

AFRI 2002 Final Exam Study Guide

April 11, 2016

7:00 PM

This exam is going to have the same structure that the midterm did, with longer questions, medium questions, and then definitions. Again, this study guide is designed to help you with the themes for the long and short answer questions, so that you have a good understanding of what you're talking about. I'm going to list each theme and give a description of what you need to know for it. After my description, I'll tell you which weeks we covered the theme and I encourage you to look at notes and readings from that week.

Bear in mind that in addition to these themes there will be a question involving selecting two conflicts and assessing the causes and consequences of each. I'm not going to go through every conflict with you, but these themes give you an idea of most of the conflicts, and you can go through the notes and readings for the conflicts you want to talk about.

Ethiopia and Mengistu:

Mengistu Haile Mariam toppled Haile Selassie and eventually took over the Derg. He tried to institute a leftist regime, courting an alliance with the Soviet Union, and to create Afro-Marxism. He and the Derg tried to mobilise the people around their revolution, and create support. They moved away from capitalism, which was seen as a tool of colonialism and the western world to keep the African people down. They adopted a rhetoric of modernising Ethiopia, and instituted centralised economic control. He saw the state as a tool for social and economic change and institution, and tried to move people around to different areas to work the land. This was a thing tried by other African leaders, and it never worked out very well, because people have an attachment to their land, and leaders sometimes didn't understand that.

In 1977, Mengistu and his allies killed all their opponents in the Derg, in an event now known as the Red Terror. This was the final step to cementing his power. He also carried out the White Terror, a violent suppression of the Ethiopian People's Revolutionary Party and its supporters. However, the EPRP wasn't the only opposition. Mengistu inherited many of the resistance movements that had fought against Haile Selassie, such as the Eritrean People's Liberation Front, or the Tigre People's Liberation Front. The north was a major problem for Ethiopia, full of Tigre people who remembered being the dominant group and Eritrean people who felt betrayed by having been made part of Ethiopia. These groups were what eventually defeated Mengistu.

In 1977, Somalia invaded Ethiopia. It was a major struggle externally and internally, but it was great for gaining support for Mengistu. At the time of the war, Somalia had been allied with the Soviet Union, but Mengistu's idea of a socialist Ethiopia was more interesting for Soviet ideology, and they switched their alliance to Ethiopia. This led to a crushing defeat for Somalia, and gave Mengistu the confidence to set his focus on quelling the unrest in Eritrea. He did not succeed and in the 80s negotiations were held. The negotiations also did nothing, and an alliance of the EPLF and the TPLF removed Mengistu and installed a new government, letting Eritrea split and become its own country.

The exam wants you to look at the models Mengistu used and what he did, and analyse his successes and all the opposition against him.

We studied Mengistu in Week 8, with some mention of him in Week 6.

Marxist regime of Siad Barre:

Mohamed Siad Barre took over Somalia in 1969 and established a military rule. He inflamed nationalism, calling the Somali people fractured and presenting a vision of a powerful, unified Somalia. Siad Barre also tried to create an Afro-Marxist state, with a very authoritarian bent. He also created educational reform, and established universities. One major contribution he made was the institution of the use of Latin characters for the writing of Somali, which had previously had no writing system.

Siad Barre was, however, very dictatorial. In his first year of rule, he claimed there was a coup against him and killed his assistants. There was also a coup in 1978, after the Somali-Ethiopian war, which resulted in him killing many people.

Siad Barre espoused Somali nationalism, but also manipulated clan divisions to maintain his power. Somali nationalism dictated that all Somali people, in Djibouti, Ethiopia, Kenya, and the former British and Italian Somalilands, be united under the flag of Somalia. This led to the invasion of Ethiopia in 1977, a war which Somalia lost very badly. The outcome of this war destroyed public support for Siad Barre, and removed the Soviet Union as a major ally. This led to the emergence of many resistance groups, which eventually removed Siad Barre around the end of the Cold War. However, because the military rule had exacerbated clan divisions, the Somali people were fractured, and many groups declared themselves leaders, with warlords rising everywhere. Because the Cold War was over, the United States didn't care enough anymore and Somalia wasn't a very strategic location anymore, so everyone just let it happen.

We discussed Somalia in Week 9

Sudanese Conflict:

Sudan's first military coup took place in 1958, and lasted until 1964 under Aboud. He was removed by a popular uprising and replaced with a civilian government, which lasted until 1969, when Nimeiri took over as a new military ruler. He removed any group that tried to oppose him, destroying the former parties and Marxist groups. Nimeiri was the first leader to actually negotiate with the SPLA, the southern liberation group, which previous leaders had pretty much ignored. He was also the first to let them have their own internal government in the south. Nimeiri was removed from power in 1983, and the civilian government that replaced him lasted until 1989, when Omar al-Bashir took power in a military coup. Bashir still rules today.

Bashir and his ally, Hassan al-Turabi, created an Islamic state, with Turabi's ideas on how to adapt Islam to the modern world. Now, since the discovery of oil in the south in 1983, the government had realised it really needed to negotiate with the SPLA. Even larger oil reserves were found in 1996, and many other nations in the international community were not thrilled with Sudan's treatment of the southern issue. So, they started to negotiate.

The SPLA was headed by John Garang, who did not want to secede from Sudan. He believed in one unified nation under a secular constitution, and without Arab dominance. The Sudanese government refused to accept a secular constitution, and the SPLA argued that if the government could not change the constitution from an Islamic state, the South would be allowed to have a referendum and secede. A few days after an agreement was made, Garang died in a plane crash.

In 2009, the Comprehensive Peace Agreement was made stating that South Sudan would have an election, and would have its own Government of South Sudan, which would be autonomous. The president of this government would be the vice president of Sudan's Government of National Unity. In 2011, there would be a referendum, and then if South Sudan wanted to be its own state, it could. It did. After the death of Garang, he was replaced by a man called Kiir, who was secessionist, from the same ethnic group as him, the Dinka. Riek Machar, the vice president, was from the Nuer ethnic group and had wanted to run for president himself. The conflict took on an ethnic tone, and making South Sudan a viable state has been difficult.

We discussed the conflict in Sudan in depth in Week 7.

Ethiopia's Ethnic Federalism:

After the removal of Mengistu, Ethiopia put together a state based on ethnic lines, with each ethnic group having an autonomous region along with the presence of two metropolitan areas, one of which is Addis Ababa. There is conflict, but it seems to be a relatively stable state. Assess its effectiveness, and how democratic it actually is. It is a Tigre-dominated state, and Meles Zenawi was very slow to institute any sort of democratic reforms or opening of the government, saying they would not do it until they were ready.

We touched on the current state of Ethiopia a number of times, such as Weeks 9 and 10.

Eritrea as an Independent State:

First off, if you haven't watched CBC's Fifth Estate video on Nevsun in Eritrea, you should watch that to get an idea of how their government is run and the conditions inside the country.

Eritrea's troubled nature has its roots in the decision of Britain and the West to allow Ethiopia to annex it. The Eritrean people felt betrayed by the West and the UN, and fought a 30-year war of independence against Ethiopia. They finally gained independence when the EPLF allied with the TPLF to remove Mengistu and the newly-formed state allowed Eritrea to leave. The two states had an agreement that Eritrea would allow Ethiopia to use its ports so Addis could have access to the sea.

Eritrea was expected to be a successful African democracy, and it was a huge disappointment when it turned into a dictatorship. Issayas Afwerki, formerly an ally of Ethiopia, went to war with them over a small desert town on the border, and later tried to start a conflict with Djibouti. He has turned the state into a military dictatorship, and many Eritreans have fled to northern Ethiopia or the surrounding region. The government funds itself through remittance payments from emigrants, which it takes a large portion of for itself. It has been criticised for the conditions its people live in, and its belligerence to the Horn.

Eritrea is a major source of disappointment in terms of democracy, as the constitution they crafted was never even implemented. Hopes had been that it could be a new, functional African state, but that didn't happen. They are strongly anti-Ethiopian, and aggressive to other states in the region. They have also been put on the American list of state sponsors of terrorism. Many labels have been applied to them, such as "The North Korea of Africa." Many Eritrean groups, including groups that had fought against Ethiopian rule, feel betrayed by Eritrea and call for more freedoms.

We discussed Eritrea in Week 10.

Djibouti as a Successful Trading Location:

The question is, why is Djibouti so successful and well-off while the rest of the region is unstable at best? The answer is partially that Djibouti is so successful *because* the rest of the region is so destabilised. The city is located at a very strategic point in the Red Sea, where thousands of ships pass through. Somalia used to have major ports in the region, but with the civil war and the collapse of the state, no one's going there. Eritrea is closed off, and also not a welcome port. Across the sea, only about 30 miles away, Yemen's ports are closed off because of conflict. Djibouti got all the traffic, and all the money.

After 9/11, America made a military base in Djibouti, because it was the most secure ally in the region that they could trust to aid their War on Terror. This brought even more development and money to the area, and now China is courting them as well, investing in their businesses and helping them make a railroad to Addis. In the wake of destruction everywhere else, Djibouti has profited, because shipping through the Red Sea still needs a port.

We studied Djibouti in Week 10.

Islamic radicalisation:

The Horn has been a place where Islamic radicalisation has been prevalent, notably in Sudan and Somalia. In Sudan, Bashir and Turabi established an Islamic state, which was part of what made the conflict between north and south impossible to reconcile. They hosted many Islamist groups and figures, notably Osama bin Laden, coming under criticism from the West, and also tried to institute Muslim education in schools, closing Christian institutions in the South. Islam became the ideology of choice.

After the dissolution of Somalia, many groups tried to take control or assert order. One such group was the Islamic Court Union, an attempt by a religious group to install order. However, the United States and Ethiopia found the group troubling and, fearing that they might become radical and militant threats, attacked them. This caused a militant group to break off and become Al-Shabaab. Al-Shabaab had an agenda of fighting back against Ethiopian encroachment, and has not been removed, despite many attempts, some of them quite brutal, to defeat them.

We covered Islam in Sudan in Week 7, in Somalia in Week 9, and in the post-Cold War period in Week 11.