential and remain in the hands of the researcher.

I understand that I remain anonymous, and my real name will not be used in this study. People I talk about will also stay anonymous.

I, the undersigned, consent the use of some of my interview extracts in this study.

I, the undersigned, consent the original audio recordings will be retained in the hands of the researcher, and only the researcher will have direct access to the data collected during the interview.

I, the undersigned, understand and consent that the researcher of this study will keep the transcript of the data collected during the interview while all identifiable information has been removed.

I, the undersigned, consent that I can access the information I provided during the interview.

I, the undersigned, consent that I can contact the persons involved in the study to seek information details about the study. Researcher: Abdihakim Barre Warsame, a Master Student at Umea University in Sweden. Email: abdihakimw@gmail.com Tel: +46762734351

Supervisor: Associate professor at the Department of Political Science, dzenan.sahovic@umu.se

Signature of the research participant ——————————————

Date

Signature of researcher.................