

# African Journal of Political Science and International Relations

Volume 11 Number 4 April 2017

ISSN 1996-0832



*Academic  
Journals*

## ABOUT AJPSIR

The **African Journal of Political Science and International Relations (AJPSIR)** is published monthly (one volume per year) by Academic Journals.

**African Journal of Political Science and International Relations (AJPSIR)** is an open access journal that publishes rigorous theoretical reasoning and advanced empirical research in all areas of the subjects. We welcome articles or proposals from all perspectives and on all subjects pertaining to Africa, Africa's relationship to the world, public policy, international relations, comparative politics, political methodology, political theory, political history and culture, global political economy, strategy and environment. The journal will also address developments within the discipline. Each issue will normally contain a mixture of peer-reviewed research articles, reviews or essays using a variety of methodologies and approaches.

### Contact Us

Editorial Office: [ajpsir@academicjournals.org](mailto:ajpsir@academicjournals.org)

Help Desk: [helpdesk@academicjournals.org](mailto:helpdesk@academicjournals.org)

Website: <http://www.academicjournals.org/journal/AJPSIR>

Submit manuscript online <http://ms.academicjournals.me/>

## Editors

**Dr. Thomas Kwasi Tieku**

*New College, University of Toronto  
45 Willcocks Street, Rm 131,  
Toronto, Ontario,  
Canada.*

**Dr. Mark Davidheiser**

*Nova Southeastern University  
3301 College Avenue; SHSS/Maltz Building  
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33314  
USA.*

**Dr. Enayatollah Yazdani**

*Department of Political Science  
Faculty of Administrative Sciences and Economics  
University of Isfahan  
Isfahan  
Iran.*

**Dr. Kannamma S Raman**

*Department of Civics and polotics  
University of Mumbai Vidyanaagari,  
Kalina  
Mumbai 400 098  
India.*

**Dr. Upendra Choudhury**

*Department of Political Science  
Aligarh Muslim University,  
Aligarh-202002  
Uttar Pradesh,  
India.*

**Dr. S.M. Omodia**

*Department Of Political Science,  
Kogi State University  
Anyigba, Kogi State  
Nigeria.*

**Naheed Shabbir Goraya** *Centre  
for South Asian Studies University  
of the Punjab, Lahore Pakistan.*

**Dr. Muhammad Ishaque Fani**

*Department of Pakistan Studies,  
Bahauddin Zakariya University,  
Multan,  
Pakistan.*

**Dr. Aina, Ayandiji Daniel**

*Faculty of Management and Social Sciences  
Babcock University, Ilishan – Remo, Ogun State,  
Nigeria.*

**Prof. F. J. Kolapo**

*History Department  
University of Guelph  
N1G 2W1Guelph, On  
Canada*

**Dr. Nonso Okafo**

*Graduate Program in Criminal Justice  
Department of Sociology  
Norfolk State University  
Norfolk, Virginia 23504*

**Dr. Johan Patrik Stålgren**

*Department of Political Science,  
Göteborg University,  
Göteborg.  
Sweden*

**Dr. Nawal K. Paswan**

*Centre for South, Central, South East Asia and South  
West Pacific Studies  
School of International Studies  
Jawaharlal Nehru University  
New Delhi 110067  
India.*

**Dr. Okotoni Matthew Olu** *Department*

*of Public Administration Obafemi  
Awolowo University  
Ile-Ife,  
Nigeria.*

**Dr. Rudra Prakash Pradhan**

*Vinod Gupta School of Management Indian  
Institute of Technology, Kharagpur West  
Bengal- 721 302,  
India.*

**Dr. Murat Gül**

*Department of International Relations  
Süleyman Demirel University, ISPARTA, Turkey.*

## Editorial Board

**Prof. TOHĂNEANU, Cecilia**

*Dean -The Faculty of Political Science  
Christian University, Dimitrie Cantemir”, Splaiul Unirii  
nr.  
176, Bucharest Romania.*

**Assistant Prof. Bulend Aydın ERTEKIN,**

*Department of Journalism Anadolu  
University Eskisehir Turkey*

**Dr. Zakir Husain**

*Assoc. Prof. Economics,  
Institute of Development Studies Kolkata, (IDSK)  
1 Reformatory Street, Calcutta University Alipore  
Campus, 5th Floor,  
Calcutta 700 027,  
INDIA.*

**Dr. Yu-Kang Lee,**

*Associate Professor  
Department of Political Economy  
National Sun Yat-Sen University  
Taiwan (R.O.C.)*

**Dr. Xi Chen,**

*Assistant Professor  
Department of Political Science  
School of Social and Behavioral Sciences  
208 SBS  
1201 W. University Dr.  
Edinburg, TX, 78541  
USA*

**Prof. Muhammad Saleem Mazhar**

*Professor of Persian, Chairman,  
Department of Persian,  
University of the Punjab,  
Lahore*

**Prof. BOSTAN D. IONEL**

*‘A I . I. Cuza’  
University of Iasi,  
Faculty of Economics and Business Administration  
ROMANIA*

**Dr. Muhammad Ishaque Fani**

*Associate Professor,  
International Relations, Solomon Asch Center for Study of  
Eth-Political Conflict,  
Department of Psychology,  
Bettws-Y-Coed 237 Bryn Mawr College, 101N Merion  
Avenue, Bryn Mawr, PA, 19010-2899*

**Prof. Branko Dimeski,**

*Department of Administration and Management  
Information Systems  
St. Kliment Ohridski University  
Partizanska bb  
7000, Bitola  
Republic of Macedonia*

**Dr. PRAGATI JAIN**

*Associate Prof.  
Sanghvi Institute of Management and Science,  
Indore- 453331  
(M.P), INDIA.*

**Dr. Jagdish P. Verma**

*Post-Doctoral Fellow, UGC Major Research Project, Dept. of  
Defence & Strategic Studies, Faculty of Science, Allahabad  
University,  
Allahabad*

**Dr. Enayatollah Yazdani**

*Associate Professor  
Department of Political Science  
Faculty of Administrative Sciences and Economics  
The University of Isfahan  
IRAN.*

**Dr. Amir Ahmed Khuhro,**

*Assistant Professor  
Department of International Relations  
Shah Abdul Latif University Khairpur (Mir’s),  
Sindh, Pakistan*

**Dr. Bharat Chandra Rout**

*Research Scholar  
National University of Educational Planning and  
Administration (NUEPA)  
17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg,  
New Delhi  
India*

**Dr. Mohammed Viquaruddin**

*Assistant Professor  
Dept. of Political Science  
Deogiri College,  
Station Road,*

**Alemayehu Fentaw Weldemariam**

*Jimma University (JU) - Faculty of Law  
Jimma, Oromia 378  
Ethiopia.*

**ARTICLES**

- Assessing the causes and effects of social exclusion: The case of ‘pot makers’ in Yem Special Woreda in Sothern Nation, Nationalities and Peoples Regional State in Ethiopia** 68  
Tamiru Berafe
- Ethiopia’s armed entry into Somalia in 2006: Projection of its foreign policy or aspiration for hegemony?** 84  
Yohannes Gebeyehu Alebachew



*Full Length Research Paper*

# Assessing the causes and effects of social exclusion: The case of 'pot makers' in Yem Special Woreda in Sothern Nation, Nationalities and Peoples Regional State in Ethiopia

Tamiru Berafe

College of Law and Governance, Department of Civics and Ethical Studies, Mekelle University, Ethiopia.

Received 14 July, 2016; Accepted 24 January, 2017

This study was conducted to assess the causes and effects of social exclusion of 'Pot Makers' in Yem Special Woreda in Southern Nation Nationalities and Peoples Regional State in Ethiopia. Cross sectional survey research design was used to conduct the research because it would help the researcher to investigate the causes and effects of social exclusion in the case of 'pot makers' in Yem Special Woreda. In this study, both secondary and primary data were employed. Due to the nature of the study, non-probability sampling method and purposive sampling techniques were used accordingly. The data were collected through questionnaire and interview from some purposively identified members of 'pot makers' and non-pot makers. As far as the causes of social exclusion is concerned, the respondents and interviewees have suggested that the norms, belief and the way of life that defines the pot makers and the roles they undertake in the society have been viewed as a crucial factors. Concerning the effects of social exclusion, 'pot makers' in the study area have been facing several consequences. Due to social exclusion, pot makers have been facing problems such as limited access to social services such as education and health services, low self-esteem, server poverty, lack of genuine interaction with the rest of peoples of the study area, and low level of motivation to enhance their level of wellbeing. Professionals, academicians, the policy makers, and the public at large should not remain silent and let social injustice to remain unabated. Besides, values, norms and practices that resonates social exclusion should also be redefined in the study area through creating and enhancing awareness of both the 'pot makers' and non-pot makers.

**Key words:** Social exclusion, discrimination, poverty, prejudice, marginalization, pot makers, functional differentiation.

## INTRODUCTION

Social exclusion is one of the underestimated and barely researched issues in Ethiopia. However, this study believe

that in order to achieve social, economic and political aspirations of our society and state, addressing the

E-mail: [tamiruberafe@gmail.com](mailto:tamiruberafe@gmail.com).

Authors agree that this article remain permanently open access under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

problems of socially excluded section of societies is highly needed.

Ethiopia is one of the examples of heterogeneous state in Africa. Many sources reveal that there are more than 80 ethnic groups in the country. According to Article 46 (2) of FDRE constitution, regional states were delimited on the bases of settlement patterns, language, identity and consent of the people concerned. It is known that in almost all regional states there are ethnic minorities as far as the conventional conception of minority is concerned. FDRE constitution has recognized ethnic minorities and guaranteed certain rights although there are some unresolved issues yet.

However, it is also true that in all regions and subordinate level of administrations there are occupational minorities whose identity was not recognized by the laws of the state. Consequently, occupational minorities have been facing several aspects of social exclusion because of who they are and what they do in the society. Likewise, 'pot makers' in Yem Special Woreda have been encountering different aspects of social exclusion and they are called 'Fuga' by the rest of peoples.

However, calling the 'pot makers', as 'Fuga' has degrading and dehumanizing implications. Therefore, this study intends to assess the causes and effects of social exclusion considering 'pot makers' as an occupational minority.

### **The concept of social exclusion and poverty**

Ideas about social exclusion date back a long time, and it has been highly contested concept. The problem of arriving at a common definition is exacerbated by the fact that the meaning of social exclusion varies across countries (Silver and Miller, 2003; Omtzigt, 2009), and it is also rooted in different traditions and an intellectual and political history (Silver, 1994; Omtzigt, 2009).

However, the following are some of the ways social exclusion has been defined and understood by scholars from different fields of specializations. The earliest definition of social exclusion is that it is the rupture of social bond. According to de Haan (1999), social exclusion has been more broadly defined as the process through which individuals or groups are wholly or partially excluded from full participation in the society within which they live. Furthermore, social exclusion has also been defined as a process by which certain groups are systematically disadvantaged because they are discriminated against on the basis of their ethnicity, race, religion, sexual orientation, caste, descent, gender, age, disability, HIV status, migrant status or where they live (Francis, 2002). According to Burchardt et al. (1999), an individual is socially excluded if he or she is geographically resident in a society, and he or she does not participate in the normal activities of citizens in that society and he or she would like to so participate, but s/he is prevented from participating due to factors beyond his or her control (Percy-Smith, 2000).

The term social exclusion has been extended by some to include exclusion from livelihood; secure, permanent employment; earnings; property, credit, or land; housing; minimal or prevailing consumption levels; education, skills, and cultural capital; the welfare state; citizenship and legal equality; democratic participation; public goods; the nation or the dominant race; family and sociability; humanity, respect, fulfillment and understanding (Omtzigt, 2009).

Social exclusion involves discrimination, and discrimination occurs in public institutions, such as the legal system or education and health services, as well as social institutions like the household' (Department for International Development, 2010). Social exclusion occurs when citizens are denied these social rights or they are not fully realized and, furthermore, in such circumstances, citizens are likely to experience more generalized disadvantage (Percy-Smith, 2000).

Due to various reasons, social exclusion and poverty has been considered as an identical concept. However, this study attempts to discuss that the two concepts are not identical. In this regards, the study share with scholars who argues that social exclusion and poverty are highly interconnected, and reveals numerous similar features. In this respect, Howarth et al. (1998) argues that poverty and social exclusion are concerned with a lack of possessions, or an inability to do things. However, poverty, in the narrowest sense, is a monetary concept to do with falling below a certain threshold of income or expenditure, and it is seen as an individual's inability to consume enough to fulfill basic preferences or needs. Poverty in its broader sense according to Sen (1999) means capability deprivation.

When it comes to social exclusion, a person with income above the poverty line can be excluded from social relations and institutions, and a person with income below it is not necessarily socially excluded. At one extreme, social exclusion can be seen as one element within a narrow definition of poverty in terms of the minimum standard of living below which one is absolutely poor. At the other extreme, social exclusion can be seen as an alternative to poverty in terms of understanding the real livelihoods of poor people (Omtzigt, 2009).

Considering the aforementioned line of argument, scholars like Duffy (1995) notes that social exclusion is a broader concept than poverty, encompassing not only low material means but the inability to participate effectively in economic, social, political and cultural life and in some characterizations alienation and distance from mainstream society. Within this framework, the term social exclusion has also been most generally used to refer to persistent and multiple deprivation, as opposed to poverty or disadvantage experienced for short periods of time (Walker, 1997). In this respect, Tilly (2007) also argues that social exclusion lies at the heart of inequality, disparity and deprivation generating processes. By extension, Tilly (2007) believes that social exclusion itself promotes poverty, and exits from poverty therefore depend on eliminating the usual effects of social exclusion.

One of the key feature of social exclusion is that it can be seen as a process or set of processes rather than a static condition and, moreover, a set of processes largely outside the control of the individual. The other key feature of social exclusion is that it is necessarily a 'relational' concept. Groups and individuals are socially excluded from other groups and individuals, and society as a whole (Smith, 2000).

While the causes of social exclusion may be structural, its effects can be ameliorated or exacerbated by the attitudes, activities and policies of governmental bodies (Ibid). Besides the attitudes, activities and policies of government, the attitudes of the ethnic majorities affect the fate of ethnic and other types of minorities in a greater extent. The attitude of ethnic majority populations towards other communities is a potential important determinant of social exclusion, and the welfare of ethnic minorities both indirectly through its impact on the political process but also more directly through experiences of personal hostility. The attitudes of majority populations also affect the process of social and economic integration of minorities (Dustmann and Preston, 2001).

Social exclusion in principle defines boundaries between groups, locates the different groups in a hierarchy and regulates and guides their interaction. The attitude of discrimination is passed from society to individual and in due course the individual passes it back to the society as well (Mohanty, 2014).

It is not only the attitudes of mainstream cultural groups which is problematic but also the attitudes of the excluded themselves worsens their life conditions. This is partly because they tend to recognize their inferior position in the larger societies rather than standing up for justice and socio-cultural equality. In this respect, Mohanty (2014) agrees with the fact that it is not only those who discriminate against those who are inferior, incapable and lower who do not want this form of social relationship to be changed but those who are discriminated against also do not want to alter the situation since they fear greater discrimination and assault.

Social structures and divisions within and among societies based on different acceptable and unacceptable norms and values have been there in human known history universally even though variations in many regards have also been there across time and places. Therefore, throughout human history, by default there were sections of societies that had suffered and have been suffering a lot due to several reasons among which lack of power, resources and respect in the society where they racially, historically and geographically belongs are some of the crucial reasons for their sufferings. In this regards, the root causes and ultimate effects of discrimination, hatred, violation of human rights and lack of freedom and undermining the dignity and worth of certain sections of societies varies from place to place, and from time to time as well.

Ethnic, class, occupational and other forms of group

formations are there in Ethiopian societies since long time ago. In this regards, Haileyesus (2012), affirms the prevalence of mainstream cultural groups and ethnic minorities in Ethiopia. According to him, Ethiopia is the land of minority in whatever criteria minority is defined.

Ethiopia not only contains ethnic minority groups but there are also occupational minorities consisting of hunters and craft workers, including the Wayto among the Amhara, the Waata among the Oromo, the Manjo among the Kafa, and so on (Ethiopian Human Rights Council, 2009). Although these minorities play important roles in their societies, they have low status and are excluded by the majority. These minorities are exposed to discrimination based on descent, that is, a system of discrimination which stigmatizes individuals belonging to certain communities by the mere virtue of their descent or origination from the groups (Ethiopian Human Rights Council, 2009). Consequently, some minority groups have attempted to violently and peacefully oppose this discrimination (Yoshida, 2013). They have been resenting against regional and federal governments due to the fact that they have not been regarded as ethnic groups, and have become even more marginalized and deprived of access to economic and political resources (Ibid).

Furthermore, studies of these minority groups have been conducted from various perspectives, including approaches that focus on social structures such as castes and hierarchies, symbolic approaches that focus on pollution and fertility, approaches that focus on patron-client relationships, and so on (Pankhurst, 1999). Most of these studies are based on the dominant perspective of the majority group, the farmers, and disregard the viewpoint of the minorities (Ethiopian Human Rights Council, 2009).

Therefore, the particular focus of this study was about occupational minorities that is, 'pot makers' who are found within ethnic minority that is, the Yem Peoples who are found in Southern Nation Nationalities and Peoples Regional State. As far as the division of labour is concerned, in Yem Special Woreda, there are weavers, blacksmiths, metal smelters/ironworkers and 'pot makers'. These sections of the societies are socially prejudiced and discriminated even though the 'pot makers' are highly undermined and discriminated in comparison with the aforementioned stated occupational minorities. According to Popay et al. (2008) in the case of India, he argues that the scheduled caste are termed as untouchables and their identity is fixed at birth, 'pot makers' within the peoples of Yem are also seen by the rest of peoples as they are untouchable and unclean. However, one of the partial difference between the scheduled castes in India and the 'pot makers' of the study area is that the Indian Constitution identified the 'untouchables' as a scheduled caste on the basis of their social-economic cultural disadvantage, and made provision for improving their circumstances whereas the FDRE constitution has not recognized the existence of such occupation minorities in



different ethnic groups in Ethiopia.

There are no explicitly stipulated provisions in the FDRE constitution which are meant to improve the level of wellbeing and social status of occupational minorities in Ethiopia. For political and administrative conveniences, regional and subordinate level of administrations have been established for and named by a particular ethnic group. But within almost all regional states and subordinate level of administrations in Ethiopia, the existence of various forms of diversities is a reality. In this respect, some forms of diversities such as ethnic, linguistic and religious diversities have been emphasized by the state and the constitution of the state. But the issues of occupational minorities are either consciously or unconsciously underscored in our country.

In this regards, Pankhurst and Freeman (2003) insisted that the concerns of marginalized minorities such as hunters and craft workers have been little considered in "ethnic politics" since most of them are dispersed social categories rather than localized ethnic groups (Yoshida, 2013).

It is of the opinion of this study that the Ethiopians) are pursuing the principle like 'to catch the big fish leave the small one rhetoric' and we are saying that there are some fish that cannot be caught not because they are faster or stronger rather it is because of the fact that they were touched and caught by someone or something else'. If it is so, we have to be quite sure that the small fishes were surely caught by someone or something else. As regards this study, this like rhetoric could be criticized from many grounds. One ground from which the counter argument begins is from the fact that it is today's' small fish that develops in to big one in the foreseeable future. Therefore, what should be done is that we should not undermine issues categorically as they are insignificant at this time at different levels. Instead we have to pay due attention and work on each and every social, economic and political issues of our state and societies case by case accordingly.

In the aforementioned narration, it would be difficult to attempt to address the questions of occupational minorities through the provisions of ethnic minorities. It would be difficult partly because occupational minorities have their own social and cultural background. Besides, occupational minorities have been highly discriminated, exploited and alienated than other forms of minorities in Ethiopian socio-economic and political systems and history. In this respect, Department for International Development (2005) noted that poverty reduction policies often fail to reach socially excluded groups unless they are specifically designed to do so. Therefore, the study aims to study the causes and effects of the exclusion of 'pot makers' in the case of Yem Special Woreda in Southern Nation Nationalities and Peoples Regional State.

### **Division of labor as a cause for social exclusion**

Functional differentiation is one of the most important attributes of society. For survival, stability and for other

reasons, each individual and groups within a given society performs different functions. This means that members of society never perform the same functions. However, some functions that are performed by certain section of the society are viewed as less worthy than others. Due to unclear reasons, societies across places and time have been devaluing some occupations such as iron melting/blacksmith, weaving, and pot making and so on. Societies instead of appreciating, recognizing and respecting those who perform the aforementioned listed occupations usually exclude them.

As many scholars argues, the exclusion of certain section of society from being involved in social, cultural, economic and political systems of the society and state have been considered as wrong and violation of legal and moral values and principles. It has become doubtless fact that there are so many justifications which have been given by many scholars about why social exclusion is wrong. But this study argues that social exclusion among others involves prejudice, stereotypes, marginalization, discrimination and violation of human and democratic rights. Due to the aforementioned stated features of social exclusion, the excluded have been left at a disadvantageous position in the society and have been suffering a lot of social, cultural, economic and political problems. Poverty has been found to be one of the effects of social exclusion. In this study point of view, the dimensions of poverty that the excluded sections of societies have been experiencing seem quite nuanced and complicated. Socially excluded sections of the societies are born into poverty, and they usually die in poverty. It has become crystal clear fact that the excluded suffer a lot of miseries more than the perpetrators of the social exclusion.

In this regards, Kaplan (n.d.) and United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (2010) noted that in the majority of less developed countries, the people most likely to be poor and the poorest of the poor are those who are socially excluded because of their ethnicity, religion, clan, caste, gender, or region. Kaplan () discussed that disadvantaged by who or what they are, or where they live; such people are discriminated against in schools, in courtrooms, in where roads are built, and in the families and communities in which they live. Discrimination on the basis of gender, ethnicity, race, religion, or social status can lead to social exclusion and lock people into long-term poverty traps (World Bank, 2000).

de Haan (1999) also suggests that discrimination constitutes a central dimension of social exclusion, and there is growing evidence of its links to long-term poverty in poor countries (Hickey and du Toit, 2007). Furthermore, discrimination and intolerance threatens the social cohesion of plural and democratic societies. The most visible expression of intolerance and discrimination is prejudice. Indicators of intolerance such as prejudice, anti-democratic attitudes and the prevalence of discrimination consequently represent sensitive measures of social cohesion (Zick et al., 2011). Abrams (2010) also

agree with the fact that prejudice and discrimination can affect people's opportunities, their social resources, self-worth and motivation, and their engagement with wider society. Social exclusion has also been found to lower the self-esteem, effort, and performance of individuals in the groups discriminated against (United Nations Development Programme, 2010).

Although socio-economic and political reforms which were implemented by the current government in Ethiopia are grounded on the imperative of recognition, inclusion, promotion and protection of various forms of diversities, occupational minorities that are found in different parts of the country have been either passively or actively excluded by the mainstream cultural groups. Occupational minorities are considered by mainstream cultural groups as peoples with low worth and capacity.

The importance of being socially included was first articulated in the economic literature by Smith (1776), who described a key component of social life as the ability to appear in public without shame (Omtzigt, 2009). However, both theoretical and practical evidences reveals that socially excluded section of societies are usually ashamed of themselves due to prejudice and discrimination by mainstream cultural groups. In this regards, 'pot makers' themselves thought that they are not equal with the rest of the people of Yem Special Woreda. Consequently, the children of 'pot makers' perceive that learning is not what is expected from them. They usually feel ashamed to sit and learn together with the children of non-pot makers. In fact, most of the time, they were forced by the Woreda authorities to go to nearby formal schools but it was not successful yet. If they enrolled they do not continue their formal education up to the secondary and tertiary levels. Considering this truism in account, the study believe that a lot remained to be done in the study area to empower and encourage the children's of the 'pot makers' to be enrolled and learn in formal schools because education is one of the vital means that enables society to achieve several aspirations.

Furthermore, the theoretical insight that the researcher would like to add through this study is that almost all researches which had been conducted at different times by different researchers had analyzed the issues of social exclusion either at international, national and regional levels. Besides, most of these studies were Eurocentric in their approaches in the sense that most of the studies were conducted in Europe and/or in some other continents and they considers migrants, refugees, women, physically handicapped, mentally ill, unemployed, older/aged peoples, retired peoples and so on as socially excluded portion of societies (Silver, 1994).

Accepting the fact that social exclusion is multi-dimensional, dynamic, and relational and should be studied contextually, studying the causes and effects of the exclusion of refugees, migrants, elder peoples, and unemployed is not a priority issue for investigation in Ethiopia in general and in the study area in particular.

Ethiopia is known as a home for nations, nationalities and peoples that is, there are more than 85 ethnic groups. Therefore, the issues of social exclusion in Ethiopia should be studied considering the fact that Regional/states, Zones, and Woredas are established on the bases of ethnic backgrounds and in most of the regional states and subordinate levels of administrations, there are ethnic and occupational minorities (Belay, 2010). These ethnic and occupational minorities were socio-culturally marginalized and discriminated by the mainstream cultural groups with whom they share a lot of commonalities. Therefore, investigating about the causes and effects of the exclusion of occupational minorities should be seen as one of the priority issue in our country.

Besides, in our country, the concepts of poverty and social exclusion are viewed as one and the same, and used interchangeably. However, poverty has been seen as a number one social and economic challenge in Ethiopia. As a result laws, policies, strategies and programmes were designed to either reduce or eradicate poverty. In this respect, the incumbent government has been doing a lot in reducing and eradicating poverty since it came to power. In the meantime, the issue of social exclusion seems sidelined and neglected because it was not separately seen from poverty. In this study point of view, in order to successfully and sustainably win the battles and wars against poverty, the need for clearly identifying and studying some of the proxy concepts like social exclusion is not only mandatory but it should also be an urgent issue. In this regards, Mathieson et al. (2008) warns us that care should be taken to avoid defining, measuring, and interpreting poverty and social exclusion concepts interchangeably.

Furthermore, some of the studies seen have reviewed that social exclusion were conducted on ethnic, linguistic and religious minorities that are found in different parts of Ethiopia. Besides, even these existing limited studies prime focus was merely on the political rights that ethnic minorities ought to have and exercise in the regions and subordinate levels of administrations where they live. But the particular focus of this study was about the causes and effects of the social exclusion in the case occupational minorities because in the study point of view these sections of societies' issues have not been well addressed in Ethiopia partly due to the fact that these occupational minorities are numerically quite less in most cases, and as a result they do not have adequate avenues and capacity (social capital) to bring their cases to the attention of the public and the state as well. In this respect, the study sought to study socio-cultural processes that results in multiple deprivations, discrimination, disadvantage and extreme poverty for occupational minorities.

Therefore, this study was conducted at the lowest and the most important level of administration in Ethiopia that is, at Woreda level. In this regards, in order to investigate the causes and effects of social exclusion in depth, this study was conducted in Yem Special Woreda in Southern

Nation, Nationalities and Peoples Regional State considering 'Pottery Makers' as one of the occupation minority in the study area. Yem Special Woreda was selected because the researcher was born and raised there, and has lived there for more than twenty five years. As a result he has adequate knowledge and experience about social, economic and political issues of Woreda.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

### Conceptualizing social exclusion

The concept of 'social exclusion' is highly contested, and has multiple meanings. These meanings are being continually redefined over time, and have different policy implications as well. The term 'social exclusion' has been used to describe: groups at risk of exclusion; what people are excluded from; the states associated with exclusion; the processes involved and levels at which they operate; and the actors involved (Mathieson et al., 2008).

Mathieson et al. (2008) argues that there is some consensus that 'social exclusion' is a multidimensional concept due to the fact that it encompasses social, political, cultural and economic dimensions, and operates at different social levels, it is also dynamic and relational concept. As a dynamic concept, it has been impacting the excluded section of societies in different ways to differing degrees at different social levels over time. A relational perspective has two dimensions. On the one hand, it focuses on exclusion as the rupture of relationships between people and the society resulting in a lack of social participation, social protection, social integration and power. Alternatively, a relational perspective points to exclusion as the product of unequal social relationships characterized by differential power i.e. the product of the way societies are organized (Ibid).

Definitions also differ in other fundamental respects. Social exclusion has been conceptualized as a continuum across society, or as affecting a segment of the population outside mainstream social systems and relationships. Similarly, social exclusion may be defined as the processes embedded in unequal power relationships that create inequalities or as a state of multiple disadvantages (Ibid).

There is also a distinction between schools of thought that emphasize lack of participation of individuals in society and those that identify social exclusion as a lack of access to citizenship rights for members of particular group, community, society or country (Ibid). The three paradigms of social exclusion are: solidarity, specialization and monopoly, based on different notions of social integration, attribute exclusion to a different cause and is grounded in a different political philosophy, and provides an explanation of multiple forms of social disadvantage. One of the most important paradigms in connection to this study is the solidarity paradigm derived from the French

Republican thought attributes exclusion to the breakdown of social solidarity that is, the social bond between the individual and society. The solidarity paradigm, with strong antecedents in Durkheimian sociology, views society as something external, moral and normative rather than grounded in individual, group or class interests and solidarity arising out of shared values and rights (Hillary, 1994 cited in Nabin Rawal, n.d.).

According to the same author, the second paradigm which is the specialization paradigm argues that exclusion is a form of discrimination, which occurs when individuals are denied free movement and exchange between spheres, when rules inappropriate to a given sphere are enforced or when group boundaries impede individual freedom to participate in social exchanges (Ibid). The third paradigm, influential on the European Left, views exclusion as a consequence of the formation of group monopolies, with resources being controlled by hierarchical and exclusive networks. Drawing heavily on Weber, and to some extent Marx, it views the social order as coercive, imposed through a set of hierarchical power relations. According to this paradigm, exclusion arises from the interplay of class, status and political power and serves the interest of the included and the excluded are simultaneously outsiders and dominated. In this case exclusion can be combated through citizenship and the extension of equal membership and full participation in the community (Hillary, 1994 cited in Nabin Rawal, n.d.).

The ways how the three paradigms had discussed the concept of social exclusion is quite impressive because of the fact that they addressed complementarily the centerpiece of the exclusion of 'pot makers' in the study area. In the study area, 'pot makers', instead of being integrated with mainstream groups were passively left out of social, economic and political activities. As a result, there is no social bond that connects and ties the 'pot makers' with us (the rest of peoples of Yem Special Woreda). If there are any bonds that connects the two sections of the society, when we see the 'we feeling' among the rest of the peoples of the study area and the pot makers does not look like strong and well entrenched one.

In this regards, in order to build strong bond of connection (solidarity) and enhance the level of solidarity within ourselves, revitalizing/renewing/redefining the norms and values that pacifies the move for genuine integration of 'pot makers' in study area is highly and urgently needed. Besides, as it was noted in specialization paradigm, the existing norms of the study area do not encourage genuine interaction between the 'pot makers' and the rest of peoples of the study area.

In all areas and levels of interactions between 'pot makers' and non-pot makers, the former are disadvantaged because of who they are and what role they play in the society. In fact, the disadvantaged section of society's likelihood of being dominated in many regards is and should be unquestionable fact. As monopoly paradigm notes that social exclusion arises from

the interplay of class, status and political power, and also serves the interest of the included and the 'pot makers' of the study area are disadvantageous in all of the aforementioned issues. As far the issue of class and status is concerned, 'pot makers' of the study area are considered as socially undermined class and have a servant status in the study area. Class and position in a given society are seen as the main marker of power relationships no matter what power it might be.

In this regards, therefore, 'pot makers' are both powerless and voiceless. This is one of the main reason why this topic was selected to uncover causes and effects of powerlessness and voicelessness of the pot makers in the study area. As a result of all these disadvantages, the 'pot makers' of the study area are highly passively discriminated and dictated by the rest of peoples of Yem Special Woreda.

In conclusion, in order to advance the level of we feeling, the causes and effects of the exclusion of 'pot makers' has to be exhaustively figured out and addressed accordingly as soon as possible. To do this, either passively or actively discriminating the 'pot makers' through controlling resources, power and a myriads of opportunities in the study area should also be dealt well simultaneously.

### **Causes and forms of social exclusion**

This study discusses some of the causes due to which social exclusion perpetuated. From the existing scattering findings and suggestions about forms of social exclusion, some of the notable dimensions of social exclusion are roughly discussed. With regard to the causes of social exclusion, the study discusses some of the factors, reasons and attributes that result in exclusion of individuals, communities and societies from engaging in social, economical and political systems. In this regards; race, color, gender, ethnicity, religion, caste, role, occupation, educational status, age, health condition, settlement pattern and so on are some of common grounds that are used to form human groupings.

Knowing the cause of social exclusion in this study, the primary reason why pot makers has been socially excluded from non-pot makers is because of the role they play in society where they live. To come to the central point, the pot makers' role in the society of the study area is pot making. Indeed, in addition to making and providing earthenware to society, pot makers are also obligated to undertake some traditional practices. Yem peoples as a society have their own beliefs, traditions, norms, customs, values and way of life. Among other beliefs and traditions, there are some which are and should be performed by pot makers. The Yem peoples used to believe that if individual families have bear twin babies (they call it Mano), there may be something wrong that they have committed and omitted.

Therefore, they are expected to prepare everything which is necessary for the forgiveness and purification

program/ceremony. In this regards, all those who have a parental relationship with the one who got twin babies must be invited to and attend the program. This purification and forgiveness program is performed by the chosen pot makers (they are called Bera). The same ceremony is also practiced if thunder and lightning has damaged some ones Tree, Enset and other resources. Otherwise they believe the same thing might happen on the victim and his or her resources again. In the recent past, in the study area, pot makers were also obligated to carry the diseased persons to its resting places. Furthermore, pot makers were also used to serve as a slave for non-pot makers because they were obligated to work for the non-pot makers with very less compensations. The above highlighted roles that the pot makers play in society and beliefs and traditions of the peoples of the study area altogether have been serving a lot as a cause for the exclusion of pot makers in one way or another.

For the sake of convenience to examine and address social exclusion, some scholars have identified the following dimensions. In this regards, Khan (2012) discusses that political exclusion can include the denial of citizenship rights such as political participation and the right to organize, and also of personal security, the rule of law, freedom of expression and equality of opportunity. Bhalla and Lapeyre (1997) argue that political exclusion also involves the notion that the state, which grants basic rights and civil liberties, is not a neutral agency but a vehicle of a society's dominant classes, and may thus discriminate between social groups.

Economic exclusion is concerned with the fact that the excluded usually encounters particular difficulty to get own and access assets and resources. In this respect, due to lack and limited capabilities, the excluded may fail to compete and use provisions and opportunities which might be provided for the society as a whole. Failing to compete and use the economic opportunities such as employment would likely lead the excluded to live below the level of life that they supposed live. In this regards, pot makers do not use employment opportunities which are available in the study area partly due to lack of the required knowledge, skills and experiences for formal positions.

The other highly crucial dimension of social exclusion is social and cultural exclusion as it was discussed by Khan (2012), and according to the author it may take the form of discrimination along a number of grounds including gender, ethnicity and age, which reduce the opportunity for such groups to gain access to social services and limits their participation in the labour market. As far cultural exclusion is concerned with the fact that the values, norms, beliefs and traditions of the society that resonate and enjoin social exclusion.

The aforementioned stated dimensions of social exclusion are highly interconnected to each other. That is why social exclusion as a concept has been seen by many scholars as a multidimensional issue. For instance if certain section of societies are either actively or passively excluded from employment and access to assets, they

would likely lack minimum income and other basic necessities. Due to capability limitation, the excluded would likely leave out social and cultural interactions. As a result, it is highly challenging to identify single specific dimensions to examine and address the whole aspects of social exclusion.

In this regards, Khan (2012) asserts that people may be excluded because of deliberate action on the part of others (for example, discrimination by employers); as a result of processes in society which do not involve deliberate action; or even by choice.

## **Social exclusion and poverty**

### ***Is social exclusion a cause for poverty or poverty is a cause for social exclusion?***

Hereunder, the study has tried to discuss poverty and social exclusion because of the following reasons. Firstly, the two concepts are highly interconnected but not identical, and as a result there is confusion among many of us. Therefore, in order to contribute in reducing the existing confusions and misconceptions about the two concepts, the study has incorporated some literatures that have been reviewed for this study. Secondly, after the study has included some of the definitions of poverty and social exclusion from existing body of knowledge, the study also reflected on whether poverty is a cause of social exclusion or social exclusion is a cause for poverty.

It is not easy to define poverty. There was no universally accepted definition of poverty. This is because of the fact that some definitions used income, while others used human poverty/qualitative approach. Traditionally, poverty has been defined as the inability to obtain basic necessities of life, and these basic necessities include food, shelter and cloth. Besides, poverty is viewed as a pronounced in wellbeing.

The conventional view links well-being primarily to command over commodities, so the poor are those who do not have enough income or consumption to put them above some adequate minimum threshold. This view sees poverty largely in monetary terms. But this has been considered as a narrow definition as it only focuses on material deprivation (that is, the failure to command private resources).

The broadest approach to well-being focuses on the capability of the individual to function in society. Poverty is seen as the deprivation of basic capabilities to live the kind of life one has reason to value. The poor lack key capabilities, and may have inadequate income or education, or be in poor health, or feel powerless, or lack political freedoms. Poverty is much more than inadequate income; it is a sense of powerlessness, exhaustion and exclusion from decision making. Further, that the dimensions of poverty cover gender equality, education, health, shelter, water, sanitation, risk, vulnerability,

participation, 'voice', and other social 'rights' (Sen, 1999). Robinson (2002) also stresses that poverty is an assault on human dignity, but it can also reflect a violation of human rights when it is the direct consequence of government policy or is caused by the failure of governments to act.

Similar with the concept of poverty, social exclusion has been defined in a numbers ways. Among others, the concept of social exclusion has been defined as the breakdown social bond and the process due to which individuals or groups are wholly or partially excluded from participating in the society within which they live (Francis, 2002). Social exclusion is also understood by many scholars as a multidimensional concept because it encompasses social, political, cultural and economic dimensions. It is also seen as a dynamic and relational concept. As a dynamic concept, it has been impacting in different ways to different degrees at different levels over time (Mathieson et al., 2008).

There is no unanimous consensus among scholars on whether poverty is a cause for social exclusion or social exclusion results poverty. This study has argued that poverty is the effect of social exclusion. This is because of the fact that the manners in which the poor fails to engage in social, economic, cultural, and political endeavors differs from the socially or categorically excluded groups in the society. What the study wants to discuss here is that, comparatively speaking poverty seems in most cases a temporary phenomenon than social exclusion because social exclusion is usually rooted in social and cultural systems of the society. The social and cultural systems in turn often times influences the economic and political systems of the society.

As a result, transformations in the earlier listed aspects of social exclusion might demand numerous requirements and this truism suggests many scholars to view social exclusion as it is an intergenerational issue. For instance, if an individual from poor family has won 100 Million Ethiopian Birr in this year, every opportunities would be ease and available for him or her in the society. However, if the above lottery winners' background is from the excluded sections of society, many opportunities will not be ease, accessible and available to him or her due to the fact that the other factors such as social, cultural and political systems. Therefore, this lottery winner would likely remain unfulfilled, dissatisfied, unhappy, inferior, and insecure and so on in the society because his or her social, cultural and political aspirations might be compromised due to who s/he is. To simplify the discussion, for instance, the lottery winner does not have right to choose and marry spouse from the perpetrators of the social exclusion. In this respect, the societies that perceive them as they are superior over the excluded would likely out caste the claimants of the marriage as they are socio culturally unfit. Besides, s/he would likely suffer a lot because of lack of friends from different walks of life. That is to mean that the lottery winner, if he/she is from the excluded section of



society, would lack friends for example from business, justice and political sectors. Therefore, is this not poverty? If this is not poverty, what else is poverty? For me, lack of love and respect, friends, recognition and honor, interaction and communication in society are some of the dimensions of poverty and they are the effects of social exclusion.

Consequently, these are some of the logical arguments and reasons that influenced me to support the scholars who believe that poverty is the effect of social exclusion.

## **Effects of social exclusion**

### ***Why social exclusion is a problem?***

For the question why social exclusion is wrong and it is a problem, finding unanimously agreed justifications and conclusions might be difficult. However, some of the commonly found justifications, assumptions and analysis for why social exclusion is wrong include the following. At any level, social exclusion results in the categorization of peoples into different categories.

Additionally, social exclusion also divides (a given) society into different groupings based on certain criteria's. Some of the bases according to which social exclusion takes place at different levels include race, class, color, religion, gender, age, ethnicity, role, status, occupation, wealth, health condition and employment status. No matter on which of the aforementioned stated grounds and attributes social exclusion was based, it has been viewed by many scholars as it is wrong and unjust (Le Grand, 2003). In this regards, Le Grand (2003) discusses that social exclusion dilutes social solidarity and creates a problem for democratic politics. According the same author, social solidarity was conceptualized as a sense of fellow feeling that extends beyond people with whom one is in personal contact with.

Considering the earlier stated definition of social solidarity into account, the following inferences can be made. Social exclusion rather than strengthening feeling in the society, it usually loosens and breaks the networks that connect individuals to individuals, individuals to society and society to society as well. Lack of feeling and harmony in the society and among society would also likely lead to competition instead of cooperation and consensus on common concerns and issues of a society.

Consequently, lack of cooperation and the prevalence of competition over resource and power often times results either violent or non violent conflicts within a given society and among societies and states too. In this regards, resources which could have been used to achieve social, economic and political aspirations of the societies might be allocated for war and conflicts. History has been showing to us a lot about the effects of conflict at different levels. Some of the effects of conflict at different level include lack of peace and order, lack of trust within and among society,

breakdown of rule of law, violation of human and democratic rights loss of human life, destruction of the existing limited resources, destruction of infrastructure, poverty and backwardness. These are some of the effects of social exclusion that justify why social exclusion is wrong and problem.

Social exclusion is not only wrong, unjust and it also creates problem for a democratic politics, as it was discussed by Le Grand (2003), but it has also been viewed by some scholars as a violation of human rights. Social exclusion is viewed as a human rights issue because the excluded sections of societies usually face difficulty to exercise their social, economic and political rights. Every citizen has the right to equal and fair access to social services. However, social exclusion usually creates inequality of opportunity, especially with respect to education, health and employment opportunities (Ibid).

Furthermore, social exclusion is wrong because it usually cause poverty and causes difficulty for the excluded to escape from it. It seems quite difficult for socially excluded to escape from poverty partly because the causes of poverty are highly complicated and multidimensional. In this regards, Kabeer ( n.d.) argues that the extreme or the chronic poor are not 'just like' the rest of the poor, only poorer or poor for longer, but are additionally disadvantaged by 'who they are', aspects of their identity which set them apart from the rest of the poor. de Haan (1999) also discusses that the disadvantages faced by the excluded may be, and often are, interrelated. For example, people belonging to minorities or school drop-outs may have a greater risk of being unemployed or employed in precarious jobs and hence be low paid, less educated, recipients of social assistance, have little political power, and fewer social contacts

In this regards, this study strongly believe that the effects, dimensions and severity of poverty and deprivation is more nuanced in the 'pot makers' than the majority of the peoples of the study area. One of the primary reasons why poverty is more nuanced on 'pottery makers' than the rest of us is that they were socially excluded and marginalized in many regards. Furthermore, the 'pot makers' are more vulnerable to shocks, emergencies, and insecurities than the rest of us comparatively speaking. In the following section, the study discussed some of the effects of the exclusion of 'pot makers' in Yem Special Woreda in Southern Nation, Nationalities and Peoples Regional State in Ethiopia.

## **The effects of social exclusion in the study area**

In order to discuss some of the effects of the social exclusion in the study area, the study raised the following question: what had happened and what has been happening on 'pot makers' because of who they are and what they work in the study area? Do the 'pot makers' have the same respect and honor with the rest of peoples

of study area? Why is it that the 'pot makers' seems more vulnerable for poverty and many other hardships in the study area? Even though the 'pottery makers' are Yem by their racial background, due to the fact that their livelihood is based primarily on income which was generated from selling earthenware, they were placed at the lowest level of social strata. This subordinate position of the 'pot makers' and the role which was assigned to them relegated them at a disadvantageous position in the society where they live.

In the study area, pot makers for a long time had been mandated to perform certain tasks such as producing clay products, serving for non-pot makers in many ways, providing ritual practices for non-pot makers and so on. This division of labour had resulted social division within 'the same people' that is, the people of Yem. Therefore, by default 'we' and 'they' category had emerged and has been unendingly continuing in the study area. As a result of prejudice and discrimination by the rest of peoples of study area, the 'pot makers' were not proud of who they are and what they produce and provide for the society. Furthermore, 'pot makers' lack fair recognition and humane treatment by the rest of peoples of the study area.

The 'pot makers' in the study area have been producing and providing clay products for the society because of the fact that the other means of survival for them are highly tough and rare due to many reasons. For instance, most of the 'pot makers' in the study area, have too limited and unproductive land and by and large they usually lack oxen to plough that limited plot of land. Besides, their land is highly degraded due to natural and manmade factors and as a result it is not fertile enough. To worsen the case, the 'pot makers' of the study area have been eventually reducing their level dependence on producing earthenware for the society for many reasons. One of the main reasons why they seem to give up pot making is that they feel that non pot makers are prejudiced and discriminated upon.

In this respect, value systems, norms and practices of the study area resonate that 'pot makers' are not socially equal with the rest of people of the study area. In this regards, Yoshida (2008) asserts that Manjo believe their practice of making earthenware was one of the reasons the Kafa peoples discriminate against them. Similarly, the people of Manjo are considered by Kafa as the people of bad clan, 'pot makers' in Yem Special Woreda are also seen the same by the people of the study area. The other reason why pot makers are forced to reduce their dependence on pot making as some interviewees has suggested is that pot making is quite tiresome business.

According to Yoshida (2008), the reason why Kafa peoples prejudice and stereotype the Manjo is because the Manjo eat unclean, dirty and religiously prohibited animals such as savanna monkey, baboon, colobus, wild boar, and dead animals. The Kafa peoples describe the Manjo as they are short in height and have very curly hair. Their noses are low and wide and they do not care about

hygiene, do not wash their bodies or clothes, and smell unpleasant and the Manjo are wicked and are liars, they are not interested in education, and they are ignorant and lazy. Furthermore they are viewed as an extravagant and lack a sense of morality (Yoshida, 2008).

The socio-cultural prejudices, stereotypes and discriminations that the Manjo people encounters are quite similar with the stereotypes of 'pot makers' in Yem Special Woreda. Social discrimination against 'pot makers' is noticeable in many places such as during greetings, at mealtimes, in the social and cultural structures of the Yem peoples, in marriage and so on. In other words, due to the existing stereotypes and prejudices, pot makers are not allowed to marry with non-pot makers, and the reverse also true. Not only intermarriage but also having sexual intercourse with pot makers is considered as a taboo that entails serious punishment to the extent of excluding the wrong doer until certain traditional practices are carried out. Besides, during meal time, pot makers are socially obligated to sit either at the corner or outside of the non pot makers house where the guests were gathered for instance for Ikub, Edir, Debo and Mehaber. Furthermore within Yem Peoples there are also social organizations in which pot makers do not have any place to participate.

Therefore, these stereotypes and malpractices have lessened the worth and the potential of the 'pot makers' in the study area. As a result, they view themselves as they are worthless for and powerless in the society. In this regards, Department for International Development (2005) asserts that when people feel they are being judged on the basis of who they are, they may perform less well. When people expect prejudice, it can undermine their motivation to achieve. Together with social stigma and the ill perception of 'pot makers' about themselves becomes a paramount contributor for multiple deprivations of 'pot makers' in the study area. That is why, in this respect, Tilly (2007) noted that social exclusion lies at the heart of inequality generating processes. Tilly (2007) argues that exclusion itself promotes poverty, and exits from poverty therefore depend on eliminating usual effects of social exclusion. But in this study point of view, any sort of exclusion not only promotes poverty but it also multiplies poverty and worsens the fates of poor or/and poorest.

In this respect, Department for International Development (2005) also notes that people who are excluded are not just like the rest of the poor, only poorer. Rather they are also disadvantaged by who they are or where they live and as a result are locked out of the benefits of development. Social exclusion deprives people's choices and opportunities to escape from poverty and denies them a voice to claim their rights. In order to further discuss the effects of social exclusion in the context of the study area, the following definitions of social exclusion are worth mentioning.

Social exclusion is the processes due to which individuals or groups are misjudged and excluded from participating in the society where they live (Francis, 2002).

Mathieson et al. (2008) also assert that there is some consensus that 'social exclusion' is:

1. Multidimensional, encompassing social, political, cultural and economic dimensions, and operating at different social levels;
2. Dynamic, impacting in different ways to differing degrees at different social levels over time; and
3. Relational (ibid).

Considering these conceptions of social exclusion, the effects of social exclusion on the 'pot makers' of the study area was discussed as the following:

The 'pot makers' are not only socially disregarded and discriminated but they are also not active participant in decision makings in the study area. Due to lack of myriads of 'capabilities', their active and meaningful involvement in decision making at all levels is at infancy in study area. In this regards, of course, there is no any legislation that prohibits the active and full participation of 'pot makers' in decision making. Likewise there is no any legislation that encourages their active, equal and meaningful engagement. The partial reason why the 'pot makers' were not able to actively engage in civic and political activities is that no one perceives that they have right and capacity to do so. Besides, there is a belief that the problems of participation at local levels can be addressed by implementing the countrywide reforms. However, unless policies, programmes and packages are driven from the existing realities and implemented as per these existing realities, it would be very difficult to reap achievements for which our policies, programs and packages were intended for.

Active, equal and meaningful participation in both developmental and political decision making matters a lot at all levels in general and at grass root levels in particular partly because politics is concerned with active participation, influencing policies and programmes in different ways and knowing about who is getting what, how much share someone deserves, why s/he/they has/have got that share and what would happen if someone has/have not participated and left with nothing due to lack of participation. In this respect, 'pot makers' were not participating, influencing, deciding and knowing and getting the benefits that they should have got not because the legislations of the study area prohibits them rather it is because of socio-cultural factors which are embedded in the study area. It is through participation they could know the benefits and claim more avenues to be benefited, represented and empowered.

Furthermore, legally and politically, the 'pot makers' are entitled with rights, freedoms and privileges of citizenship in the Woreda. But in practice, they are not actively claiming and exercising these citizenship rights, freedoms and privileges in the study area. Because citizenship is not only legal entitlement but also it is equal and active

participation in the political systems as many political theorists argues.

In this respect, citizenship is held to constitute an inherently progressive form of political status, associated with the rule of law, secure property rights, democratization and empowerment (Hickey and du Toit, 2007). Silver (1994), Hickey and du Toit (2007) also suggests that exclusion is combated through citizenship, and the extension of equal membership and full participation in the community. Therefore, due to the adverse incorporation, 'pot makers' in Yem Special Woreda in Southern Nation, Nationalities and Peoples Regional State do not actively engage in decision makings. As a result, they have not been raised any affirmative action and/or any other mechanisms of empowerment for them from the Woreda government and other levels of governments which have a mandate and stake in this regards so far. As a result of all the aforementioned reasons, poverty with its all dimensions is more acute in the case of 'pot makers' than the rest of the peoples of Yem Special Woreda.

## METHODOLOGY

### Research design

de Haad (1999) argues that social exclusion can be measured in quantitative terms. Kanbur (2001) also argues that the quantitative approaches that dominate mainstream analyses of poverty are, however, at a disadvantage when used to study adverse incorporation and social exclusion, particularly when seeking to exploit their capacity to produce cross-national comparative findings. Social exclusion is not an easily visible, stable unchanging reality but a complex and multi-leveled process: although some of its outcomes and aspects can be indirectly quantified, though it is not itself directly available to measurement. Moreover, its proxies and markers are always highly contextual and socially embedded. This makes it very difficult to identify a shared benchmark that can be applied and compared across different contexts. The deeply contextual character of adverse incorporation and social exclusion is further problematic for quantitative approaches (Kanbur, 2001). Cognizant of all the aforementioned justifications about the weaknesses of quantitative approach, the researcher has utilized both quantitative and qualitative research approaches accordingly.

### Data type and source

In order to assess the causes and effects of social exclusion, the researcher has employed both primary and secondary data. The primary data was obtained through questionnaire and interview. Besides, the primary data and secondary data were also obtained from different sources such as published and unpublished articles, researches and books. Therefore, the residents of the study area that is, Yem Special Woreda and purposively selected individuals from both the 'pottery makers' and non pot makers were the sources of the primary data.

### Sampling frame, techniques and size

Due to the nature of the study, non probability sampling method and purposive sampling techniques were opted in this study. Accordingly, about 20 respondents from non-pot makers and 17 respondents from

pot makers were selected to fill the questionnaire, and interview was also conducted to strengthen the data that was acquired through questionnaire.

### **Method of data collection**

#### **Questionnaire**

The questionnaire of this study was prepared in English language, and it was translated into 'Yemigna' (the vernacular language) and Amharic (working language) of the region and the study area. Structured questionnaire was distributed to those purposively selected respondents. The questionnaire was designed in a manner that its contents would provide in-depth information about the causes and effects of social exclusion in the study area.

#### **Interview**

Following questionnaire distribution and administration, semi-structured interviews was also conducted with some purposively selected interviewees. The data that were obtained from the interviews were used to strengthen and fill the gaps that are not filled by the questionnaires. Open ended questions were raised for those interviewees and they have provided their responses in a free and explained manner.

### **Method of data analysis**

The researcher has used both quantitative and qualitative methods of data analysis and interpretations. Based on the objectives of the study, descriptive statistical analysis such as percentages, frequencies and tabular representation were used. Inductive analysis was largely given sound caution and weights as some aspects of social exclusion are normative and interpretive in their nature.

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

The study analyzed the data that were acquired through questionnaire and interview. Most of questions incorporated in the questionnaire and interview are similar. Due to this reason, the results of interview were not separately discussed from the results which were obtained through questionnaire. The data were collected from non-pot makers (mainstream groups) and 'pot makers'.

To assess the causes and effects of social exclusion, the specific question which were incorporated in the questionnaire and interview guide include: does poverty vary among 'pot makers' and non-pot makers; how do mainstream groups perceive 'pot makers'; are 'pot makers' excluded from participating in social, economic, and political activities; are 'pot makers' excluded by themselves or they are excluded by the rest of peoples of the study area; from what 'pot makers' are excluded; what are the bases according to which 'pot makers' are differentiated from the rest of the peoples of the study area; do 'pot makers' have their own identity which is different from non-pot makers; if the pot makers have their own identities, do mainstream groups recognize and

respect their identities; what is the reaction of the 'pot makers' for prejudices by non-pot makers, what are the causes of poverty in the case of 'pot makers', what are the ultimate and causal effects of social exclusion on 'pot makers', what is the economic base of the 'pot makers', do 'pot makers' in the study area are abandoned from engaging in religious and cultural celebrations together with non-pot makers, do pot makers get similar health services with non-pot makers and where does stereotype and prejudice takes place in the study area. The responses of these all enquiries were analyzed as the following.

One of the central questions that the study incorporated in the questionnaire is the question which is concerned with whether the 'pot makers' are excluded or not from social, cultural, economic and political activities in the study area. In this regard, about 65% of the respondents suggested that, 'pot makers' are excluded from the social, cultural, economic and political activities that they could and should have been participated. For one or other reasons, the remaining percentage (35%) of the respondents opined that pot makers are not excluded from social, cultural, economic and political activities in the study area. For the same question, about 55% of the respondents from pot makers replied that they are not excluded from social, economic and political activities that they could and should have been participated. And the remaining proportion of the respondents replied that they are excluded from engaging in social, economic and political undertakings in the study area.

As far as the concept of social exclusion is concerned, many scholars believe that social exclusion might occur voluntarily and forcedly. In this regard, the great majority of the respondents suggested that 'pot makers' are excluded by the rest of peoples of the study area. On the contrary to above suggestion, about 35% of the respondents replied that 'pot makers' were not excluded by the rest of peoples of the study area. To strengthen the reliability of the data, the study also raised the same question for pot makers, and about 55% of them have replied that they face the act exclusion by the rest of peoples of the study area. However, the remaining 35% of the respondents replied that they are excluded voluntarily due to numerous reasons.

If the pot makers were excluded as it was suggested earlier, what attributes serves as ground for differentiating the pot makers from the rest of peoples of the study area? The has incorporated this question in the questionnaire and interview guide because societies usually use various attributes such as nationality, gender, ethnic origin, sexuality, physical ability, color and language, occupation, economic and social status to categorize a group of peoples. In this respect, it seems highly confusing about the attributes that results the division of the peoples of the study area in to 'pot makers' and non-pot makers. It is confusing because the great majority of the respondents suggested that 'pot makers' are distinguished from the rest

of peoples of the study area by their own unique identities that characterizes them. Opposing the above suggestion, about 40 percent of respondents argued that the pot makers' mainstay is the main ground according to which they are differentiated from the rest of peoples of the study area. That means 'pot makers' livelihood is based on producing and selling earthenware. The remaining 5 percent of respondents have also suggested that they were born different and they have their own social structure which is different from the rest of peoples of the study area.

As far the attributes which resonates social division and exclusion in the study area are concerned, respondents were also asked about whether 'pot makers' have their own belief, tradition, custom, and way of life or not. In this respect, most of the respondents suggested that 'pot makers' do not have their own belief, tradition, custom, and way of life which is different from non-pot makers. However, about 40% of the respondents believe that pot makers have their belief, tradition, custom and way of life. The latter proportion of respondents argued that it is due to this reason that non pot makers exclude 'pot makers'. The great majority (53 percent) of respondents from pot makers have also suggested that they do not have their own values and culture which is different from non-pot makers. The remaining proportion of respondents from pot makers argued that they do have their own belief, traditions, norms, and identities. In this respect, it seems very difficult to conclude about the exact lists of attributes according to which the 'pot makers' are differentiated from non-pot makers. Therefore, to reach to exact conclusion with regard to whether pot makers have their own identities or not further investigation might be needed.

Even though the study has encountered difficulty concluding the attributes which serves as benchmark to differentiate the 'pot makers' from the rest of the peoples of the study area, the study has tried to examine and analyze whether the unique identities of the 'pot makers' are recognized and respected by the rest of peoples of the study area or not. In this respect, about 20% of respondents replied that non pot makers do not recognize and respect the norms, beliefs and values of pot makers. Instead of recognizing and respecting their identities, non-pot makers discriminate and treat them accordingly. However, 80% of the respondents replied that non pot makers recognize and respect the values and way of life of the 'pot makers'. Contrary with the reality on the ground, about 77% of respondents from pot makers also replied that non pot makers recognize and respect the value system of pot makers. The aforementioned opinions seem false and questionable because the values, customs and way of life of the pot makers lack recognition and respect in the study area.

However, the remaining 20% of the respondents from non-pot makers and 23% from pot makers replied that non pot makers do not recognize and respect value system of the pot makers'.

Pot makers not only lack respect and recognition but they face prejudice and discrimination in the study area. This is because prejudice and discrimination are emanated from and embedded in the value systems of the society and the value system of the society in turn affect and shape the attitude of the society accordingly. In this respect, about half of the respondents replied that they perceive the 'pot makers' as anyone else with no distinction of any kind. It was only 35% of the respondents who have replied that they perceive them with less respect. And the remaining 15% of the respondents replied that they see the pot makers with high respect. Even though the respondents suggestions were divided with regard to the question, the fact of the matter is that the 'pot makers' in the study area are considered by the rest of peoples as people with low worth. It is not only because of their unique identities that the 'pot makers' encounters stereotypes, prejudice and discrimination but also they produce and sell earthenware products. Hence, both pot makers and non-pot perceives that the economic activities up on which pot makers rely on have either directly or indirectly played its part for the exclusion of pot makers in the study area.

In this respect, 45% of respondents have opined that the primary mainstay of pot makers is producing and selling earthenware. The remaining 25 and 30% of respondents replied that farming and mixed economic activities are the primary mainstay for pot makers respectively.

The issue of social exclusion would not be a serious issue, if the excluded sections of societies do not suffer many consequences with various degrees. In this regards, 55% of the respondents replied that 'pot makers' were excluded due to various reasons from access to social services such as education and health services. Hence, it can be inferred that either the absence or the limited access to aforementioned stated services might have contributed a lot for dire poverty for the 'pot makers' in the study area. The remaining 30 and 15% of the respondents suggested that pot makers were excluded from access to land and other assets, and employment opportunities respectively. As far as land is usually acquired through inheritance, the 'pot makers' chance of obtaining it seems quite difficult if not impossible. Consequently, there is no a single employed 'pot makers' in the public offices partly due to lack of opportunities for education. Even though the great majority of respondents from non-pot makers replied that pot makers are excluded from access to basic services, slight majority of respondents (42%) from pot makers suggested that they are excluded from access to land and other assets. About 35% of respondents from pot makers replied that they are excluded from access to social services such as education and health services. In this respect, only 23 percent of respondents replied that they are excluded from access to employment opportunities.

The aforementioned suggestions of the respondents



might lead us to infer that it is not only social exclusion which is multidimensional but also the effects of social exclusion are multidimensional. In this respect, about 40% of the respondents suggested that pot makers feel shame and inferiority due to prejudice by non-pot makers. With regard to the same question, about 42% of respondents from pot makers themselves have supported the response of non-pot makers by approving the fact that they feel shame and inferiority as an outcome of prejudice and discrimination. To worsen the case, the pot makers in the study area are not aware about from what and how they were excluded. Besides, they do not know about their capacity to challenge and alter the practices of the age old prejudices and discriminations that they have been facing. Contrary to the above respondents, about 30 and 23 percent of respondents from non-pot makers and pot makers replied that pot makers do not feel shame and inferiority respectively. In this respect, 20 percent of respondents replied that pot makers usually feel loneliness, helplessness and hopelessness and the remaining 10 and 23 percent of respondents from non-pot makers and pot makers replied that they usually feel frustration and seek to revenge against the perpetrators of social exclusion respectively.

Inferiority feeling, shame, loneliness, helplessness, hopelessness and frustration are not the only consequences of social exclusion. Many scholars believe that poverty, lack of solidarity, violation human rights and lack of peace and order at different level are some of the additional consequences of social exclusion. One of the facts that make social exclusion a multidimensional issues is that it results highly complicated and interconnected outcomes. In this respect, a great majority of respondents replied that lack of social cohesion is the ultimate cause of social exclusion. Among the respondents about 25% of them replied that extreme poverty is the ultimate effects of social exclusion. In this regards, there are some respondents who replied that violation of human rights and lack of peace and order in the society are some of the effects of social exclusion. Their response supports the fact that social exclusion is both human right and peace issue at different level.

Furthermore, one of the effects of social exclusion is lack of genuine interaction between pot makers and non-pot makers. Partly due to lack of genuine interaction among the pot makers and the rest of peoples and due to negative attitude of non-pot makers towards pot makers, some peoples of the study area perceives that health workers might not serve their clients impartially. However, 75 and 71% of respondents from non-pot makers and pot makers have suggested that health workers in the Woreda serve the pot makers similarly as they serve non pot makers respectively. And the remaining 25 and 29% of the respondents from non-pot makers and pot makers replied that health workers do not visit the homes of pot makers as they visit the home of non-pot makers respectively. The latter respondents have hinted that health services seem

biased. Based on the suggestion of the latter respondents, it can be inferred that pot makers were denied to exercise their basic right to impartial access to social services. Because peoples should not be left out of the game because of who they are and what role they play in the society.

By and large, social exclusion not only causes poverty but it has also become one of the important factors for severity of poverty. In this respect, almost all respondents replied that the level of poverty vary among 'pot makers' and non-pot makers. The thorny question which has to be raised in this regard is that why the level of poverty varies among the pot makers and the rest of peoples of the study area? According to both the respondents and interviewees, some of the main factors which causes the variation of the level of poverty among the 'pot makers' and the rest of peoples of the study area include: limited and infertile plot of land; lack of access to basic services such as education and health services; settlement pattern that is, 'pot makers' resides in remote and unproductive areas; stereotypes, prejudice and discrimination by mainstream cultural groups. Having analyzed the level of poverty in the case the pot makers, the study has tried to analyze the nature of their poverty as the following. The questions that the study raised for the respondents (for the pot makers) were; what are the main causes of your poverty and why the pot makers become poorest of the poor in the study? In this respect, 30% of respondents have replied that lack of access to social services is the primary cause for poverty. And 20% of the respondents replied that pot makers become poor because of the some natural disaster that occurred in a course of time. It is only 3% of the respondents who replied that poverty is intergenerational.

The remaining 35% of the respondents replied that pot makers become poor not because of lack of access to basic services and any disaster that had happened in a course of time rather it was because they lack scientific agricultural practices about how to manage their resources and assets. As far the same question is concerned, about 47% respondents from pot makers replied that they become poor because of lack of access to social services such as education and health services. Whereas, about 18% of the respondents from pot makers have suggested they become poor because their families were poor. The remaining proportions of respondents have suggested that they become poor neither because of lack of access to social services nor because of the fact that their families were poor.

The last issue of the analysis in this study was about the places, areas, and issues where prejudice, stereotypes and discrimination against 'pot makers' are reflected. In this regards, both the results of the questionnaire and interview unanimously suggested that some of common areas and issues where prejudice, stereotypes and discrimination takes place include during meal time, during the choice of spouses, during greeting times and during the choice of burial grounds.

## CONCLUSION

The causes and effects of social exclusion vary from place to place, situation to situation and from time to time. The levels where social exclusion takes place also differs. As far as the findings of this particular study are concerned, the causes and effects of social exclusion are highly complicated and confusing. Before this study was conducted, the study thought and presumed that 'pot makers' might have different racial background from the rest of peoples of the study area.

However, the findings suggest that it is quite challenging to reach conclusion about whether pot makers are racially different from or similar with the rest of peoples of the study area. The other finding is concerned with the cause of social exclusion in the study area. One of the main causes for the exclusion of pot makers in the study area is the function that they perform within the society where they live.

In this respect, the norm, belief and traditional practices that characterize the pot makers might have also contributed its part for both active and passive exclusion of them in the study area. Lack and limited access to social services such as education and health services, lack of ease access to market, relegated settlement, limited and unproductive land, hopelessness and voicelessness, lack of genuine social cohesion and shame feeling are some the effects of the exclusion of pot makers in the study area.

Furthermore, due to social exclusion in general and prejudice, stereotypes and discrimination in particular, 'pot makers' were left at a disadvantageous position in the study area. In this regard, even though the 'pot makers' are many in number in the study area, until now, there is no a single graduate from college or university who is qualified to access an employment opportunity. This is partly because 'pot makers' in the study area perceive that education is a privilege which is predetermined for non-pot makers. Consequently, poverty seems relatively sever in the case of pot makers than the rest of peoples of the study area.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

Nowadays, social exclusion is viewed by many as a human right, moral, development and peace issue and it has also been viewed as a vital issue for democracy. Countries and societies have been doing a lot to achieve so many aspirations at different levels and time. In order to do so, unity and solidarity among society about how to achieve those predetermined aspirations is highly demanded. It is not only unity and solidarity which is vital but also consensus among society on some of the potential challenges of growth, development, peace and order are highly crucial. Cognizant of this truism and based on the findings of the study, the following recommendations were suggested.

1. At national, regional and local levels, poverty has been

identified as a number one enemy against which war has been waged many years ago in Ethiopia. Therefore, in order to win the war and battles against poverty, some of the proxy issues which are highly related with poverty such as socially exclusion ought to be studied separately and addressed simultaneously with poverty. In this regards, in this study point of view, in our country for unclear reasons social exclusion in general and the rights of occupational minorities in particular have failed to attain appropriate attention and emphasis by the government, researchers and the public as well. As social exclusion is one of the underestimated and hardly studied concepts in our country, further studies ought to be conducted by all concerned bodies. The incumbent government has to establish a particular institution at different levels which is mandated to handle the issues which are concerned with occupational minorities.

2. It is overly applauded that Ethiopian society is usually appreciated by many for instance with regard to the age old values such as tolerance, cooperation, patriotism, hospitality and love for peace and order. Contrary to the aforementioned, the question that reads why is that prejudice, stereotypes and discrimination of occupational minorities viewed as normal thing and for how long should it be viewed as normal were raised. Therefore, our society at different levels should give up discriminating, marginalizing and dehumanizing occupational minorities that exist everywhere in our country. The Woreda authorities in the study area ought to work a lot to enhance the level of awareness of the whole peoples of the study area about social equality.

## CONFLICT OF INTERESTS

The authors have not declared any conflict of interests.

## REFERENCES

- Belay S (2010). *Minority Rights Protection in the Amhara National Regional State: The Case of the Kemant People in North Gondar* (A Master Thesis Submitted to the Graduate Programs Faculty of Law, Addis Ababa University). Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
- Bhalla A, Lapeyre F (1997). *Social Exclusion: Towards an Analytical and Operational Framework*. *Dev. Change*. 28:413-433.
- Burchardt T, Le Grand J, Piachaud D (1999). 'Social Exclusion in Britain 1991-1995'. *Soc. Policy Admin.* 33(3):227-244.
- de Haan A (1999). 'Social Exclusion: Towards a Holistic Understanding of Deprivation.' *Deutsche Stiftung für internationale Entwicklung (DSE), Villa Borsig Workshop Series*. Available at: <http://www.dse.de/ef/poverty/dehaan.htm>.
- Department for International Development (2005). *Reducing Poverty by Tackling Social Exclusion*. A DFID Policy Paper, Department for International Development, PD 043.
- Dustmann C, Preston I (2001). *Attitude to Ethnic Minorities*. *Ethnic Context and Location Decisions*. *Econ. J.* 111:353-373.
- Ethiopian Human Rights Council (2009). *Parallel Report Submitted to the Committee on Racial Discrimination*.
- Haileyesus T (2012). *Issues of Minority Rights in the Ethiopian Federation*. ECMI Working Paper. European Centre for Minority Issues.

- Hickey S, du Toit A (2007). Adverse Incorporation, Social Exclusion and Chronic Poverty. CPRC Working Paper 81, Institute for Development Policy and Management, School of Environment and Development University of Manchester. Available at: [https://www.files.ethz.ch/isn/127869/WP81\\_Hickey\\_duToit.pdf](https://www.files.ethz.ch/isn/127869/WP81_Hickey_duToit.pdf)
- Kabeer N (n.d). Social Exclusion: Concepts, Findings and Implications for the Millennium Development Goals. Institute of Development Studies, University of Sussex, Brighton.
- Khan S (2012). Topic guide on Social Exclusion. International Development Department, University of Birmingham.
- Le Grand J (2003). Individual Choice and Social Exclusion. Case Paper 75, Centre for Analysis of Social Exclusion, London School of Economics, London.
- Mathieson J, Popay J, Enoch E, Escorel S, Hernandez M, Johnston H, Rispel L (2008). Social Exclusion: Meaning, Measurement and Experience and Links to Health Inequalities: A Review of literature. World Health Organization Social Exclusion Knowledge Network Background Paper 1.
- Mohanty P (2014). From Exclusion to Social Cohesion. Center for Study on Social Exclusion and Inclusive Policy, Babasaheb Bhimrao Ambedkar Central University. Bridge Center.
- Omtzigt DJ (2009). Survey on Social inclusion: Theory and Policy. Working Paper, Oxford Institute for Global Economic Development, Oxford University.
- Pankhurst A, Freeman D (2003). Change and Development: Lessons from the Twentieth Century. In: Freeman, D. & A. Pankhurst (eds.), *Peripheral People: The Excluded Minorities of Ethiopia*. Asmara: The Red Sea Press, pp. 334-366.
- Percy-Smith J (2000). Policy Responses to Exclusion. Towards Inclusion? Open University Press, Philadelphia.
- Rawal N (n.d). 'Social Inclusion and Exclusion: A Review'. Dhaulagiri J. Sociol. Anthropol. P 2.
- Sen A (1999). Development as Freedom. New York: The New York Times.
- Silver H (1994). Social exclusion and social solidarity: three paradigms. *Int'l Lab. Rev.* 133: 531
- Silver H, Miller SM (2003). A Social Exclusion: The European Approach to Social Disadvantage. *Indicators* 2(2):1-17.
- Tilly C (2007). Poverty and the Politics of Exclusion. In Narayan D and Petesch P (eds.) *Moving Out of Poverty: Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives on Mobility* Volume 1, 45-76. Washington DC: Palgrave Macmillan and The World Bank.
- United Nations (2010). Analyzing and Measuring Social Inclusion in a Global Context. Department of Economic and Social Affairs, ST/ESA/325, United Nations publication.
- United Nations Development Programme (2010). *Marginalized Minorities in Development Programming. A UNDP Resource Guide and Toolkit*, United Nation Development Programme, New York.
- Yoshida S (2008). 'Searching for a Way out of Social Discrimination: A Case Study of the Manjo through the 2002 Incident in Kafa'. *Nilo-Ethiopian Studies* 12, 47-60, Nagoya University.
- Yoshida S (2013). The Struggle against Social Discrimination: Petitions by the Manjo in the Kafa and Sheka Zones of Southwest Ethiopia. *Nilo Ethiopian Studies* 18:1-19, Osaka Prefecture University.
- Zick A, Küpper B, Hövermann, A (2011). Intolerance, Prejudice and Discrimination. A European Report Nora Langenbacher.

*Full Length Research Paper*

## Ethiopia's armed entry into Somalia in 2006: Projection of its foreign policy or aspiration for hegemony?

Yohannes Gebeyehu Alebachew

School of Diplomacy and International Relations, Ethiopian Civil Service University, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

Received 25 October, 2016; Accepted 15 November, 2016

Ethiopia's armed entry into Somalia in 2006 has been subjected to heated academic and policy debate. Some take it as part of the effort of Ethiopia's aspiration to hegemony in the Horn of Africa region, while others link it to the old-fashioned thinking of Christian Ethiopia's animosity to Islamic Somalia. The Ethiopian government defended it in terms of protecting its national interest. Ethiopia also justifies its intervention in Somalia as something that it did as per the will and the invitation of the Transitional Federal Government. This paper juxtaposed Ethiopia's entry into Somalia in 2006 against theories of hegemony, and Ethiopia's foreign policy. This piece used the foreign policy analysis of neoclassical realism and realist explanation of hegemony to see the situation all together and analyzed the data collected through document and text analysis and empirical literature review. This piece prefers to use realism because the paper is about what is called 'intervention' which includes, needless to say, conflict and elements of power which are currency to realist thought and narrative. Ethiopia in the process of protecting its national interest may have been involved into activities that deemed hegemonic. But given the policy direction and principles that concentrate on activities at home, it is difficult and beyond imagination to conclude that Ethiopia entered into Somalia aspiring for hegemony. It definitely went there only following line of its national interest as articulated in the policy document. So, Ethiopia 's entry into somalia in 2006, according to this paper's reach, was projection of its foreign policy and indeed projection of its national security and survival.

**Key words:** Hegemony, Ethiopia's Foreign policy, armed intervetion.

### INTRODUCTION

#### Historical background of Ethio -Somalia relations

Since Somalia in 1960 came to be state and independent, its policy towards Ethiopia in particular and its neighbors as whole had been dominated by irredentism. Somalia invaded Ethiopia two times since independence and those

invasions were part of the effort to materialize the five stars Greater Somalia Republic. The 1977/78 Somalia invasion was a turning point in the history of Somalia. It was a suicide that Somalia committed to only end up being stateless. War is destructive to whichever side of the warring party, be it to the victor or to the defeated. That holds true to the Ethio-Somalia war of 1977 too.

E-mail: [yohannes.mofa@gmail.com](mailto:yohannes.mofa@gmail.com).

Authors agree that this article remain permanently open access under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

According to Samatar the 1977 war “ set Somalia on long course of crisis, climaxing in its collapse in 1991, thus marking the end of Somalia as a state” (2007). It particularly brought political, social and economic mess. The Said Barre regime which was at the last breathes of its life failed to rectify and correct the mess. That created resentment among the Somalia people. Said Barre determined to retain power at all costs despite popular dissent. Finally, his popular political power dwindled to be restricted to his clan. That all grew to bring him down in 1991. That was the declaration of state collapse in Somalia.

Since then Somalia is nonexistent. “Going through any checklist of successful state building, be it in normative, realist, institutionalism or constructivism, Somalia appears the biggest failure. Somalia as a state is neither fragile nor weak-it simply is nonexistent” (Weber, 2008). The attempts by different warlords to establish a central government failed to come to be true. Between 1991 and 2006, there were over a dozen unsuccessful attempts by Somali warlords and clan leaders to establish a central government in Somalia. In 2006 the Transitional Federal Government, an Ethiopia-backed assembly of former warlords, was unified in the city of Baidoa. (Civins, 2012).

Ethiopia made armed and invited entry into Somalia in 2006, when it became clear that the internationally recognized Transitional Federal Government (TFG) would soon befallen to the mercy of the extremist Union of Islamic Court (UIC). “Ethiopia, at the request of the TFG, deployed an unspecified number of ENDF soldiers to Baidoa in July 2006 following the capture of a nearby city by militias loyal to the Islamic Court Union (ICU)” (Civins, 2012). That entrance of Ethiopia has been subjected to heated academic and policy debate.

This short piece looks into Ethiopia’s role in Somalia particularly its intervention in 2006. Some evaluated it as part of the effort of Ethiopia’s aspiration to hegemony in the Horn of Africa region. The Ethiopian government defended it in terms of protecting its national interest. Ethiopia also justifies its intervention in Somalia as something that it did as per the will and the invitation of the Transitional Federal Government. This paper juxtaposes Ethiopia’s entry into Somalia in 2006 against theories of hegemony, and Ethiopia’s foreign policy.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

This section lies out theoretical settings of hegemony in international relations and empirical review of hegemony in the Horn of Africa. Accordingly, the conventional approach, the neoliberal approach, the Gramscian approach and the radical approach to hegemony are used as theoretical perspective for investigating Ethiopia’s intervention in Somalia. Empirical literatures on the Ethiopia’s regional diplomacy is also used to put the general policy setting in looking into this specific episode.

## Hegemony in international relations

Hegemony as an important concept of international relations is known to be introduced by Antonio Gramsci. Gramsci defined hegemony as “intellectual and moral leadership (*direzione*) whose principal constituting elements are consent and persuasion” (Fontana, 1993). The concept of hegemony emphasizes on consent against the reliance on the use of force. In the parlance of Joseph “the concept of hegemony is normally understood as emphasizing consent in contrast to reliance on the use of force” (2002). The understanding of hegemony passes intellectual fatigue from Gramsci through classical Marxism to historical, structuralist and post-structuralist analysis.

It has both simplistic and complex forms. In its simplistic form, it is concerned with the construction of consent and the exercise of leadership by any dominant group over the subordinate group (Joseph, 2002).

But in its complex sense hegemony goes far to deal with issues such as the elaboration of political projects, the articulation of interests, the construction of social alliances, the development of historical blocs, the deployment of state strategies and the initiating of passive revolutions (Joseph, 2002). Thus, the definition of hegemony lacks precision. As result it give rise to different academic and theoretical interpretations.

There are four approaches in international relations to define hegemony, according to Antoniades (2008). These are the conventional approach, the neoliberal approach, the Gramscian approach and the radical approach to hegemony. Conventionally, hegemony has been used to signify a condition of disequilibrium of power in which one state becomes powerful to dominate or take leadership over another (Antoniades, 2008). Antoniades (2008) also pointed out that hegemony is required for open and liberal economy which is at the crux of neoliberal hegemony. The Gramscian approach argues that “hegemony equals the establishment within the sphere of the international of universally accepted values – a commonsense” (Antoniades, 2008). The radical approach to hegemony “understands hegemony as the moment that a specific particularity /project acquires universal signification” (Antoniades, 2008).

Contemporary usage of the concept ‘hegemony’ is, thus, far cry from the original meaning given by Gramsci. It is currently used to mean influence of whatever nature, be it economic, political or possibly military. Related to today’s conception of hegemony is a definition by Destradi (2008) and Dehez (2008) who define hegemony as:

A form of power exercised through strategies which are subtler than those employed by states behaving as imperial powers. The means through which power is exercised – and here the distinction between hegemony and empire becomes evident – can vary from the exertion of pressure to the provision of material incentives, up to the discursive propagation of the hegemon’s norms and



values. The end of hegemonic behavior is always primarily the realization of the hegemon's own goal.

Hegemony, as has more or less been defined in all the aforementioned definitions, signifies the projection of one's influence and presence out of one's territorial boundary and border. Hegemony thus defined is used in the course of this writing, because it is this definition of hegemony that has been gaining theoretical and practical currency.

### **Hegemony in the horn of Africa**

Before what should have to be written and said about the potential regional hegemony in the Horn of Africa, it is indispensable to say a little about regional hegemony and what it precisely means. Regional hegemony is a concept in international relations which refers to the influence exercised over neighboring countries by an independently powerful nation, the regional hegemon.

Elman (2007) points out "Regional hegemony is the dominance of the area in which the great power is located". Mearsheimer (2001) also articulates "regional hegemony dominate distinct geographical areas". Global hegemony is unattainable due to Mearsheimer's 'the stopping power of water'. The stopping power of water means "the difficulty of projecting power across large bodies of water, which makes it impossible for any great power to conquer and dominate regions separated from it by oceans" (Mearsheimer, 2001). States are as a result keen at aspiring for regional hegemony.

In international relations, hegemony is favored by offensive structural realists who are ardent proponents of power maximization in international relations. They believe that "power maximization is not necessarily self-defeating and hence states can rationally aim for regional hegemony" (Elman, 2007). They rather assert that "hegemony is the best way for any state to guarantee its own survival" (Mearsheimer, 2001). Do we have regional hegemon in Africa and in particular in the horn of Africa? let us look at what Dehez (2008) and Herbst (2000) write about in response to questions like these.

Dehez (2008) believes that there are potential regional hegemony in Africa. The big African countries that have the potential to be regional superpowers or hegemony are Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC), Ethiopia, Nigeria and South Africa. In his own words, "Conventional wisdom has it that there are only four countries in Sub Sahara Africa that potentially could act as regional hegemony: Nigeria, South Africa, Ethiopia and the Democratic Republic of the Congo". Population size and territorial largeness seem to be at the center of his definition of regional hegemony. These countries comprise, according to him, large populations in Africa and command the largest and with South Africa the most effective armies in the continent.

Consolidating and corroborating the idea of the importance of population in building great power and

hegemony is Mearsheimer (2001), who articulates "population size matters a lot, because great powers require big armies, which can be raised only in countries with large populations. States with small populations cannot be great powers". Dehez (2008) seemed to suggest that Ethiopia is a hegemon in the Horn of Africa. Samatar (2007) also parenthetically commented on the presence of hegemony in the Horn of Africa and Ethiopia's aspiration for hegemony. This is what he had to comment "It could be said that the history of the Horn of Africa, throughout the ages, has been the story of a struggle between Egypt and Ethiopia for regional hegemony".

But another scholar who has extensively been writing on African politics, Herbst (2000), casts doubt about the possibility of Ethiopia and DRC being potential hegemony. According to Herbst and Greg (2006) "hegemony are by definition large and capable of projecting power beyond their own borders in unbiased or disinterested way". Theoretically, big and hegemony states provide economic opportunities and stability to the group they dominate. Ethiopia and DRC seen in this light are not hegemony. Dehez (2008) also quoted Herbst (2000) as asserting that, DRC cannot project power all over its territory let alone any projection of power outside its territory. With regard to Ethiopia Herbst (2000) pointed out as quoted from Dehez that "given its profound poverty and ethnic division, Ethiopia also cannot play the disinterested big brother role in Africa".

Any reference to Ethiopian history in the past and Ethiopian policy including foreign policy documents show that Ethiopia adopts defensive realism or if it is stretched neoclassical realism in its long history of engagement with the outside world. Ethiopia does not have any record of aspiration for hegemony in its history. Today, as we will see, Ethiopia define every policy of hers in light of sustainable economic development, democratic system building, mutual benefit and reciprocity all of which are not or little known in the vocabulary of hegemony.

### **Ethiopia's regional diplomacy: the "camera obscura" of reality**

Observers, commentators, and peoples of the region alike frequently misunderstand Ethiopia's regional diplomacy and its peacekeeping activities. They often tend to think that the reality is hidden, and take a "camera obscura" view of Ethiopia's role in the region, claiming that Ethiopia's increasing presence in the name of peacekeeping and peace-making operations and missions is hardly innocent and conceals covert aims.

But even the most superficial reference to the Foreign Affairs and National Security Policy Strategy (FANSPS) document reveals that the current government has laid down its firm convictions of the necessity of good neighborliness in its conduct of foreign relations. It bases its relationships on mutual benefits and its belief in reciprocity. In sum, it underlines that Ethiopia's regional

diplomacy should be guided by principles of good neighborliness, non-interference, mutual respect, win-win formulation, collective security and responsibility. At the epicenter of Ethiopia's foreign policy are development and democratization, and not just for Ethiopia. "Ethiopia's foreign policy should understand that the success of Ethiopia's development and democratization has a positive contribution not only to Ethiopia but to all neighbors as well; and that a policy that is free of arrogance and greed would contribute to changing the entire region. These are the premises on which Ethiopia's policy is based". (Ministry of Information of FDRE, 2002: 62).

While Ethiopia's regional diplomacy is premised on a strong commitment to mutual development and cooperation, it is also, certainly in part, based on the view from Ethiopia itself. The foreign policy document makes this quite clear: "the external environment is viewed from the prism of the country's national situation and condition, and this ensures that the policy and strategy have relevance to our national security and survival." (Ministry of information of FDRE, 2002).

That doesn't mean Ethiopia's foreign policy towards countries of the region is merely the outcome of consideration of domestic conditions. Closer reading of the FANSPS makes clear that foreign policy should also be considered in the light of how domestic conditions and situations are seen through the wider the prism of the global situation or globalization. In this connection, FANSPS reiterates that "the efforts in our country to bring about rapid development, democracy and good governance cannot be seen outside the regional and global contexts" (Ministry of information of FDRE, 2002).

These policy statements in face demonstrate that Ethiopia has synthesized domestic and international factors in its relations with neighboring countries and with other entities with which it has relations. It remains very careful to take into account the international distribution of power in relation to its own capability to effectively pursue its national interests. This is an excellent example of neo-classical realism in foreign policy theory: "neo-classical realists argue that domestic factors are needed to explain how systemic factors are actually translated into foreign policy decisions" according to Schmidt (2008). Ethiopia's regional diplomacy certainly falls into the purview of careful consideration of domestic capabilities and their relation to regional and international distribution of power. Ethiopia's regional diplomacy has to work to maximize its desire for security, which lies at the center of defensive or neo-classical realism, in the midst of unpredictable behavior of regional actors and a highly complex regional insecurity.

The Foreign Policy document also lays down the regional parameters of Ethiopia's economic-centered foreign policy. In the short and medium term, this involves a whole series of promising and incremental economic and trade relations associated with infrastructure links such as the new railway to Djibouti, highways to Sudan and Kenya, the sale of hydropower across the region and use of port

services.

The longer-term possibilities are even more important in many respects. The region of the Horn is endowed with an exceptionally long coastline. It is strategically important to Ethiopia, even though Ethiopia no longer has a coastline, but the more so to the rest of the world with the Red Sea being one of the world's major trade arteries, linking Europe to much of the Middle East and Asia.

Certainly, various aspects of neighboring developments could have been very useful for Ethiopia if there had been no conflicts, no state collapses or failures. Ethiopia could have freely used "no less than seven ports" in Somalia, as well as ports in the Sudan, Eritrea or Kenya (Ministry of information of FDRE, 2002). These countries could all have benefitted substantially from the service payment that Ethiopia would have made. The problems of the region have made this largely impossible. This has been underlined by the way the region has been a safe haven for terrorists for much of the last two decades. Somalia's disintegration, Eritrea's role in sponsoring terrorists, the Sudan a center of political Islam, Kenya threatened by terrorist activity from Somalia, the deteriorating situation in South Sudan have all provided ever-growing dangers to Ethiopia, and indeed to the Horn of Africa in general.

Ethiopia's regional diplomacy for centuries has been guided by defensive realism and the principle of maximization of security under which it maintains the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of its neighbors on the one hand and also ensures Ethiopia's right to safeguard its peace and stability on the other. As part of this effort, together with the carrying out its UN responsibilities, Ethiopia has been much involved in the region's peacekeeping and peace-making missions. Disregarding all the theoretical and practical facts and figures noted above, some commentators accuse Ethiopia of working to realize regional hegemony. This is the inverted view of reality, the "camera obscura".

Ethiopia is working in collaboration with international and regional organizations and with the peoples of Somalia to help provide for peaceful solutions in Somalia. It has been working there with the AU and the UN, in AMISOM in the international efforts to build strong and effective governments to provide for the sustainable stability, peace and development.

### **ETHIOPIA'S ENTRY INTO SOMALIA IN 2006: ASPIRATION FOR HEGEMONY OR PROJECTION OF ITS FOREIGN POLICY?**

This part of the piece juxtaposes Ethiopia's 2006 entry into Somalia against the theory and concept of hegemony and its foreign policy. Hegemony presupposes the entry of a country into another or the domination of country over another last up to what the dominant group wants to achieve. Was what Ethiopia did, has resonance to this presupposition? Ethiopian foreign policy has non-interference at the center of its principle. It also makes

'doing activities at home first' at the crux of the whole foreign policy direction. Therefore, is Ethiopia contradicting its own principle and direction when it made armed entry in to Somalia in 2006? This paper puts head to head the foreign policy principle and what Ethiopia practically did to see if that was contradiction.

### **Ethiopia's Intervention in Light of the Concept of Hegemony**

Hegemony, which is at the center of offensive realism, strongly asserts that "a hegemon is a state that is so powerful that it dominates all the other states in the system" (Mearsheimer, 2001). In light of which Ethiopia is not hegemon because it is not the unrivalled and unchallenged state dominating other states in the Horn of Africa. Hegemons have building and keeping hegemonic status as their goal in international relations. By Mearshimer's standard Ethiopia cannot be hegemon because it does not have the material preconditions to qualify hegemony. "To qualify as a potential hegemon, a state must be considerably wealthier than its local rivals and must possess the mightiest army in the region" (Mearshimer, 2001). Ethiopia though does have effective army, it is not wealthier than its local rivals, and indeed it is one of the poorest nations in the region. Samatar (2007) indicated how mighty Ethiopia's army is when he commented "Ethiopia boasts a battle-hardened professional army that can probably defeat in a conventional war the combined forces of Eritrea, Djibouti, Somalia and Kenya".

A state that is substantially more powerful than the other great powers in the system is not a hegemon, because it faces, by definition, other great powers. To apply the concept of a system more narrowly and use it to describe particular regions, such as the Horn of Africa. Ethiopia is not a hegemon because there are Kenya, Djibouti, the Sudan and Uganda in the Horn of Africa region. Ethiopia cannot dominate these powers in any meaningful way. So, in the conventional and euro-centric standard of hegemony Ethiopia is not hegemon and did not enter into Somalia aspiring for hegemony. It has no material and other qualifications for aspiring for hegemony.

Dehez (2008) believes that Ethiopia is a strong candidate of potential hegemon due to its sheer size and large population. This is what he had to write "The Ethiopian case is particularly revealing, because the country is undoubtedly a candidate for regional hegemony, simply because of its sheer size and its large population". He went to write Ethiopia has been strong, independent and imperial power well into the twentieth century. Also, according to report by Duke University (2007). "Ethiopia has always been a hegemon within the East African region; its strong military tradition is rooted in a strong sense of national pride". Ethiopia's entry into Somalia in 2006 would be a projection of that hegemonic behavior and maintain power in its favor. "Zenawi's (1991-2012)

use of preventive warfare amounts to nothing more than a forceful demonstration of Ethiopian hegemony in the region" (Duke University, 2007).

Information made public at different times and by different means assert that Ethiopia did not enter into Somalia to promote any goal of hegemony. Ethiopia did not enter to prevent the coming into being of united Somalia that would challenge hegemony for Ethiopia. Reasons for its entrance had to do with national interest and national security. The late Ethiopian prime minister Melese Zenawi in his discussion with Senator Feingold and in his answer to the question 'what kind of Somalia the Ethiopian government wanted to see', he stated the motive of Ethiopian government.

*Meles (2006) answered that the government of Ethiopia (GOE) did not have the means to pursue the kind of reconstruction and reform agenda that the U.S. had pursued in Iraq. "Ethiopia must tailor its agenda to its means." That agenda would be limited to 1) proving that Jihadists could not rule Somalia; and 2) redressing the current military imbalance to encourage dialogue between moderate members of the CIC and the TFG. The PM stated that although Ethiopia did not like the idea of Sharia Law, Somalis had the right to implement it. What they did not have the right to do was promote Jihadist expansionism. Meles (2006) said that the GOE had no problem with a united Somalia. He noted that Puntland favored a loose confederation, while Somaliland made an argument for independence based on the principles of espoused by the African Union. Resolving these questions was not part of Ethiopia's agenda, however (Daniel Berhane, 2011).*

*Ethiopia's intervention was not, according to evidences close to government officials of Ethiopia, therefore, to promote hegemony but was made in self-defense. It was made to hold terrorists and extremists in check. In various discussions with USA government officials of Ethiopia made it clear that " If the extremists are not dealt with immediately, both politically and militarily, they will further consolidate their control over the CIC (Council of Islamic Court), overthrow the TFG and threaten the security of the neighboring states" (wiki leaks from Daneil Berhane's blog, 2011). According to the then minister of foreign affairs of Ethiopia, Seyoum Mesifen " Somalia is in absolute chaos with between 50,000 to 80,000-armed militia, even if the estimate is only having this figure there is problem. Additionally, the Somalia coast is open thus giving free access to extremists" (wiki leaks from Daneil Berhane's blog, 2011). So, it is crystal clear that Ethiopia acted in self-defense than in pursuance of hegemony according to the assertion of evidences close to the Ethiopian government.*

### **Ethiopia's intervention in light of its foreign policy document**

Important foreign policy and external relations principles

that have constitutional articulation are at the center of Ethiopia's relations with other countries including its relations with Somalia. FDRE constitution had this to provide that "to promote policies of foreign relations based on the protection of national interests and respect for the sovereignty of the country" (Art89 (1)).

Another important constitutional provision in guiding Ethiopia's relations is "to promote mutual respect for national sovereignty and equality of states and non-interference in the internal affairs of other states" (Art89 (2)). Mutual benefits, reciprocity, non-interference etc are guiding principles to Ethiopia's foreign policy. Building democracy and democratic system, promoting peace and stability and materializing sustainable economic development are the goals. What Ethiopia has been doing is guided by these principles and directed at realizing the above-mentioned goals. If that is the general direction, let us now look at Ethiopia's foreign policy towards Somalia and more particularly Ethiopia's entry in 2006 in Somalia.

Ethiopia's fundamental policy remains to persistently work towards the birth of a peaceful and democratic Somalia. But in light of the continuing instability, the policy it pursues should essentially be a damage-limitation policy to ensure that the instability does not further harm the country, the region and the people of Somalia. If the instability is not stopped, the only option left is to limit the damage that may be caused. (Ministry of Information, 2002)

According to the Foreign Affairs and National Security Policy and Strategy (henceforth FANSPS) of Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, there are three main options to limit the damage. These are, helping relatively peaceful and stable regions of Somalia, creating capability to defend Ethiopia and foil any attacks from terrorist, extremists and anti-peace elements originating from Somalia and working in cooperation with the Somalia people and international communities to weaken and neutralize any force coming from any part of Somalia to perpetrate attacks against Ethiopia.

"First, Ethiopia's decision makers have to try to help those regions which are comparatively stable and do not shelter extremists and terrorists in order that the relative peace they enjoy is maintained and even strengthened" (Ministry of Information, 2002). Ethiopia believes that it is in the interest of Somalia land and Punt land and Ethiopia to strengthen links with these regions in such areas as trade, transport, and the like. Ethiopia also articulates that assisting these regions in maintaining peace and stability is to its advantage and benefits peoples living in the area.

"Secondly, Ethiopia shall certainly continue to be exposed to various dangers as long as peace and stability elude Somalia as a whole. In recognition of this, it must create the capability to defend itself and foil any attack by forces of extremism, terrorism and other anti-peace elements originating in Somalia. In this regard, it must always be vigilant" (Ministry of Information, 2002).

"Thirdly, Ethiopia has to work in cooperation with the

Somali people in the region, and the international community as a whole, to weaken and neutralize those forces coming from any part of Somalia to perpetrate attacks against the country" (Ministry of Information, 2002). Ethiopia in 2006 entered into Somalia as per the request of the internationally recognized Transitional Federal Government (TFG) of Somalia. "Ethiopia, at the request of the TFG, deployed an unspecified number of ENDF soldiers to Baidoa in July 2006 following the capture of a nearby city by militias loyal to the Islamic Court Union (ICU)" (Civins, 2012; Samatar, 2007). So, Ethiopia's entrance emanated from its policy direction, not from its aspiration to hegemony.

"While maintaining the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of Somalia, Ethiopia has to ensure its right to safeguard its peace and defend itself" (Ministry of Information, 2002). Ethiopia's armed entry into Somalia was in response to defending itself from the war declared by Union of Islamic Court (UIC).

On 21 December 2006, Sheik Hassen Dahir Aweys, one of the UIC leaders declared from Mogadishu that Somalia was in a state of war against Ethiopia, and that all Somalis should take part in this struggle against Ethiopia. This was just what the Ethiopian leadership had been waiting for as it provided them with a legitimate reason to officially confront the UIC in Somalia. Thus, on the 24 December 2006 the Ethiopian government could recognize the implication of its troops by declaring that "The Ethiopian government has taken self-defensive measures and started counter-attacking the aggressive extremist forces of the Islamic Courts and foreign terrorist groups" (Fanta, 2007).

Arguments that follow the aforementioned line of reasoning believes that Ethiopia intervene to protect its national sovereignty, security and interest. Indeed, it acted in self-defense. Also, Samatar (2007) corroborated this when he commented "Islamists made ...self-destructive blunders in the run-up to the Ethiopian invasion. One was their idle, shrill banter of threats of Jihad against the instinctively jihad fearing Ethiopian state". That urged Ethiopia to act in defense of its national security and survival which is at the center of its foreign policy as is in other countries, that made-up Ethiopia to take a drastic action in self-defense against the mullahs.

But others criticize Ethiopia for the blundering of its foreign policy principles when it made intervention. "One has to say that Ethiopia's decision to intervene in Somalia remains to be its biggest national security and foreign policy blunder, though it is hard to deny that she has had legitimate national security concerns in Somalia" ((Alemayehu, 2011). Alemayehu, (2011) commented that Ethiopia could have dealt the security issue with other means and ways short of resort to force. One way was to keep the Ethiopian National Defence Force (ENDF) on high alert by assuming defensive military posture. Given the easy possibility of subverting Jihadist war waged by the Mullahs against Ethiopia with the Transitional Federal

Government, what Ethiopia did seem cost-effective, in line with what is stated in its foreign policy and timely because the UIC had already waged war and made outcry.

"A further strategy was for Ethiopia, in cooperation with the US, IGAD, and AU, to mediate between the UIC and the TFG so that they can reach a comprehensive peace agreement acceptable to both sides" (Alemayehu, 2011). But according to cable communication "Melese (2006) observed that it will take time for IGASOM to become established" (Daniel Berhane Blog quoted wiki leaks). And it was important according to Melese (2006) to take short military action by Ethiopia and other countries to keep the extremists 'off-balance'. As to the role of AU same wiki leaked cable communication quoted AU Chairman Konare as remarking that "too many leaders recognized the threat of extremism in Somalia but have been silent. Their voices will be important in supporting the TFG and moderation within the CIC" (Daniel Berhane Blog quoted wiki leaks). In light of such alarming situations, the feasibility of both of the ways suggested by Alemayehu (2011) are doubtful. All that go down to show how controversial Ethiopia's entry into Somalia was.

## METHODOLOGY

The study makes use of qualitative methods of data collection and analysis. Qualitative design is selected because it is important to understand the difference between stated policies and implemented policies, theories and realities. It better helps understand process, which is the unit of analysis in this study, than quantitative design does. The study used exploratory research design which is also called formulative research studies (Kothari, 2004). "The major emphasis in such studies is on the discovery of new ideas and insights" (Kothari, 2004: 36). Flexible design is recommended in which the broadly defined research problem will be transformed into a precise one in due course of the research (Kothari, 2004). This study, thus, employs this design. The research uses inductive analysis whereby conclusions are only be made from data that would be collected in due course of the research process. Document review and analysis are important techniques employed in this study.

This piece is assumed to be a droplet in the ocean of knowledge of international relations, foreign policy and particularly Ethio-Somalia relations. But it may be important to a range of stockholders like policy makers, researchers, educationalists who are concerned with the Ethio-Somalia relations. This tinny study would serve as a spring board for further research on the subject.

This study only covers the 2006 Ethiopia's intervention in Somalia in light of Ethiopia's foreign policy and the concept of hegemony. Was Ethiopia's entrance into Somalia by the will of the Transitional Federal Government (TFG) an intervention, was that politically correct seen in light of the foreign policy document of Ethiopia and

questions of these kind would be looked into in due course of this study.

Prior researches and literatures on the subject at hand are hardly available. Those available are highly skewed to political motivation. This may possibly compromise the quality of the paper. It limits any possibility of triangulation there by reducing the problem of construct validity.

This study used the foreign policy analysis of neoclassical realism and realist explanation of hegemony to see the situation all together. This piece prefers to use realism because the paper is about what is called 'intervention' which includes, needless to say, conflict and elements of power which are currency to realist thought and narrative.

## CONCLUSIONS

Ethiopia's entry in 2006 in Somalia has been subjected to different academic and policy interpretations. The interpretation of the motive for Ethiopia's entrance has been ranged from the desire for hegemony to the inherent right to self-defense.

Ethiopia, with a visible national security stake, has been justifying its entrance in terms of self-defense. Ethiopia entered into Somalia to ward off the already declared Jihad against it by the Union of Islamic Court. It is this study conclusion that, in the process of protecting national interest Ethiopia may be involved into activities that made her seem work for hegemony. But given the policy direction and principles that concentrate on activities at home, it is difficult and beyond imagination to conclude that Ethiopia entered into Somalia aspiring for hegemony. It definitely went there only following line of its national interest as articulated in the policy document.

So, Ethiopia 's entry into Somalia in 2006, according to this paper's reach, was projection of its foreign policy and indeed projection of its national security and survival.

## CONFLICT OF INTERESTS

The authors have not declared any conflict of interests.

## REFERENCES

- Antoniades A (2008). From 'theories of hegemony' to 'hegemony analysis' in international relations. Paper presented at: 49th ISA Annual Convention Panel: Hegemony, security, and defense in IR 28 March 2008 San Francisco, USA.
- Civins B (2012). Ethiopia's intervention in Somalia, 2006-2009. University of Texas. Also, available at [yonseijournal.files.wordpress.com/2012/08/ethiopia.pdf](http://yonseijournal.files.wordpress.com/2012/08/ethiopia.pdf)
- Daniel Berhane (2011). Horn affairs. General Abizaid: Don't rush into conflict Ethiopia's Somalia intervention in 2006. Available at <http://hornaffairs.com/en/2011/11/04/general-abizaid-don't-rush-into-conflict-ethiopias-somalia-intervention-2006/>
- Duke University (2007). Seeking peace in the Horn of Africa: Solutions for Somalia. Duke University Talent Identification Program: International Affairs Institute.

- Dustin Dehez. (2008). Ethiopia – Hegemony in the Horn of Africa region? Available at <http://dustin-dehez.blogspot.com>
- Elman C (2007). Realism. In Martin Griffiths (Eds) *International Relations Theory for Twenty- First Century: An Introduction*. London and New York, UK and USA: Routledge pp. 11-21.
- Ethiopian Ministry of Information (2002). *The Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia Foreign Affairs and National Security policy and Strategy*. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia: Ministry of Information Press & Audiovisual Department.
- Fanta E (2007). Ethiopia-Analysis:Ethiopian intervention in Somalia in context. Available on line and can be accessed at [http://nazret.com/blog/index.php/2007/02/01/ethiopia\\_analysis\\_ethiopian\\_intervention](http://nazret.com/blog/index.php/2007/02/01/ethiopia_analysis_ethiopian_intervention). (Accessed on January 10,2014).
- (Alemayehu F (2011). Ethiopia's Somalia policy: A very brief critique. Accessed at [http://aigaforum.com/articles/critique\\_somalia\\_policy.php](http://aigaforum.com/articles/critique_somalia_policy.php) and retrieved on 23 of December 2013.
- Fontana B (1993). *Hegemony and power: On the relation between Gramsci and Machiavelli*. Minneapolis, London: University of Minnesota Press.
- Herbst J (2000). Western and African Peacekeepers: Motives and opportunities. In: John W. Harbeson and Donald Rothchild (Eds.), *Africa in world politics: The African state system in flux*. Oxford, Westview. pp. 308-328.
- Herbst J, Greg M (2006). Africa's big dysfunctional states: An introductory overview. In: Christopher Clapham, Jeffrey Herbst and Greg Mills (Eds.), *Big African states:Angola, Sudan, DRC, Ethiopia, Nigeria, South Africa*. Johannesburg, Wits University Press pp. 1-15.
- Joseph J (2002). *Hegemony: A realist analysis*. London and New York: Routledge Taylor and Francis Group.
- Mearsheimer J (2001). *The tragedy of great power politics*. University of Chicago, New York and London: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Samatar SS (2007). *The Islamic Courts and Ethiopia's intervention in Somalia: Redemption or adventurism?* 10 St. James' Square, London: Chatham House. Retrieved from <http://www.chathamhouse.org.uk/research/africa/papers/>
- Melese (2006). A meeting between Prime Minister Meles Zenawi and Senator Russ Feingold. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia Cable communication. Wikileaks. Retrieved from <http://hornaffairs.com/en/2011/11/04/senator-inquires-ethiopian-motive-military-capacity-ethiopia-somalia-intervention-2006/>



# African Journal of Political Science and International Relations

## Related Journals Published by Academic Journals

- Journal of Geography and Regional Planning
- Journal of Economics and International Finance
- Journal of Hospitality Management and Tourism
- International Journal of Sociology and Anthropology
- Journal of Public Administration and Policy Research
- African Journal of Marketing Management

**academicJournals**