THE RISE AND DECLINE OF A DISCOURSE:

DID REPHRASING THE 'WAR ON TERROR' DISCOURSE IMPACT U.S. FOREIGN POLICY IN SOMALIA?

A.D.M Meulenkamp
3943062
Utrecht University
August 5th, 2013

A thesis submitted to the Board of Examiners in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of Master of Arts in Conflict Studies and Human Rights

Name of Author:	A.D.M Meulenkamp
Student Number:	3943062
Name of Program:	MA Conflict Studies & Human Rights
University:	Utrecht University
Name of Supervisor:	Dr. G.J.C. van der Borgh
Date of Submission:	August 5th, 2013
Number of Words:	15.594 (excluding footnotes and citations)
Program Trajectory:	Research and Thesis Writing (15 ECTS) Internship (15 ECTS – see Internship Report)

Table of Contents

Preface & Acknowledgements

This thesis is the last step towards completing the Master program Conflict Studies & Human Rights. Little over a year ago, I got the final call that I got off the waiting list and into the program. I was beyond excited and very pleased that I got accepted. I was anxious to learn as much as possible about social theories behind violent conflict and foreign policy issues. I learned from and worked with an amazing, diverse, ambitious and most of all fun group of students and professors with whom I have had a great and inspiring year.

First of all, I wish to thank my supervisor Chris. From the beginning, he has helped me see things differently and approach the topic from a new perspective. I always left our meetings feeling energized and motivated. Also, he has helped me out during my search for an internship, making connections and writing me a recommendation letter.

Second, I would like to thank my colleagues and my supervisor Hans Teunissen at the Department of Stabilisation and Humanitarian Aid at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. They have all been extremely helpful, understanding and flexible when my thesis deadline approached. I am only halfway through my internship period, but it has already been the most rewarding experience and I look forward to going back to work this Monday.

Finally, I wish to express my greatest gratitude to my family and all my friends who have supported me. My parents, Juul & Dietje, for always supporting me in the choices I made as a student, for listening to all my stories about my courses, my thesis and my internship and for helping me to make the right choices (usually). All my friends, who put up with literally not seeing me for the past two months and are still excited to see me now. And lastly, Huub, for always listening to me when I needed to complain about the hard work and for making me see the bright side of things when I was simply too tired to write any more words.

With my sociological background, I never expected to write a thesis that is so heavily political and foreign policy orientated. It took quite some time to get used to the topic, but once I did, I realized how exciting I find the field of foreign policy. This is the field I want to work in. This is what makes me tick and this is what I want to do. This masters program, this thesis and my internship have shown me that I made the right choice.

Madelien Meulenkamp
Utrecht, August 2013

List of Abbreviations

AMISOM	African Union Mission in Somalia
ARPCT	Alliance for Restoration of Peace and Counter Terrorism
AU	African Union
CJTF-HOA	Combined Joint Task Force-Horn of Africa
EARSI	East African Counter Terrorism Initiative
ICU	Islamic Courts Union
NSCT	National Strategy for Combating Terrorism
NSSR	National Security Strategy Report
SNM	Somali National Movement
SUGL	Sustaining U.S Global Leadership
TFG	Transitional Federal Government
UN	United Nations
UNITAF	Unified Taskforce
UNOSOM I	United Nations Operations in Somalia I
UNOSOM II	United Nations Operations in Somalia II
U.S	United States

Introduction

"The deliberate and deadly attacks, which were carried out yesterday against our country, were more than acts of terror. They were acts of war. (…) This battle will take time and resolve, but make no mistake about it, we will win. (…) America is united. The freedom-loving nations of the world stand by our side. This will be a monumental struggle of good versus evil, but good will prevail."[1] *– Former U.S President George W. Bush*

For years, the U.S public had seen terrorism as an overseas issue but the events of 9/11 drastically changed this and brought terrorism dangerously close to home. The terrorist attacks in New York, Washington and Pennsylvania on September 11, 2001 shocked the U.S and the world. Terrorism had invaded the domestic context of the United States and had taken nearly three thousand lives. The president at the time, George W. Bush, immediately defined the attacks as an act of war.

Soon after the attacks, the Bush administration refocused both its foreign and national security policy on (countering) terrorism. This new focus in policy became known as the 'War on Terror', a term that has been used repeatedly by the government and was instantly taken over by the media as well[2]. One year after the attacks, Nicholas Lemann[3] wrote in The New Yorker: "[The War on Terror] has entered the language so fully, and framed the way people think about how the United States is reacting to the September 11th attacks so completely, that the idea that declaring and waging war on terror was not the sole, inevitable, logical consequence of the attacks just isn't in circulation."[4] The War on Terror was such a strong and forceful discourse in defining U.S foreign policy in the years that followed, that it has been described as 'the defining discourse of the age' (Krebs & Lobasz, 2007: 423).

This War on Terror policy led to renewed interest from the U.S in countries that had long been ignored: Afghanistan, Pakistan and Iraq. Aside from these countries in the Middle

[1] The above words are an excerpt of the speech of President George W. Bush's when he opened a Cabinet meeting with his national security advisers on September 12, 2001. The complete speech is online available at: http://www.pbs.org/newshour/updates/terrorism/july-dec01/bush_speech_9-12.html

[2] 'In overall frequency, the War on Terror was most often mentioned [in USA Today and the Associated Press] in the aftermath of 9/11, declining sharply afterwards, before holding relatively steady from 2003 through the first quarter of 2006, with a significant bump during the 2004 presidential election' (Reese & Lewis, 2009: 783).

[3] Nicholas Lemann is a Professor of Journalism and a staff writer for the New Yorker.

[4] Nicholas Lemann, "The War on What? The White House and the Debate About Whom to Fight Next," *The New Yorker*, 9 September 2002. Online available at: https://www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/bush/lemann.htm

East, the U.S also regained interest in the east of Africa; more specifically the Horn of Africa and Somalia in particular. The U.S had already been confronted with acts of terror in the Horn back in 1998, when their embassies in both Dar es Salaam and Nairobi were bombed.[5] Somalia was the most instable country in the Horn of Africa at that time. This led to the U.S securitizing Somalia in their policy, following renewed engagement with the country.

Interestingly, it was the same country that had led to a period of absence of the U.S in Africa. Back in 1992, in response to the humanitarian crisis in Somalia, the U.S had led the humanitarian mission 'Unified Taskforce' (UNITAF) in Somalia. UNITAF cooperated with the United Nations Operations in Somalia I (UNOSOM I), which was succeeded by UNOSOM II in March 1993[6]. The aim was to complete the task of UNITAF: to provide a safe environment for the delivery of humanitarian assistance. However, on the 4th of October 1993 U.S soldiers got dragged into the conflict; the 'Battle of Mogadishu'. Ultimately, this led to the infamous Black Hawk Down incident[7]. When images of Somali militias dragging dead U.S soldiers through the streets of Mogadishu hit American television, the U.S left Somalia in a rush. "We turned out the lights, closed the doors and forgot about the place," said Frank Crigler[8] in Lyons & Samatar (1995: 28). As claimed by Brunk (2008) and others, the period of absence in Africa that followed was caused by this 'Somali syndrome'.

However, the events of 9/11 led to reignited (diplomatic but mainly military) engagement of the U.S in Somalia, with the aim to counter terrorism and Islamist extremists groupings like al-Shabaab, while simultaneously striving for a stabilization of the state. In the 9/11-commission report[9], it is stated, "when people lose hope, when societies break down, where countries fragment, breeding grounds for terrorism are created" (2004: 378). Somalia had been stateless for over ten years, since the fall of the dictatorial regime of Siad Barre.

[5] On 7 August 1998, 213 people were killed at the U.S embassy in Kenya (of whom 12 were U.S citizens) and 11 people at the U.S embassy in Tanzania (Dagne, 2002: 62).
[6] For more information, see the website of the UN:
https://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/missions/past/unosom2backgr2.html#three
[7] The BBC reports on October 4,″ 1993 that at least 5 U.S soldiers have been killed and that 2 Black Hawk helicopters have been shot in a heavy firefight in Mogadishu, the capital of Somalia.
http://news.bbc.co.uk/onthisday/hi/dates/stories/october/4/newsid_2486000/2486909.stm
[8] Crigler was the U.S ambassador to Somalia from 1987 to 1990.
[9] The National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States prepared the Final Report of the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks, as requested by the President and Congress. The commission was established on November 27, 2002. The final report was published on July 22, 2004 and is available for download at http://www.9-11commission.gov/report/911Report.pdf

Therefore, the U.S perceived Somalia as a 'breeding ground for terrorism'. Hence, the country became the top priority of the U.S in Africa during the War on Terror.

All throughout the first term of the presidency of George W. Bush, the War on Terror discourse was on the rise. In his second term, the discourse was still very prominent in defining U.S foreign policy. President Barack Obama, who came into office in January 2009, portrayed himself as an antidote to the excesses of the Bush administration (McCrisken, 2011: 781), specifically regarding the War on Terror. Obama had a clear 'anything but Bush flavour' to many of his stances and announced he wanted to effect ideological change (Indyk, Lieberthal & O'Hanlon, 2012: 2). He hoped to do so by not embracing the global War on Terror discourse (Ibid., 14). 'The administration has stopped using the phrase and I think that speaks for itself,'[10] said his Secretary of State Hillary Clinton in March 2009. Thus, one can expect a decline of the War on Terror discourse since 2009.

But does changing the narrative, thus a change on the level of the discourse itself, influence the foreign policy on the ground, and if so, how? Does no longer using the term 'War on Terror' in foreign policy discourse actually impact U.S actions and behaviour in foreign policy? This thesis will attempt to answer these questions by focussing on U.S foreign policy in Somalia in particular.

The War on Terror discourse and its impact on both U.S foreign policy, the international system, and even on the study of foreign policy, has received much attention in the past decade. However, most of this attention has focused on the countries that are more 'famous' for the involvement of the U.S, mainly Afghanistan and Iraq. Less attention has been given to the foreign policy of the U.S in Somalia, and the impact of the War on Terror discourse on U.S foreign policy in Somalia in particular. Africa has never been top priority of the U.S in its foreign policy, which probably explains why the involvement of the U.S in Somalia has received less attention. Nonetheless, the U.S has been very active in the country, both on the diplomatic and military level. Because the reignited interest country was steered by the events of 9/11 and the rise of the War on Terror, it is an intriguing country to use as case study to answer the earlier posed questions.

[10] This quote was cited in McCrisken (2008: 782) and was originally found in an article by Jay Solomon, 'US drops "war on terror" phrase, Clinton says', *Wall Street Journal*, 31 March 2009 (online at: http://online.wsj.com/article/SB123845123690371231.html

The purpose of this thesis is to debunk the rise and decline of the War on Terror discourse and in what way this has impacted U.S foreign policy actions on the ground. The earlier posed questions can be rephrased into the following research puzzle: 'In what way has the rise and decline of the War on Terror discourse impacted U.S foreign policy actions in Somalia?'

This thesis will start with a theoretical framework on which the research is based. Secondly, the context of Somalia up until 2001 as well as U.S involvement in Somalia up until 2001 will be described. Next, the rise of the War on Terror discourse will be analysed, followed by the fourth chapter in which the practice of the War on Terror in Somalia will be discussed. The fifth chapter describes the decline of the War on Terror discourse in U.S foreign policy, and the sixth and last chapter analyses if the decline of the War on Terror impacted U.S foreign policy actions on the ground in Somalia.

As a matter of methodology, this thesis is based on existing academic literature on the topic of the conflict in Somalia, U.S foreign policy and the War on Terror discourse. I have analysed several speeches from U.S officials (presidents, secretaries of state, ambassadors etc.) as well as U.S policy documents released by the White House between 2001 and 2012. Conclusions are drawn from researching these documents as well as existing academic literature.

Chapter 1 – Theoretical framework: a constructivist perspective

"There is an inescapable link between the abstract world of theory and the real world of policy"[11] – Stephen M. Walt

The study of foreign policy can be approached in many different ways. There are four dominant perspectives in the field of International Relations: realist, liberal, constructivist and post-structural understandings (Smith, Hadfield & Dunne, 2012: 8). In this chapter, it will be explained why constructivism is relevant perspective for this research, and how this deviates from realism. The chapter continues with an explanation of the concept of discourse and securitization.

The events of 9/11 did not only impact the domestic and international politics of the U.S, but impacted the discipline of international relations in general as well. The study of international relations had long focused on the structure of the international system (bipolar or unipolar systems, et cetera) with states being the main actors. However, the events of 9/11 heavily impacted the international system whilst other actors than states were involved (Smith, Hadfield & Dunne, 2012: 2). Foreign policy could apply to other actors than states as well.

1.1 Defining Foreign Policy

Hill (2003: 3) defines foreign policy as "the sum of official external relations conducted by an independent actor (usually a state) in international relations." Another definition is given by Hudson (in Smith, Hadfield & Dunne, 2012: 14): Foreign policy is "the strategy or approach chosen by national government to achieve its goals in its relations with external entities. This includes decisions to do nothing." Both definitions show that, even though states are often at the centre of foreign policy, there are also other external entities involved in foreign policy making.

[11] Stephen M. Walt is professor of political science and a member of Foreign Policy's editorial board. This quote was taken from "International Relations: One World, Many Theories" in 1998: 29.

The dominant foreign policy theory throughout the Cold War was realism. Realism can be seen as the foundational school of thought about international relations (Wohlforth in Smith, Hafield & Dunne, 2011: 35). The theory is based on three core assumptions:

1. Groupism: Nation states are the main actors in International Relations. Humans face each other mainly as members of groups, and the most important human groups today are states.
2. Egoism: Political behaviour is driven by self-interest.
3. Power-centrism: The fundamental feature of politics is power. International relations and politics always evolve around great inequalities of power in both social influence or control and resources (Wohlforth in Smith, Hadfield & Dunne, 2011: 36).

The international structure of the Cold War had fit perfectly with the realist approach because of the emphasis on competition in realism. However, the ending of the Cold War led to a new way of theorizing in International Relations. According to Dannreuther (2008: 35), post-Cold War theorizing about international relations shifted from a realist to a more constructivist approach. He describes the core idea of constructivism "the rejection of an unproblematized objective external reality and the need to recognize the world as a social construction, mutually constituted through shared meanings and intersubjective understandings (2008: 40)."

1.2 Studying Foreign Policy Through A Constructivist Perspective

Compared to realism, constructivism focuses more on how ideas and perceptions influence the international system. The constructivist view allows for a more dynamic conceptualization of the structures of international system and offers an explanation for slowly evolving transformations in both the international system and foreign policy (Dannreuther, 2008: 40-41). Where the realist is convinced that we can do little to change things, the constructivist states that "the world is of our making" (Onuf, 1989 in Smith, Hadfield & Dunne, 2012: 79) and that people construct the meaning of things (Milliken, 1999: 229). While 'making this world', agents are both influenced by structures of our world or system as much as those structures are influenced by the agent (Wendt, 1999: 1).

Ultimately, this leads to four core assumptions in constructivism (Flockhart in Smith, Hadfield & Dunne, 2011: 82).

1. A belief in the social construction of reality and the importance of social facts.
2. A focus on ideational as well as material structures and the importance of norms and rules.
3. A focus on the role of identity in shaping political action and the importance of 'logics of action'.
4. A belief in the mutual constitutiveness of agents and structure, and a focus on practice and action.

This fourth point is based on the structuration theory of Giddens (1984), who states that the agent and its behaviour is influenced and bounded by the rules of society and the structures in which the actor is placed. Thus, constructivists claim that there is a constant interaction between the structure and the agent and that this interaction creates socially constructed ideas and beliefs. Constructivism is therefore a social theory that aims to understand social processes.

From this constructivist perspective, states (and their behaviour) cannot be taken for granted. Rather, state behaviour is shaped by elite beliefs, collective norms and social identities (Walt, 1998: 38). Hence, constructivists see the interests and identities of states as "a highly malleable product of specific historical processes" (Walt, 1998: 40).

1.3 Analysing foreign policy through discourse analysis

Following a constructivist stance, all policy making is an inherently dynamic process. This means that a policy on a certain issue often shifts or changes as time passes. A constructivist perspective on foreign policy is especially attentive to the sources of change (Walt, 1998: 41). One way to research these changes is by researching discourses used in foreign policy. Foucault drew attention to the power of language with this concept of discourse. He defined discourses as "linguistic systems through which meaning is generated" (Foucault, 1974: 38 in Smith, Hadfield & Dunne, 2012: 95). The power of a strong discourse is explained by Milliken: "Discourses are understood to work to define and to enable, and also to silence

and to exclude (…) endorsing a certain common sense, but making other modes of categorizing and judging meaningless, impracticable, inadequate or otherwise disqualified" (1999: 229).

Studying discourses used in foreign policy shows how these policies are dependent on particular representations of the countries, places and people the policy is aimed at (Hansen in Smith, Hadfield & Dunne, 2012: 95). Thus, discourse analysis assumes that foreign policies rely upon representations, that these representations are articulated in language and that this leads to a concern with public texts (Ibid., 106). These discourses represent the 'problem' that the foreign policy is aimed at solving (Shapiro, 1988 in Smith, Hadfield & Dunne, 2012: 101).

The point of a discourse analysis is not to establish the one right or true story. Instead, the point is "to render ambiguous predominant interpretations of state practices and to demonstrate the inherently political nature of official discourse (Campbell, 1992 in Millken, 1999: 243)". A discourse analysis thus shows what the political implications of adopting a particular discourse are (Hansen in Smith, Hadfield & Dunne, 2012: 103). Analysing these discourses in foreign policy provide insight in how certain discourses used in foreign policy rise and wane. It should be noted that this form of analysis is ill suited for predicting the future of a certain foreign policy because it cannot predict the future of discourses very well. However, studying foreign policy from a constructivist perspective through discourse does allow for a reconstruction of the past.

As stated earlier, all policy making is dynamic. This means that the discourses used to justify a certain policy are dynamic as well and change over time. The question remains how exactly this change takes place. Hansen (in Smith, Hadfield & Dunne, 2012: 105) describes two main routes through which changes in foreign policy are produced:

1. Through pressure at the level of the discourse itself.

   This might be caused by pressure within the domestic context. In this case specifically, politicians in the United States who claim that the policy undertaken is unable to handle the foreign policy problem, or other states in the international community who criticize the chosen approach.
2. Through changes in the foreign policy 'issue' itself.

In this case, this would mean changes within the local context of Somalia or in the Horn of Africa. However, it is unclear how long it takes before changes in the local context will actually lead to a revision of the prominent discourse.

Both routes will be used to explain changes in U.S foreign policy in this thesis. Because a discourse analysis inherently leaves out how the policy worked out on the ground, the discourses in foreign policy will be compared with actual action on the ground in Somalia. This way, it is attempted to not only consider a "stylized type of act or policy" (Milliken, like 'intervention' or 'foreign aid' (Milliken, 1999: 241), but to also consider how the actions that these terms cover were enacted under the specific circumstances in Somalia.

1.4 Methodology

This thesis focuses on how the development of the War on Terror discourse has impacted U.S foreign policy in Somalia. How has this discourse grown into being the leading discourse of U.S foreign policy, and how has it faded in the years that followed? And ultimately, how has the fading of the War on Terror discourse impacted U.S foreign policy in Somalia and has this desecuritized this policy? These questions can be answered with a discourse analysis that traces how the War on Terror discourse has risen and waned, and how U.S policy makers have changed their representation of 'the problem' (being the situation in Somalia) and 'the policy' between 2001 and 2012. Hence, researching this with a dynamic discourse analysis is an 'investigation of change' (Fairclough in Jorgensen & Philips, 2002: 7).

Discourse analysis thus assumes that foreign policies rely upon representations and that these representations are articulated in language. Consequently, this leads to a concern with public texts. For this thesis, both speeches as well as official U.S policy documents have been researched. Speeches from former President George W. Bush, President Obama and other government officials have been included. With regard to U.S policy documents, the U.S has released several documents between 2001 and 2012, which will be introduced and discussed in both chapter three and five.

Chapter 2 – Sketching the context before 2001

"When you drop a vase and it breaks into three pieces, you take the pieces and put it back together. But what do you do when it breaks into a thousand pieces?" - Mohamed Sahnoun[12]

In the first part of this chapter, a brief overview will be given of the history of the country of Somalia. In the second half, the involvement of the U.S in Somalia since 1991 up until 2001 will be discussed. This chapter will provide insight of the context of both Somalia and U.S-Somalia relations leading up to 2001.

2.1 Somalia

Somalia is a small country in the Horn of Africa with a population of approximately 10 million people.[13] The country has a long tradition and a rich history, but has suffered on going conflict for the last 25 years. Hundreds of thousands of Somalis have lost their lives in this conflict; some in battle, others of famine or drought.[14]

2.1.1 Arab influence

Many Somalis have always seen themselves as different from other Sub-Saharan African countries, because of the perception that they have a strong connection with the Arab world (Harper, 2012: 45). The long coastline along the eastern part of the African continent had many settler communities and Somalia was in touch with other parts of the world, mainly the Arabian Peninsula at the other side of the Gulf of Aden and the Arabian Sea, with which they established a long tradition of trading connection (Lewis, 2008: 1).

Substantial Arab influence can be traced back to the seventh century, where coastal towns as Mogadishu and Berbera had Arab merchant communities (Harper, 2012: 46). This connection led to intermarriages and therefore to a mixing of Arab and Somali blood. Consequently, the Islam became more present in Somalia and mixed with Somali culture.

[12] Mohamed Sahnoun was appointed by former Secretary-General Kofi Annan as the United Nations Organization of African Unity (OAU Special Representative for the Great Lakes region of Africa in January 1997. Quote from Annan, 2012: 39.

[13] Central Intelligence Agency, The World Factbook: https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/so.html

[14] Since 1991, an estimated 350,000 to 1,000,000 Somalis have died because of the conflict

This became known as a 'Somali-style' Islamic belief system (Harper, 2012: 46). The Somali people were converted to Islam at an early date. Nowadays, most Somalis are Muslims. One of the oldest mosques on the East African Coast can be found in Mogadishu, the capital of Somalia (Lewis, 2008: 3). This mixture of an African culture and Arab influence has led Elmi (2010: 17) to describe Somalis as 'an ethnic group, who are African in race and Muslim in faith.'

2.1.2 Clans and Social-insurance Cooperatives

Traditionally, the Somalis know a pastoral nomadic culture, herding camels, sheeps, goats and cattle. Sixty to seventy per cent of the Somali population are nomadic or have nomadic affiliation (Lewis, 2008: 3). Somalia is a clan-based society that can roughly be divided into four clan families (the Darod, Dir, Hawiye and Rahanweyn) and a fifth clan that exists of two minority groups, the Arab and Bantu.[15] Clan identity is based on patrilineal descent (Elmi, 2010: 29). Furthermore, the Somalis divide themselves in subclans, sub-subclans and beyond[16](Hesse, 2010: 249). Harper (2012: 36) warns that, because of this splintering, clan division is fluid and ambiguous. Also, alliances between different (sub)clans shift frequently.

The clan structure also severed as the basis for the judicial system in Somalia. Thus, before the Europeans arrived in Africa, Somalis did not have a state in the sense of the Weberian bureaucratic state that existed in Europe. The Somalis used traditional law and the Islam for resolving disputes, both among individuals and groups (Elmi, 2010: 17). Clans organized themselves into *diya*-groups[17] that Hesse (2010: 251) describes as 'social insurance cooperatives'. These *diya*-groups consists of clans, sub clans et cetera. Members of *diya*-groups are always bounded to pay and receive damages collectively. There is no individuality within these groups. This means that when, for example, one member commits a murder, he will have to compensate the whole diya-group of the victim. This also entails that the whole group of the victim is free to act against the murderer when no just compensation is received (Ibid. : 251). With a system like this, a relatively small conflict can

[15] I.M. Lewis, A Pastoral Democracy: A Study of Pastoralism and Politics Among the Northern Somali of the Horn of Africa, Reprint Edition, London: James Currey, 1999.
[16] Hesse (2010: 249) uses the Isaaq clan as an example. These clans exist of at least three subclans (Habar Awal, Habar Jaalo and the Harhajis. The Habar Awal is then divided into at least two sub-subclans, the Sa'ad Muse and the Lise Muse et cetera. Classifications can even extend to the individual household level.
[17] *Diya* translates to blood wealth (Hesse, 2010: 251)

easily escalate into a larger conflict in which many different people are involved. Most scholars agree that clan identity has definitely been a factor in the conflict, but whether it is a root cause or rather a contributing cause is contested (Elmi, 2010: 34).

2.1.3 The Scramble for Africa

In the 19th century, the Scramble for Africa started. The western part of Somalia was given to Ethiopia by the colonial powers, as a symbol for their cooperation (Elmi, 2010: 19). The British, the French and the Italians occupied the rest of the Somali territory. This led to a separation of Somalia in five different territories.[18] The British Minister at the time, Ernest Bevin, proposed in 1941 that the Somali territories should be united and prepared for independence. He suggested to the British House of Commons in 1946 that "the Somali-speaking areas should be humped together as a trust territory" and "All I want to do is to give those poor nomads a chance to live." (Harper, 2012: 50). However, this plan was resisted by the other main post-war powers and thus never executed.

In the 1940s and 1950s, political activity started to rise in Somalia Italiana. According to Elmi (2010: 19) this political activity was a response to the division of the Somalis and in an attempt to mobilize for independence. In 1954, the Somalis were prepared for independence with the start of municipal elections. The Italians handed over most power in 1956 (Harper, 2012: 52). On June 26th, 1960, British Somaliland became independent. Five days later, British Somaliland united with Somalia Italiana and both territories formed the Republic of Somalia (Harper, 2012: 49-50). Abdirashid Ali Sharmarke became the prime minister of the Republic, and later president. In the first years of the independence of the Republic, Somalia was a democratic state (Elmi, 2010: 17). In 1969, there were 1002 candidates from 62 different parties for the 123 seats in the National Assembly (Harper, 2012: 53). These nine years have been described by Harper (2012) as 'relatively positive'. However, near the end of 1969, things changed. President Sharmarke was killed by a policeman in October 15th, which supposedly was revenge linked to a clan dispute (Harper, 2012: 54). On October 21st, merely a week later, the military took over important installation in Mogadishu, banned political parties and arrested several politicians. From that moment,

[18] The Northern Frontier District, the Ogaden, the French Somali Coast, British Somaliland and Somalia Italiana (Harper, 2012: 49-50).

the country was governed by the Supreme Revolutionary Council led by General Siad Barre (Harper, 2012: 54).

2.1.4 Siad Barre's Dictatorial Regime

Barre introduced Scientific Socialism[19] in Somalia. All other political parties were banned. His regime attempted to eradicate all forms of clans. One famous slogan used by Barre's regime was "Tribalism divides, socialism unites." It was forbidden to refer to clans in anyway, and people were only allowed to refer to each other as *jaale*, meaning so much as 'friend' (Harper, 2012: 54). In 1972, the written form of the Somali language was introduced, partly in an attempt to get rid of (oral) clan culture.

In 1975, Somalia experienced the worst drought the country had ever known (Harper, 2012: 54). Two years later, Barre declared war on Ethiopia in an attempt to create a 'Greater Somalia' and capture the Ogaden. The Ogaden war led to a refugee crisis between 1978 and 1980 (Lewis, 2008: 64). The combination of the drought and the devastation of the war took its toll on the Somali population, which started to turn against their president. The repression of Barre's regime led to fear and resentment of the state (Menkhaus, 2006: 78). Barre's effort to eliminate clans backfired on him with several clan-based armed group-organizing rebellions (one of which being the Somali National Movement, SNM) (Harper, 2012: 55). In 1978, a group of army officers from the Majeerteen clan led an abortive coup against Barre (Elmi, 2010: 18). A very aggressive response from Barre was next, when he bombarded the city of Hargeisa[20] (Harper, 2012: 56). Most of the population left Hargeisa.

2.1.5 State Collapse

In 1988, the civil war started between the regime and Somaliland's Isaaq clansmen (Lewis, 2008: 71). During this first round of civil war, militias were organized along clan lines (Elmi, 2010: 18). Barre lost most of its territory and got the ironic nickname of 'Mayor of Mogadishu.' (Harper, 2012: 56). In July 1989, Barre arrested some well-known religious leaders. As a response to these arrests, several Islamists groups decided to show their support for these leaders and started to resist state repression (Elmi, 2010: 59).

[19] Hesse (2010: 251) describes this as "An ideological mix of Lenin, Marx, the Koran, Mao and Mussolini, obliquely known as 'scientific socialism."

[20] This bombardment became known as the 'Dresden of Africa' (Harper, 2012: 56).

On January the 26th in 1991, Barre also lost control of Mogadishu and was driven out by USC (United Somali Congress) fighters. Most of the country's institutions, as well as the law and order, were destroyed. However, the fall of Barre did not end the civil war. The USC turned against itself. It appeared that the clan-system seemed self-destructive. Warlords and powerful clan leaders ruled the conflict, supported by wealthy business men. The situation was unpredictable for the Somali population, "and a weapon was essential for everyone living there" (Harper, 2012: 57).

The death and destruction of the conflict led to hunger (Harper, 2012: 58). Harper describes this as 'essentially a man-made famine" where "food could not be moved around the country without being looted by clan militias" (Harper, 2012: 59). Once foreign journalists arrived in Somalia and the devastating situation was broadcasted to television, there was enormous international public pressure to do something about the situation. In 1992, the number of humanitarian agencies present in Somalia increased rapidly (Menkhaus, 2010: 324). However, Somalia was an unusual situation being a country without a government (Harper, 2012: 59). "Aid ships were being shot at even before they reached land." (Harper, 2012: 59) In 1991, state institutions collapsed and Somalia became the ultimate failed state.

2.2 The U.S in Somalia

The U.S had established diplomatic relations with Somalia right after independence in the sixties. During the cold war, Somalia was a valuable country due to its strategic position and long coastline. Somalia was an ally of the West. The U.S provided $380 in military aid towards Somalia (between 1954 and 1987). In the same period, the U.S provided $680 in bilateral economic aid. The U.S named this the 'security/development mix'.[21] However, Menkhaus argues that this led to the West only focussing on security concerns in Somalia which "badly compromised humanitarian operations" in the 1980s (2010: 323). In the post-cold war era, the U.S expressed their concerns about human rights abuses by the Siad Barre regime. Ultimately, this led them to freeze foreign assistance to Somalia. According to

[21] This was said by professor and former diplomat David Rawson in "US Foreign Assistance to Somalia: Phoenix from the Ashes?" by Ken Menkhaus in 1991.

Menkhaus this "was an ethical luxury that the logic of the Cold War had prevented in the past" (1997: 126).

In 1990, Iraq invaded Kuwait. This led the U.S to place priority on military bases in that area, rather than in Somalia. Herman Cohen[22] said "[We assumed] that the clan system would somehow find a way to bring order out of chaos. With US forces well accommodated directly in the Gulf and with our embassy closed, we more or less dropped Somalia from our radar screen." But as described previously in this chapter, a humanitarian crisis broke out in Somalia in the early nineties. The international community responded. Several missions in Somalia would follow: UNOSOM I, UNITAF and UNOSOM II. The U.S was involved in all three missions, which will now be discussed.

2.2.1 Operation Provide Relief (UNOSOM I) & Operation Restore Hope (UNITAF)

In April 1992, the U.N Security Council adopted resolution 751. This resolution led to the establishment of the United Nations Operation in Somalia (UNOSOM I). The UNOSOM mission was "to provide military assistance in support of emergency and humanitarian relief to Kenya and Somalia" (Allard, 1995: 12) and received the name "Operation Provide Relief." The U.S took the lead in this operation that started off in August 1992 with a food airlift authorized by the Bush administration (Weis in Lederach et al., 2011: 45). The situation in Somalia grew worse during UNOSOM I: An aid ship was forced to withdraw when it was fired upon in November of that year (Ibid.) It appeared that the presence of the UN was not enough to contain the conflict or the consequences it had for the population.

The international community agreed on an armed intervention to protect the delivery of humanitarian aid (Weis in Lederach et al., 2011: 45). This also included the deployment of a military force (Annan, 2012: 42). This led to resolution 794, which was unanimously adopted by the Security Council on December 3, 1992. The resolution mandated the use of "all necessary means to establish as soon as possible a secure environment for humanitarian relief operations in Somalia." The next day, former President George H.W. Bush announced Operation Restore Hope (UNITAF) on 4 December 1992, saying that "only the United States has the global reach to place a large security force on the ground in such a distance place quickly and efficiently and, thus, save thousands of innocents from death" (Annan, 2012:

[22] Herman Cohen was the United States Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs from 1989 to 1993

42). On December 9, 28.000 U.S soldiers were deployed in Somalia, supported by 17.000 soldiers from additional troops from twenty other countries (Annan, 2012: 42). According to Kofi Annan (2012: 43) the U.S led taskforce was "highly successful" in both securing population centres in much of Somalia and delivering humanitarian supplies to approximately 40 per cent of the country. Allard (1995: 14) also argues that UNITAF "clearly succeeded in its mission of stabilizing the security situation."

2.2.2 UNOSOM II (USFORSOM)

Despite the success of UNITAF, the fighting still continued and the original plan to replace UNITAF with a permanent UN peacekeeping force (UNOSOM II) was put off repeatedly. Finally, U.N Security Council Resolution 814 was established on March 26, 1993. This resolution led to the formation of UNOSOM II. The objectives for this mission were "far-reaching" according to Allard (1995: 15) and included rehabilitating the political institutions as well as building a secure environment throughout the country (Ibid.). The expanding of the ambitions of the mission did not match with the reduction in size. Where UNOSOM I consisted of over 40.000 troops, UNOSOM II existed of barely 20.000 troops (Annan, 2012: 43). The U.S did not lead UNOSOM II but provided logistics and was asked to provide a Quick Reaction Force. This force consisted of 1,150 U.S soldiers and its mission was to conduct military operations to operations to consolidate, expand, and maintain a secure environment for the advancement of humanitarian aid, economic assistance, and political reconciliation in Somalia (Allard, 1995: 16).

The fighting in Somalia still continued and UNOSOM II did not manage to get the fighting under control. The extensive mandate of UNOSOM II threatened the power base of one clan warlord, Mohammed Aideed. On June 5' 1993, 24 Pakistani soldiers were attacked and killed by Aideed's men. When UNOSOM II attempted to disarm the Somali factions, the force was dragged into the conflict (Annan, 2012: 44). In secrecy, former secretary general of the U.N Boutros-Ghali[23] decided to deploy U.S Special Forces to hunt for Aideed. The U.S troops in particular focussed on arresting general Aideed, who was now perceived as the greatest threat to the entire mission. According to Kofi Annan, this new focus on Aideed distracted the mission from "important strategic questions" (Ibid.). Ultimately, the manhunt led to "the bloodiest battle of any UN peacekeeping operation" (Allard, 1995: 17). On the 3rd

[23] Boutros Boutros-Ghali was secretary-general of the United Nations from 1992 until 1997.

of October in 1993, the U.S Special Forces were given command to hunt down some of Aideed's men, after their location was discovered. During this raid, 18 American soldiers were killed and another 75 wounded (Ibid.). Ultimately, this 'first battle of Mogadishu' let to the infamous Black Hawk Down incident.

When images of dead U.S soldiers being dragged through the streets of Mogadishu hit American television, the American public was in shock. The mission in Somalia was known as a "peacekeeping mission" and therefore, the American public was not prepared for casualties. Soon after the traumatic incident, the U.S announced its departure from Somalia. This departure also meant that the best-trained soldiers left UNOSOM II, weakening its force. In the months that followed the UN mission in Somalia collapsed (Annan, 2012: 45).

2.2.3 The Somalia Syndrome

"We turned out the lights, closed the doors and forgot about the place," said Frank Crigler in Lyons & Samatar (1995: 28). The experience of Black Hawk Down traumatized both the U.S government as well as the American public. The effect of the mission gone wrong in Somalia was a "backlash against humanitarianism itself" (Brunk, 2008: 302). A U.S citizen said, "If I have to choose between pictures of starving Somalian babies or dead American soldiers being dragged through the streets of Mogadishu, well, I don't want to see any more dead Americans. Sorry." (Shalom, 2005 in Brunk, 2008: 302).

The impact of the events in Somalia let to a "post-Somalia international climate" according to Kofi Annan (2012: 53). This climate was characterized by a strong reluctance of the U.S to intervene, especially when these interventions endangered American lives. This fear supposedly let to the decision of the U.S to not intervene during the Rwandan genocide in 1994. In 1998, former president Bill Clinton apologized for this in a speech when he visited the country: "The international community, together with nations in Africa, must bear its share of responsibility for this tragedy, as well. We did not act quickly enough after the killing began. (…). We cannot change the past. But we can and must do everything in our power to help you build a future without fear, and full of hope."[24]

[24] This would later be known as "the Clinton apology." The full transcript of this speech can be found online at: http://www.cbsnews.com/2100-202_162-5798.html

2.3 Conclusion

The relationship between the U.S and Somalia has been a turbulent one during the nineties. The complex context in Somalia, with so many clans and factions involved in the conflict, made it a challenging environment for the international community. Even though the second mission, UNITAF, has been described as successful, international forces could not contain the conflict in Somalia. The U.S had presented as ambitious and confident, claiming that it was "the only country able to place such a large security force on the ground and save thousands of lives." Despite these ambitions, the events of the 3rd of October 1993 traumatized both the U.S public as U.S congress. This experience would define the foreign policy of the U.S in the later nineties, which was one of non-intervention.

Chapter 3 – The Rise of the War on Terror discourse

"This will be a monumental struggle of good versus evil,
but good will prevail.[25]" – President George W. Bush

The first speech that Bush gave to the American public after the 9/11 attacks dominated the news: "The deliberate and deadly attacks which were carried out yesterday against our country were more than acts of terror, they were acts of war (…) This will require our country to unite in steadfast determination and resolve… This will be a monumental struggle of good versus evil, but good will prevail."[26]

As the excerpt shows, the attacks were immediately defined as acts of war. This is the first time Bush mentioned both 'war' and 'terror' in the same sentence. Soon, this would grow out to the discourse of the War on Terror, which has been described as "the defining discourse of the age" (Krebs & Lobasz, 2007: 423). One year later, Nicholas Lemann wrote in The New Yorker: "[The War on Terror] has entered the language so fully, and framed the way people think about how the United States is reacting to the September 11th attacks so completely, that the idea that declaring and waging war on terror was not the sole, inevitable, logical consequence of the attacks just isn't in circulation."[27] The discourse of the War on Terror appeared to be forceful in defining U.S foreign policy.

The War on Terror discourse was used to represent, or 'frame' U.S foreign policy. Framing has been defined by Snow & Benford (1992: 137) as "the efforts to define reality by placing the selected idea in a context that favours certain interpretations". Framing can thus define and construct a political issue, in this case the War on Terror. It is essential for a discourse like the War on Terror to be framed correctly by the correct actors. In 2001, this was former President George W. Bush. Hence, the War on Terror was socially constructed through the public language as expressed by political leaders (Jackson, 2011: 392). Aside from the language used, the War on Terror was co-constituted by its material practices and action. Languages and practise are interdependent: language gives meaning to material

[25] The above is an excerpt of the speech of President George W. Bush's when he opened a Cabinet meeting with his national security advisers on September 12, 2001. The complete speech is online available at: http://www.pbs.org/newshour/updates/terrorism/july-dec01/bush_speech_9-12.html
[26] Ibid.
[27] Nicholas Lemann is a Professor of Journalism and a staff writer for the New Yorker. "The War on What? The White House and the Debate About Whom to Fight Next," *The New Yorker*, 9 September 2002. Online available at: https://www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/bush/lemann.htm

practices, and therefore makes these practices possible. Language and practice shape each other and together constitute the War on Terror discourse (Jackson, 2011: 393).

In this chapter, the rise of the War on Terror discourse will be described by starting with the communication strategy the President and the government used to unite the Americans and create support for the War on Terror. In the second part of this chapter, it will be shown how the discourse can be traced back in policy documents released by the government in the years that followed, showing how the War on Terror found its way in U.S foreign policy.

3.1 The Discourse and the President

As Björkdahl (2007: 174) describes it: "Once an idea has been selected, its ability to survive and be integrated into policy depends to a large extent on the conscious efforts of the actors promoting the idea." The main 'actor' promoting the 'idea' was President Bush. "In our grief and anger we have found our mission and our moment," said Bush while speaking to Congress and the public on September 20th, 2001.[28] The U.S government immediately attempted to unite the American public after the events of 9/11. Confidence among Americans needed to be restored (Hutcheson et al., 2010: 30). Both the U.S government and military leaders used American themes in their communications (Ibid.: 27). This uniting of the American public was needed in order to render support for the War on Terror.

The above excerpt of Bush's speech is an example of strategic political communication as described in Manheim (1991 in Hutcheson et al, 2010: 28), where "political leaders communicate with the goal to create, control, distribute, and use mediated messages as a political resource". Hutcheson et al. (2010) found that "the government and military officials consistently emphasized American core values and teams" while simultaneously demonizing the 'enemy'. Journalists closely paralleled these themes in their language. They also argue that the events of 9/11 were critical for U.S national identity (Hutcheson et al., 2010: 2 7).

[28] This is an excerpt of Bush's address to a joint session of Congress on September 20th, 2001. The full transcript can be found here: http://edition.cnn.com/2001/US/09/20/gen.bush.transcript/

In his State of the Union speech on January 29, 2002, Bush used the word 'evil' five times and 'war' twelve times (Entman, 2010: 416). Introducing U.S foreign policy post 9/11 as a war against terrorism was an "effective framing choice" (Ibid.). Aside from using words as 'war' and 'evil', Bush was also known to use more moralistic words in speeches. Ethicist Peter Singer described Bush as "America's most prominent moralist. No other president in living memory has spoken so often about good and evil, right and wrong" (in Krebs & Lobasz, 2007: 426).

"The terrorists," Bush declared on the day of the attacks, "hate our freedoms—our freedom of religion, our freedom of speech, our freedom to vote and assemble and disagree with each other. This is the world's fight. This is civilization's fight. This is the fight of all who believe in progress and pluralism, tolerance and freedom."[29] This is a clear example of what Singer described as moralistic. Bush focuses on how the terrorists attack the moral value of freedom, which is a pro-American theme as well. By repeatedly emphasizing 'our', Bush also unites his American public with these words.

In June 2002, Bush spoke to the U.S Military Academy's Class of 2002: "We must take the battle to the enemy, disrupt his plans and confront the worst threats before they emerge. In the world we have entered, the only path to safety is the path of action. And this nation will act."[30] By emphasizing that "the only path of safety is the path of action", Bush makes clear that the War on Terror is the only logical consequence of the attacks. There is no room to discuss alternatives. This is in line with what Lemann described as well.[31] The power of the War on Terror discourse allowed Bush to use military force to achieve foreign policy objectives "with few checks and balances or sustained media coverage – to an extent unprecedented in U.S history" (Zenko, 2012).

During his State of the Union address, Bush referred to the War on Terror once more as he addressed the American troops in Afghanistan: "Our war on terror is well begun, but it is only begun. This campaign may not be finished on our watch, yet it must be and it will be waged on our watch. (…) Yet as we act to win the war, protect our people and create jobs in

[29] Former President George W. Bush addresses a Joint Session of Congress and the American People on September 11, 2001. The full transcript is online available at: http://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2001/09/20010920-8.html

[30] Former President George W. Bush spoke to graduates of the U.S Military Academy's Class of 2002 on June 1, 2002. This is an excerpt from this speech. The full transcript is available online at: http://www.defense.gov/News/NewsArticle.aspx?ID=43798

[31] See 33.

America, we must act first and foremost not as Republicans, not as Democrats, but as Americans."[32]

Thus, the War on Terror was a discourse that became institutionalised and normalized by reorienting the national security structure and embedding the ideas of a terrorist threat within American culture (Jackson, 2011: 394). Hutcheson et al. (2010: 30) have defined four different communication strategies used by government officials: the affirmation of American values and ideals, the affirmation of U.S international power and domination, an emphasis on the unification among Americans across ideological and racial lines, the positioning of the United States as a moral leader among nations, and finally the demonization of the 'enemy'.

3.2 The Discourse in Policy

The War on Terror discourse quickly found its way into U.S foreign policy documents. The first updated U.S foreign policy document was the new National Security Strategy Report (NSSR), published on September 17, 2002. This report is published by the executive branch of the U.S government and is intended to be a "comprehensive statement articulating the worldwide interests, goals, and objectives of the United States that are important to its security." The next NSSR was published on March 16, 2006.[33] A year after the release of the 2002 NSSR, the National Strategy for Combating Terrorism (NSCT) was released in February 2003. This document elaborates on Section III of the NSSR[34], and focuses on "identifying and defusing threats before they reach our borders." (NSCT, 2003: 2). The NSCT was updated in September 2006, a few months after the updated NSSR of that year.

[32] This is an excerpt from Former President George W. Bush during his State of the Union address on January 29th 2002. The full transcript is available online at: http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/onpolitics/transcripts/sou012902.htm

[33] "Under the Goldwater-Nichols Defense Department Reorganization Act of 1986 (amending Title 50, Chapter 15, Section 404a of the US Code), the President must submit a report on the national security strategy of the United States to Congress each year. However, especially in recent years, these reports have been made late or not at all." – National Security Strategy Archive, online available at: http://www.nssarchive.us

[34] Section III of the NSSR 2002 is called "Strengthen Alliances to Defeat Global Terrorism and Work to Prevent Attacks Against Us and Our Friends".

Furthermore, the 9/11-commission report was released on July 22, 2004[35]. The Congress and the President created the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States with the establishment of Law 107-306 on November 27, 2002. The law directed the commission to investigate "facts and circumstances relating to the terrorist attacks of September 11." The aim of the commission was "to provide the fullest possible account of the events surrounding 9/11 and to identify lessons learned." In the preface of the report, the commission states, "we learned about an enemy who is sophisticated, patient, disciplined and lethal" and "its purpose is to rid the world of religious and political pluralism." (9/11 commission report, 2004: xvi).

Lastly, the U.S has published an annual report on "Patterns on Global Terrorism" since 1995. The name changed to "Country Reports on Terrorism" from 2004 onwards. These reports are "a full and complete report on terrorism with regard to those countries and groups meeting criteria set forth in the legislation."[36] These reports will not be researched because they do not include much information on actual U.S foreign policy, but rather report the threat of terrorism in specific countries in the world.

Now, the NSSR of both 2002 and 2006 will be analyzed on the use of the War on Terror discourse, as well as the NSCT of 2003 and 2006 to answer the question how the discourse has impacted U.S foreign policy. Both reports were released again during the Obama administration and will be discussed in the fifth chapter, "The Decline of the War on Terror Discourse", as well to see whether or not the use of the War on Terror discourse in these documents has declined in later years.

3.2.1 The National Security Strategy Report - 2002

There are two prominent themes throughout the 2002 NSSR that reflect the integration of the War on Terror discourse in U.S foreign policy. First, there is the proactive stance of the U.S with the clear ambition to actively fight (potential) terrorists or terrorists' havens. This shows in the foreword of former President George W. Bush."(…) As a matter of common sense and self-defense, America will act against such emerging threats before they

[35] The National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States prepared the Final Report of the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks, as requested by the President and Congress. The commission was established on November 27, 2002. The final report was published on July 22, 2004 and is available for download at http://www.9-11commission.gov/report/911Report.pdf

[36] As explained on the website of the U.S Bureau of Counterterrorism, online available at: http://www.state.gov/j/ct/rls/crt/2007/index.htm

are fully formed. We cannot defend America and our friends by hoping for the best." In this same foreword, the potential danger of weak or failed states is also emphasized by Bush, stating that: "The events of September 11, 2001, taught us that weak states, like Afghanistan, can pose as great a danger to our national interests as strong states. Poverty does not make poor people into terrorists and murderers. Yet poverty, weak institutions, and corruption can make weak states vulnerable to terrorist networks and drug cartels within their borders." Secondly, the U.S shows a strong vision to focus on democratization and provide other countries with the "infrastructure of democracy" (NSSR, 2002: 21). In section II, 'Champion Aspirations for Human Dignity' it is specifically mentioned that "make freedom and the development of democratic institutions" are key themes in the National Security Strategy of the U.S. Not only does the U.S shows the intention to development of democratic institutions in countries that lack a functioning government, also the U.S states that "We will help ensure the state has the military, law enforcement, political, and financial tools necessary to finish the task[37]." (NSSR, 2002: 7).

The proactive defense came into practice with the U.S invading Afghanistan in 2002 and Iraq in 2003. This is very much intertwined with the theme of democratization, since the U.S has shown the ambition to bring democracy to both these countries as well, following intervention. Concluding, the 2002 NSSR was clearly built around the War on Terror and this foreign policy appeared to be leading for the U.S in the following years.

3.2.2 National Strategy for Combating Terrorism, 2003

The 2003 NSCT was an extension of the third section of the 2002 NSSR that focused on defeating terrorism. Both themes prominent in the 2002 NSSR can be found in the 2003 NSCT as well, and are strikingly consistent and similar.

The focus on democratic values and democratization is made clear in the introduction. In the introduction, it is stated: "Freedom and fear are at war" (…) "we must fight terrorist networks, and all those who support their efforts to spread fear around the world, using every instrument of national power." (NSCT, 2003: 1). And, "We seek to integrate nations and peoples into the mutually beneficial democratic relationships that protect against the forces of disorder and violence. Ultimately, our fight against terrorism will help foster an

[37] The task being to "isolate the terrorists" and "disrupt and destroy terrorists organizations of global reach and attack their leadership" (NSSR, 2002: 5-6).

international environment where our democratic interests are secure and the values of liberty are respected around the world." (NSCT, 2003: 3).

The 'ready for action' mentality of the U.S also emanates from the 2003 NSCT. "Where states are reluctant, we will work with our partners to convince them to change course and meet their international obligations. (…) Where states are unwilling, we will act decisively to counter the threat they pose and, ultimately, to compel them to cease supporting terrorism (NSCT, 2003: 12)," shows that the U.S is prepared for war and to invade in these unwilling states. That the U.S does not want to 'wait and see' is also made clear in the following statement: "We cannot wait for terrorists to attack and then respond. The United States and its partners will disrupt and degrade the ability of terrorists to act, and compel supporters of terrorism to cease and desist" (NSCT, 2003: 14).

Because the 2003 NSCT is an extension of the 2002 NSSR, it allows more room to elaborate on the actual strategy that the U.S is planning to follow in practice. A 4D strategy (Defeat, Deny, Diminish and Defend) is announced in the NSCT to counter terrorists and terrorist organizations (NSCT, 2003: 14). The U.S expects that this approach will have "a cascading effect across the larger terrorist landscape, disrupting the terrorists' ability to plan and operate (NSCT, 2003: 11).

3.2.3 The National Security Strategy Report - 2006

It appears that both the use of the War on Terror discourse as the themes of proactivity and democracy had grown even stronger in the 2006 NSSR, compared to the 2002 NSSR. This was the U.S fourth year in Afghanistan, and its third in Iraq. "America is at war," are the first words of former President George W. Bush in the introduction of the 2006 NNSR. "These inseparable priorities – fighting and winning the war on terror and promoting freedom as the alternative to tyranny and despair – have now guided American policy for more than 4 years." This quote shows how explicitly and leading the War on Terror discourse had become in U.S foreign policy.

In the second paragraph of the introduction, Bush mentions the ideals that "have inspired our history" being freedom, democracy and human dignity. The theme of democracy is clearly a recurring one, which is emphasized in section III: "Democracy is the opposite of terrorist tyranny, which is why the terrorists denounce it and are willing to kill the innocent to stop it. Democracy is based on empowerment, while the terrorists' ideology

is based on enslavement. Democracies expand the freedom of their citizens, while the terrorists seek to impose a single set of narrow beliefs. Democracy sees individuals as equal in worth and dignity, having an inherent potential to create and to govern themselves" (NSSR, 2006: 11).

The theme of proactivity is not as evidently endorsed as it was done in the 2002 NSSR, perhaps because the U.S had already followed through on doing this by invading in both Afghanistan and Iraq. When challenges and successes since the 2002 NSSR are discussed, these also seem to focus on democracy and state building. As successes, it is mentioned that "the peoples of Afghanistan and Iraq have replaced tyrannies with democracies", "Democracy has made further advances in Africa, Latin America, and Asia, with peaceful transfers to power," and others (NSSR, 2006: 2). Challenge mentioned, among others, are fragile states, tyranny in "a number of nations" and some governments who "have not delivered the benefits of effective democracy and prosperity to their citizens" (NSSR, 2006: 3).

3.2.4 National Strategy for Combating Terrorism, 2006

Remarkably, the 2006 NSCT starts with the same four words as the 2006 NSSR: "America is at war." In the introduction, it is explained that de NSCT "recognizes that we are at war and that protecting and defending the Homeland, the American people, and their livelihoods remains our first and most solemn obligation (NSCT, 2006: 1). The War on Terror is described as "a different kind of war" (Ibid.). It is explained as "both a battle of arms and a battle of ideas."

Also in line with the 2006 NSSR, there is a strong emphasis on the democracy theme. Democracy is presented as "the best long-term answer to al-Qaida's agenda" and has been promoted "through the freedom agenda" (Ibid.). A strategy for winning the War on Terror is presented with a long-term approach: "the advancement of freedom and human dignity through effective democracy" (NSCT, 2006: 9). "Democracy is the antithesis of terrorist tyranny," (NSCT, 2006: 10) is a statement that is preceded by the following arguments for advancing democracy: "In place of alienation, democracy offers an ownership stake in society, a chance to shape one's own future. In place of festering grievances, democracy offers the rule of law (…). In place of a culture of conspiracy and misinformation, democracy

offers freedom of speech (…). In place of an ideology that justifies murder, democracy offers a respect for human dignity that abhors the deliberate targeting of innocent civilians (Ibid.)."

3.3 The Discourse in Media and Culture

The War on Terror did not only found its way into speeches of the President or in U.S foreign policy. The War on Terror grew out to be much more than simply a policy discourse; the War on Terror became an integral part of American culture (Jackson, 2011: 396). Study centres and degree programmes arose in the U.S that carried the name or focused on the War on Terror. Sources of research funding were made available specifically to research addressing the topic of the War on Terror. Also, the core narratives of the War on Terror have been collectively re-enacted through public ceremonies and by the American media (Ibid.).[38]

The media played an inescapable role in the rise of the War on Terror discourse as well. Reese & Lewis discuss in their article how the War on Terror became a "socially shared organizing principle" through its transmission via the US press (2009: 778). For their research, they tracked how often the combination of the words 'war' and 'terror (War on Terror, War on Terrorism et cetera) was used in USA Today and the Associated Press between 2001 and 2006. The War on Terror was mostly mentioned in the aftermath of 9/11, then declined and became relatively steady from 2003 through 2006. It peaked significantly around 2004, when the issue played a prominent role during the presidential election (2009: 783).

3.4 Conclusion

The phrase 'War on Terror' was first used by the president and was quickly taken over by the media, American culture and the American public. The War on Terror became a strong and forceful discourse that influenced and defined U.S foreign policy in the following years. The idea of the War on Terror quickly found its way into U.S foreign policy documents in the years that followed. Leading teams where the proactivity of the U.S, as well as the intention of the U.S to preserve values like 'freedom' and 'human dignity' by striving to bring democracy to the world. Clearly, the U.S was ready to act and did so by invading in

[38] See the work of Spigel, L. (2004). Entertainment Wars: Television Culture After 9/11. *American Quarterly,* 56(2): 235 – 270.

Afghanistan and Iraq. In 2006, Bush declared that America was at war. The focus on bringing democracy as an answer to terrorism had seemingly grown even stronger. Aside from being at war, America thus also aimed at state building.

Interestingly, Somalia is never mentioned in each of these strategy documents. Nevertheless, the War on Terror would also impact U.S foreign policy decisions on the ground in Somalia. This will be discussed in the next chapter.

Chapter 4 – The War on Terror practice in Somalia

"The war on terrorism has distorted our vision of complex dynamics in Somalia." - Ken Menkhaus[39] (2002: 218)

As has been shown in the previous chapters, the U.S had redirected their foreign policy towards a focus of countering terrorism, and supporting democracy abroad. Especially weak and/or failing states posed a danger, being a potential safe haven or breeding ground for terrorists. Somalia was such a danger, having been ranked as the number one in the Failed State Index[40] for several years in a row.

Even though Somalia never was mentioned in the strategy documents discussed in the previous chapter, the country has been discussed in the annual Patterns of Global Terrorism[41]. In 2001, Somalia was identified as one of those "potential breeding grounds for terrorism" (2001: 7). In the reports that followed, the text about Somalia more or less stayed the same until 2005. However, the text for Somalia changed in 2006, when Somalia was identified as a "serious threat" to both the U.S as the allies in the region. (Country Reports on Terrorism, 2006). "Somalia remains a concern, as the country's unsecured borders and continued political instability provide opportunities for terrorist transit and/or organization" (Ibid.). Back in 2002, the U.S government had also added several Somali individuals and organizations on their lists of terrorists.

The War on Terror had shaped the way the U.S and others approached Somalia (Harper, 2012: 169). Eventually, this led to reignited (diplomatic but mainly military) engagement of the U.S in Somalia[42], with the aim to counter terrorism and Islamist extremist groupings like al-Shabaab, while simultaneously striving for a stabilization of the state. In the 9/11-commission report, it is stated, "when people lose hope, when societies break down,

[39] The quote is from Menkhaus (2002: 218).

[40] The Failed State Index is a yearly recalculated index published by the Fund for Peace. The FSI through the years can be accessed online at: http://ffp.statesindex.org/

[41] On the website of the U.S government, it is explained that "U.S. law requires the Secretary of State to provide Congress, by April 30 of each year, a full and complete report on terrorism with regard to those countries and groups meeting criteria set forth in the legislation. This annual report is entitled *Country Reports on Terrorism*. Beginning with the report for 2004, it replaced the previously published *Patterns of Global Terrorism*." All the annual Country Reports on Terrorism are online available at: http://www.state.gov/j/ct/rls/crt/index.htm

[42] According to Berman, the U.S foreign policy towards Africa (and Somalia in particular) had already changed before 9/11. However, the 9/11 attacks did "quicken the pace of these changes and deepened the commitments towards the continent" (2010: 133).

where countries fragment, breeding grounds for terrorism are created" (2004: 378). Somalia had been stateless for over ten years, since the fall of the dictatorial regime of Siad Barre. Therefore, the U.S perceived Somalia as a 'breeding ground for terrorism'. Hence, the country eventually became a top priority of the U.S in Africa during the War on Terror. However, it should be noted that the argumentation that weak or failing states would be a safe haven for terrorists has been contradicted by several academics (Menkhaus, 2006 and Newman, 2007). The assumption of a connection between weak states and terrorism is controversial and contested, but nevertheless became the "new conventional wisdom" in U.S foreign policy (Bryden, 2003).

Nonetheless, Somalia was identified as a 'serious threat' in 2006 by the U.S government. In this chapter, it will be analysed how the War on Terror impacted U.S foreign policy on the ground in Somalia. Menkhaus has defined four different periods in Somalia between 2001 and 2010. He identifies the years leading up to 2001 as the 'post-UNOSOM' period that was characterized by "limited external engagement and interest in the country" (Menkhaus, 2010: 321). This chapter is divided according to the two periods that followed as defined by Menkhaus (2010: 321):

2001 – 2006: In this period, the U.S was preoccupied with terrorist threats that could emanate from Somalia, being a possible breeding ground for terrorism. In this period, the U.S also showed renewed interest for state building in Somalia.

2006 – 2008: This period was a turbulent one. Ethiopia (backed by the U.S) intervened in Somalia, the African Union (AU) intervened with the African Union Mission in Somalia (AMISOM), the U.S performed several direct counter terrorism operation, a massive humanitarian crisis arose, there was a powerful Islamist insurgency and the U.S actively supported the Transitional Federal Government (TFG).

January 2009: Menkhaus describes this as the 'post-occupation period', since the Ethiopian forces withdrew. The Jihadist insurgency rose in this period, leading to a shrinking of humanitarian space. During this time, the U.S placed restrictions on humanitarian aid and al-Shabaab. This period will be discussed in the sixth chapter, since this covers the period when the War on Terror discourse was actively played down by the Obama administration.

4.1 2001-2006: Increasing Military Presence

The renewed interest of the U.S in Africa (and Somalia in particular) was mainly a military one. Since 9/11, U.S military aid towards Africa had nearly quadrupled (Weis in Lederach et al., 2011: 46). In 2002, the U.S established the Combined Joint Task Force-Horn of Africa (CJTF-HOA) in Djibouti. The mission of CJTF-HOA, as stated on their website[43], is "to support partner nation military operations in Somalia to defeat AQEA/AS, conduct focused military-to-military engagement to strengthen East African partner nation militaries and conduct crisis response and personnel recovery (…), in order to protect and defend the national security interests of the United States." A year later, the East Africa Counter-Terrorism Initiative (EARSI)[44] was established.

Also, press reports state that both military reconnaissance flights and surveillance activities increased in 2002 (Dagne, 2002: 68). Even though U.S military attention towards Somalia evidently increased, the U.S did not undertake the more extreme measures as the invasion in both Afghanistan and Iraq. Rather, the U.S gathered intelligence and surveyed Somali airspace. (Bryden, 2003). The War on Terror had led to a more militaristic approach in Somalia, but the main focus the U.S was with the invasions in both Iraq and Afghanistan around this period. According to Charles Snyder[45]: "We [the US] have too much baggage… This is a problem right now that we're managing, not solving" (Elmi, 2010: 82).

In Somalia itself, the Transitional Federal Government (TFG) was formed in October 2005. According to Menkhaus (2007: 368) the TFG was seen as "another stillborn administration." The TFG had been formed after two years of internationally sponsored peace talks in Nairobi (Menkhaus, 2010: 331), but immediately suffered internal splits and became dysfunctional from an early start. Between 2005 and 2006, the TFG was also unable to establish a presence in Mogadishu, and most members of the TFG resided in Nairobi (Ibid.).

[43] The website of the Combined Joint Task Force – Horn of Africa can be accessed at: http://www.hoa.africom.mil/

[44] Since 2009, this has been renamed to the Partnership for Regional East Africa Counterterorrism (PREACT) and is a "U.S.-funded and implemented multi-year, multi-faceted program designed to build the counterterrorism capacity and capability of member countries to thwart short-term terrorist threats and address longer-term vulnerabilities." More information is online available at: http://www.state.gov/j/ct/programs/index.htm

[45] Charles Snyder is a former Acting Assistant Secretary of State

4.2 2006 – 2008: Countering the rise of the Islamists

Although the TFG had been technically formed, the TFG was unable to – literally – set foot on the ground in Somalia. Its lack of legitimacy meant that Somalia was still an ungoverned space. During this time, the Islamic Courts Union (ICU) rose to power. Harper (2012: 4) describes the ICU as a "home-grown form of political Islam". This ICU organized Sharia courts throughout the country. Before 2006, the ICU had already provided stability in certain ungoverned regions in Somalia. These courts were known to provide safety for the majority of Somalis, even though "they carried out harsh punishments such as amputations" (Harper, 2012: 5).

4.2.1 The Rise of the Islamic Courts Union

Despite these harsh punishments and the strict rules the ICU imposed, the Somali public generally appreciated the actions of the ICU. For the first time since 1991, the Somalis perceived it safe to go on the streets. Trade revived and food prices dropped (Lewis, 2008: 88). Islamists militias supported the ICU and reopened the main national airport as well as the seaport. Both had been out of action for more than a decade (Ibid.). The ICU had established high levels of public order and security (Menkhaus, 2010: 332). Harper (2012: 9) explains the success of the ICU because it arose from the bottom up, and was not externally imposed on the Somali people like had happened with the TFG. The ICU had built up "performance legitimacy" to the Somali public the TFG had not. Many Somalis believed the ICU was responsible for making the street safe again and restoring law and order (Menkhaus, 2007: 371).

4.2.2 The Alliance for Restoration of Peace and Counter-Terrorism

From June to December 2006, the international community debated whether or not the ICU was led by moderates or driven by extremists. It was hoped that the moderate wing of Islamists could start a dialogue with the TFG with the aim of creating a more inclusive TFG cabinet (Menkhaus, 2007: 376). The U.S had supported the TFG and with a focus on state building and democracy in order to counter terrorism, the U.S did not want the ICU to gain any more power, let alone overthrow the TFG at one point. But the TFG became weaker and weaker. This meant the U.S had no central government to work with in Somalia.

Instead, the U.S forged partnerships with local militia leaders in 2006. The U.S brought these local partners together in the Alliance for Restoration of Peace and Counter-Terrorism and assigned them to attack so called "high value targets" of al-Qaida (Menkhaus, 2007: 368). "According to one Somali warlord I spoke with in March 2008," said Gettleman, "an American agent named James and another one named David showed up in Mogadishu with briefcases stuffed with cash. Use this to buy guns, the agents said. Drop us an e-mail if you have any questions. The warlord showed me the address: no_email_today@yahoo.com" (Gettleman, 2009: 64). The Alliance was supposed to counter the rise of the ICU but did not manage to do so (Weis in Lederach et al., 2011: 46). Soon however, ICU militias overthrew the Alliance. Several Alliance members decided to join the ICU after that. The money and weapons the U.S had provided for this Alliance thus ended up with ICU militias. Paul Salopek[46] (2008) describes this as "a covert war in which the CIA has recruited gangs of unsavoury warlords to hunt down and kidnap Islamic militants (…). Mostly, though, it is a policy time bomb that will be inherited by the incoming Obama administration: a little-known front in the global war on terrorism that Washington appears to be losing, if it hasn't already been lost."

The Alliance debacle in the first half of 2006 led the U.S to change strategy. Somalia became a top priority and U.S officials sought working relations with moderate Islamists. Menkhaus argues that even though peace building and state building gained more focus in U.S foreign policy, counter terrorism was still the main U.S concern (2007: 377). The U.S repeatedly pressured the ICU with their concerns of Mogadishu being a safe haven for al Qaida, but the ICU did not do much with these concerns. Thus, the ICU did not cooperate with the U.S State Department. This led to the U.S shifting its tone towards Somalia in the end of 2006. This shift in policy went from an attempt to promote dialogue between the ICU and the TFG to given a green light for Ethiopia to invade Somalia a few months later (Menkhaus, 2007: 378).

[46] Paul Salopek is a correspondent for the Chicago Tribune and published a series on the conflict in Somalia in 2008.

4.2.3 The Ethiopian invasion

In the second half of 2006, the ICU had defeated several clan warlords and had gained control over Mogadishu and other parts in the south of Somalia. In its first months of power, the ICU did very well and appeared to be "the springboard to a new era of state revival and public order for Somalia" (Menkhaus, 2007: 370). However, there were two enemies that stood between the ICU and the control of the whole of Somalia. Firstly, Ethiopia was the external enemy who did not want to see the ICU gain more control. Secondly, there was an internal enemy; the more radical wing of the ICU. The ICU did not manage to keep this radicalist wing in control. Soon, this splinter group named al-Shabaab was linked to a series of terrorist attacks that had been committed in Ethiopia in the nineties. Also, the ICU relied on support of several politicians who had "strongly any-Ethiopian views" (Menkhaus, 2007: 37). The ICU thus lost control of one enemy, which only worsened the relationship with the other; Ethiopia. Menkhaus describes this failure to control the radical wing as "arguably the most disappointing of Somalia's many missed opportunities" (Ibid.).

In December 2006, Ethiopia decided to invade Somalia. Among its troops were U.S Special Forces as well, says Gettleman (2009: 68). Around this same period, the U.S actively pleaded for the UN Security Council Resolution that lifted the UN arms embargo on Somalia. Menkhaus (2007: 378) argues that this was merely done to protect Ethiopia from charges it was violating that same embargo when its troops invaded Somalia. Even though many think the Ethiopian invasion was secretly U.S led, Menkhaus contests this and says that the Ethiopian invasion would have taken place with and without U.S support (2007: 378).

The last weeks of 2006 produced "some of the most stunning and unexpected developments in Somalia's 56-year history as an independent state" (Menkhaus, 2007: 380). Ultimately, a full-scale battle erupted on December 24 between the Ethiopian forces and the ICU troops. The Islamist militias lost this battle and with that 1000 of their men (Ibid). ICU forces retreated to Mogadishu and later attempted to travel across the Kenyan border (Menkhaus, 2007: 381). The U.S believed that there would be "high value targets" among these convoys. Consequently, the U.S approved two aerial attacks on the convoys. The attacks killed eight al-Shabaab militias but no al-Qaida operatives. "Frankly, I don't think we know who we killed" said an American officer about these attack (Zenko, 2012).

Meanwhile, the U.S still had the main goal of creating a viable government of the weak TFG. U.S foreign policy was based on security, reconciliation and capacity in order to do so (Menkhaus, 2007: 383). With the ICU ousted of Mogadishu, former U.S Secretary of Condoleezza Rice said: "The Somali people (…) have a historic opportunity to begin to move beyond two decades of warlordism, extreme violence and humanitarian suffering." (Ferguson in Menkhaus, 2007: 383). This led to international support for an AMISOM mission that was supposed to protect the Somali people and the TFG.

4.2.4 The Complex Insurgency & Humanitarian Crisis

In 2007, an al-Shabaab insurgency rose against the Ethiopian forces, the TFG and AMISOM. In the same year, al-Shabaab officially broke ties with ICU and openly announced its links with al-Qaida. The Ethiopian forces responded with a counter insurgency campaign. This battle led to a massive humanitarian crisis in April 2007. By 2008, over 3.5 million Somalis were in need of emergency food relief (Menkhaus, 2010: 332).

By this time, the U.S had also declared al-Shabaab as an official terrorist organization. Simultaneously, the territory of al-Shabaab grew bigger and controlled most of Somalia. Aid agencies were forced to cooperate with al-Shabaab in order to access the population in need. The TFG became suspicious of these aid agencies and thought of them as supporters of the terrorists. Humanitarian access shrunk as TFG forces blocked and looted aid convoys (Ibid.). While this happened, the U.S still executed attacks on possible "high value targets." This complicated the situation for aid agencies even more, which were now also seen as possible spies of the U.S by the Somali people.

Ethiopia announced its withdrawal in 2008. The plan was to establish a new TFG that included the more moderate Islamists (many of them had been members of the ICU prior to that). However, al-Shabaab rejected this new TFG in 2009 arguing that it was collaborating with the West (Menkhaus, 2010: 336). With al-Shabaab still controlling most of Somalia, the U.S government announced in September that it would withhold new food aid deliveries in areas controlled by al Shabaab. Menkhaus describes this as "one of the most dramatic policy shifts affecting humanitarian access" (2010: 337). This will be further discussed in the sixth and last chapter of this thesis.

4.3 Conclusion

"Your government gets away with a lot here," said a warden of al-Shabaab controlled prison, Hassan Mohamed Ibrahim, striding about his antique facility with a pistol tucked in the back of his pants. "In Iraq, the world is watching. In Afghanistan, the world is watching. In Somalia, nobody is watching" (Salopek, 2008). Even though Somalia did not get much attention of the U.S government in the first years after 9/11, this changed radically when the fear for an Islamist insurgency grew. However, the U.S acted by creating the Alliance before the ICU had radicalized. Some argue that it could have been more productive to engage with the ICU rather than destroying it. The fear of being destroyed may have enraged the radical wing of the ICU, only making it worse (Harper, 2012: 174).

Bruton (2010: 10) argued that the Bush administration characterized the Somali conflict as "a new front of the War on Terror" and recast a "local, decades-long conflict as an ideological battle between secular democracy and Islam, between moderates and extremists." It is clear how much the War on Terror has impacted U.S foreign policy decisions in Somalia. A – perhaps too narrow – focus on countering terrorism led the U.S to ignore the complex context of the conflict. The ICU had brought peace to parts of Somalia, and even though the ICU did not live up to U.S state building ideals, it might have worked for Somalia at the time. As Menkhaus put it: "One lesson learned since September 11 is that the expanded war on terrorism has created a lens that tends to distort our vision of the complex political dynamics of countries like Somalia" (2002: 218).

Chapter 5 – The Decline of the War on Terror discourse

"The administration has stopped using the phrase and I think that speaks for itself." – Hillary Clinton, March 2009[47]

The election of President Barack Obama generated optimism about the possibility of bringing substantive change to U.S foreign policy (Jackson, 2011: 390). Obama, who came into office in January 2009, identified himself as a "change" to anything that Bush himself had done: the antidote to the excesses of the Bush administration (McCrisken, 2011: 781), specifically regarding the War on Terror. Obama had a clear 'anything but Bush flavour' to many of his stances and announced he wanted to effect "ideological change" (Indyk, Lieberthal & O'Hanlon, 2012: 2, McCrisken, 2011: 782). Regarding the War on Terror, he hoped to effect this change by not embracing the War on Terror discourse (Ibid., 14). "The administration has stopped using the phrase and I think that speaks for itself,'[48] said his Secretary of State Hillary Clinton in March 2009. Obama replaced the phrase War on Terror with "War against al-Qaida and its affiliates" (Sanger, 2012: 19) or simply the "'War with al Qaida."[49]

The first half of this chapter will discuss how Obama attempted to make the War on Terror discourse decline. In the second half of this chapter, it will be shown if this discourse also declined in the policy documents released during the Obama administration.

5.1 The Discourse and the President

The media and the public were very optimistic once Obama had been inaugurated. "In about twenty minutes, he swept away eight years of President George Bush's false choices and failed policies and promised to recommit to America's most cherished ideals."[50] But the public was deceived, says McCrisken (2011: 784), referring to research that shows that the

[47] See 54.
[48] This quote was cited in McCrisken (2011: 782) and was originally found in an article by Jay Solomon, 'US drops "war on terror" phrase, Clinton says', *Wall Street Journal*, 31 March 2009 (online at: http://online.wsj.com/article/SB123845123690371231.html
[49] This said John Brennan, the head of the White House homeland security office in an interview with The Washington Times on August 6, 2009. The article is online available: http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2009/aug/06/white-house-war-terrorism-over/?page=all#pagebreak
[50] 'President Obama' in the New York Times (January, 2009). Online available at: http//www.nytimes.com/2009/01/21/opinion/21wed1.html

public assumed he would withdraw the troops from Afghanistan and Iraq, while instead, he always said he would get tougher on America's 'real' enemies. Perhaps the media and the public were so taken in by Obama's promised 'change' that they did not realize he was still going to pursue the War on Terror, although perhaps using a different narrative.

Jackson argues that Obama did accept the core narrative of the war on terror, even though he has stopped using the phrase (2011: 402). He adds that Obama did not have much of a choice because the discourse had become so institutionalized, that it would be difficult to actually change this discourse when it is so deeply rooted in institutions, media and American culture as has been shown in the third chapter of this thesis (2011: 398). On the most fundamental level, Jackson continues, Obama never really stopped using the phrase since there are still many examples in speeches of Obama where he does refer to both 'war' and 'terror' in the same sentence.[51]

Nevertheless, the Obama administration did attempt to reframe the War on Terror discourse by giving it a lower profile alongside a wide range of other foreign policy priorities such as nuclear disarmament (McCrisken, 2011: 782). The War on Terror was not supposed to be leading in U.S foreign policy any longer. After being in office for two months, Obama announced: "I want to the American people to understand what we have a clear and focused goal: to disrupt, dismantle, and defeat al-Qaida in Pakistan and Afghanistan, and to prevent their return to either country in the future" (Sanger, 2012: 19).

Thus, Obama had always intended to reboot the War on Terror, although phrased differently. However, his policy would be different from Bush in that it would be morally acceptable, more focus and more effective (McCrisken, 2011: 781). Furthermore, Obama would focus more on social and economic development than Bush did. Obama said, "Poverty and misery of people in remote places is a U.S national interest." (Traub: 2010). Also, Obama continues with the focus on weak and failing states: "States that cannot control their borders or their territory are not only a moral dilemma but a security challenge" (Ibid.).

John Brennan[52] explains why the War on Terror discourse is no longer used by the Obama administration. Brennan states that Obama believes "words influence the way America prosecutes the fight against terrorism." Therefore, it is important to not say War against Terrorism because "terrorism is but a tactic – a means to an end, which in al Qaidas

[51] See examples in Jackson (2011: 403).
[52] See 56.

case is global domination by an Islamic caliphate." Also, Brennan explains that the war should not be described as a global war, because it "risks reinforcing the very image that al Qaida seeks to project of itself – that it is a highly organized, global entity capable of replacing sovereign nations with a global caliphate."

5.2 The Discourse in Policy

Whether or not the discourse of the War on Terror actually declined in U.S foreign policy documents will now be analysed. To do so, the in May 2010 updated National Security Strategy Report (NSSR) will be discussed. This report was previously released during the Bush administration in 2002 and 2006. Both reports were discussed in chapter three. Also, the National Strategy for Combating Terrorism (NSCT) of both 2003 and 2006 has been discussed in chapter three. The NSCT was updated again in June 2011. This 2011 NSCT will be discussed in this chapter as well.

Lastly, the U.S published a document in 2012 called 'Sustaining U.S Global Leadership: Priorities For 21st Century Defense (SUGL). This document was released in January 2012 and represented the new strategic guidance for the Department of Defense. It is supposed to "reflect the President's strategic direction to the Department and was deeply informed by the Department's civilian and military leadership, including the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Secretaries of the Military Departments, and the Combatant Commanders" (SUGL, 2012: foreword).

5.2.1 The National Security Strategy Report - 2010

Obama opens the 2010 NSSR with an introduction in which he immediately refers to the fact the Nation "has been at war with a far-reaching network of violence and hatred." In the complete 2010 NSSR, the 'War on Terror' phrase is never mentioned.

Section III, "Advancing Our Interests" has a paragraph dedicated to "Disrupt, Dismantle, and Defeat Al-Qa'ida and its Violent Extremist Affiliates in Afghanistan, Pakistan, and Around the World" (NSSR, 2010: 19). Here, it is said that the U.S is "waging a global campaign against al-Qa'ida and its terrorist affiliates. (…) Yet this is not a global war against a tactic – terrorisms or a religion – Islam. We are at war with a specific network, al-Qa'ida, and its terrorist affiliates who support efforts to attack the United States, our allies, and partners" (NSSR, 2010: 20). Here, just like in previously discussed NSSR strategies, it is states that the U.S will "deny safe havens in other states" (NSSR, 2010: 21).

In this same section, “Values” are discussed (NSSR, 2010: 35). Here, it is emphasized that the U.S will not impose values of democracy, human rights and rule of law on others. However, later it does say that the U.S will “promote democracy and human rights abroad” (NSSR, 2010: 37). Nonetheless, the tone of this seems to be less imposing than in previous NSSR strategies. What also seems to be slight different is that it is stated that “our leadership is too narrowly identified with military force (NSSR, 2010: 8) and that the U.S will focus more on engagement and diplomacy (Gray, 2011: 38). Again, this is a different tone then used in previous strategies, where there seemed to be only focus on the military action of the U.S.

5.2.2 National Strategy for Combating Terrorism - 2011

In the 2011 NSCT foreword, Obama refers to the “10th anniversary of al-Qa’ida’s terrorist attacks against the United States on September 11, 2001.” Also, he mentioned the death of bin Laden. “As a result,” Obama argues, “We now have the opportunity to seize a turning point in our effort to disrupt, dismantle, and ultimately defeat al-Qa’ida.” Also, he specifies once more that “we must define with precision and clarity who are fighting.” He concludes his introduction saying that “We can say with growing confidence – and with certainty about the outcome – that we have put al-Qa’ida on the path of defeat. With an unrelenting focus on the task at hand, and mindful of the challenges still ahead, we will not rest until that job is done.”

In its introduction, it is stated “this National Strategy for Counterterrorism maintains our focus on pressuring al-Qai’da’s core (…). At the same time, our strategy augments our focus on confronting the al-Qa’ida-linked threats that continue to emerge from beyond its core safehaven in South Asia.” The introduction is concluded with the words “To put it simply: We are bringing targeted force to bear on al-Qa’ida at a time when its ideology is also under extreme pressure. Nevertheless, we remain keenly vigilant to the threat al-Qa’ida, its affiliates, and adherents pose to the United States” (NSCT, 2011: 1).

In the overview of the document, it is immediately clarified that “this Administration has made clear that we are not at war with the tactic of terrorism or the religion of Islam. We are at war with a specific organization – al Qa’ida” (NSCT, 2011: 2). “The threat we face” is still al-Qa’ida and its affiliates and adherents (NSCT, 2011: 3).

5.2.3 Sustaining U.S Global Leadership: Priorities for 21st Century Defense - 2012

The document begins by describing the "challenging global security environment" of the world today (SUGL, 2012: 1). It is stated that al-Qaida is "far less capable" now that many of its members have been captured or killed, but that the organisation is still active in Pakistan, Afghanistan, Yemen, Somalia and other countries. It is stated that "For the foreseeable future, the United States will continue to take an active approach to countering these threats by monitoring the activities of non-state threats worldwide, working with allies and partners to establish control over ungoverned territories, and directly striking the most dangerous groups and individuals when necessary" (SUGL, 2012: 1).

Next, the "primary missions of the U.S Armed Forces," are discussed and reference is made to the 2010 NSSR. The top priority of the U.S Armed Forces is still to "counter terrorism and irregular warfare" and it is stated that "Achieving our core goal of disrupting, dismantling, and defeating al-Qaida and preventing Afghanistan from ever being a safe haven again will be central to this effort."

The document makes no mention of fighting the War on Terror specifically, but it is made clear that counter terrorism is still top priority of the U.S Armed Forces. Thus, it seems that the War on Terror discourse in this policy document is indeed no longer present. However, al-Qaida is still top priority of the U.S Armed forces.

5.3 Conclusion

It is striking to see that the three documents are consistent when it comes to avoiding the War on Terror discourse. However, it is just as striking to see that the main objectives of the U.S with regard to al-Qa'ida, are not much different than in the policy documents discussed in chapter three. The "change" that Obama had promised can be seen in the decline of the use of the phrase 'War on Terror', and therefore the discourse. However, the impact that the discourse has had on U.S foreign policy in previous years seems to have been so strong that it is inevitable in the policy documents of later years. "In substance there seems to be little change," argues Gray (2011: 43). Obama's approach looks like a continuation of Bush's policy. Perhaps less focused on imposing democracy, but definitely still fighting the same 'war'. Thus, simply abandoning the language of the 'War on Terror' seems to have had little impact on U.S foreign policy.

What should be noted though, is that Somalia (and al-Shabaab specifically) is mentioned in all three documents. This is clear contrast with the policy documents of earlier years. This can be explained because of the involvement of the U.S in 2006 since then, but perhaps even more so by the changing context of Somalia, where al-Shabaab had risen as a radical Islamist group and had now also officially announced its ties to al-Qaida.

It can thus be concluded that the phrase 'War on Terror' is no longer used by the Obama administration, but actual policy regarding fighting this 'war' has undergone little changes. In the following and last chapter, it will be analysed if the War on Terror was actually reduced in U.S foreign policy on the ground in Somalia.

Chapter 6 – Reducing the War on Terror in Somalia?

"We're doing very little on the hearts and minds,

and we're doing a lot with missiles and drones."

– John Prendergast[53]

"The United States has no desire to Americanize the conflict in Somalia," said Johnnie Carson[54] in March 2010 during a special briefing on U.S policy in Somalia. A few months later, Carson called for a more aggressive international response to the crisis in Somalia at that time. Previous responses have been "too feeble, too slow and too uncoordinated[55]," he argued.

In 2010, the Council on Foreign Relations had released a special report on Somalia (Somalia: A New Approach by Bronwyn E. Bruton[56]. In this report, Bruton proposed a new strategy for the U.S to combat terrorism and promote development and stability in Somalia (2010: vii). She opts for a policy of "constructive disengagement" from the U.S towards Somalia, explaining "doing less is better than doing harm" (2010: 5). However, in the same year Carson announced the Dual Track policy towards Somalia, rejecting a hands-off approach. In this same report, she argues that U.S foreign policy in Somalia did not keep up with the "changing counter terrorism policy" of the U.S in countries like Afghanistan and Iraq. In these countries, U.S commanders have steered away from solely a military approach that merely focuses on killing the enemy. Instead, the focus is more 'population-centric' and engages both civil society as an array of religious actors (Bruton, 2010: 81).

[53] This is a quote from an interview with John Prendergast, a human rights activist who previously worked for the National Security Council and the US Department of State. He is also the founder of the Enough project. The interview was conducted by Charles Faint and April Williamson for the Yale Journal of International Affairs and is available online at: http://yalejournal.org/2012/02/22/us-foreign-policy-state-building-and-humanitarianism-in-africa

[54] Johnnie Carson was appointed by Obama as the Assistant Secretary of the Bureau of African Affairs of the U.S government from 2009 to 2013. The above excerpt is a quote from a Special Briefing on U.S Policy in Somalia, that took place on March 12, 2010. The complete transcript is available at: http://www.state.gov/p/af/rls/rm/2010/138314.htm

[55] The interview with Carson and the Voice of America is available online here: http://www.voanews.com/content/us-calls-for-more-aggressive-international-response-to-somalia-crisis-105485833/159990.html

[56] Bronwyn E. Bruton is a democracy and governance specialist with extensive experience in Africa and works for the Council on Foreign Relations.

This seems to correspond with the NSST of 2010, in which the U.S states that the use of solely military action is too narrow. The advice of Bruton thus corresponds with an already changed policy of the U.S in Afghanistan and Iraq. This change in policy eventually happens in Somalia as well, when the U.S announces the Dual Track Strategy.

Even though Carson said America did not want to "Americanize" the conflict, James Swan[57] said in a 2011 speech "America's national interests require robust engagement with Somalia." He continues by saying that "As part of our global commitment to advancing democratic values and improved governance, we have an interest in promoting political reforms (…). The United States also has direct security interests in Somalia." He continues, "Success means that Somalia is free from totalitarian terrorist groups like al Shabaab. (…). Success means that Somalis can turn to their government for the basic services that we take for granted in America (…). And success means that the Somali people get to decide what form of government and constitutions they will have. (…) Our role is to support the Somali people as they arrive at these decisions."

In this chapter, the Dual Track policy announced in 2010 will be discussed. This is followed by an analysis of U.S military presence in Somalia. Also, the decision of the U.S to block the delivery of humanitarian aid to al-Shabaab controlled regions will be discussed. Lastly, U.S plans for the future of Somalia will be discussed.

6.1 Dual Track Policy

The Dual Track policy is a new U.S strategy towards Somalia that was introduced in the speech of James Swan. The name 'Dual Track' stems from the fact that the policy exists of two different tracks through which the U.S will engage with Somalia. Track one is consistent with the support from the U.S for both the Transitional Charter and the Djibouti Peace Process, as well as for the African Union Mission in Somalia (AMISOM).[58] The second track entails a broadened engagement from the U.S with regional and local administrations (more specifically, the semi-autonomous regions of Somaliland and Puntland). Furthermore, the

[57] James C Swan is the U.S Special Representative to Somalia, appointed in August 2011 to present. The quotes are excerpts from a speech he gave on November 9, 2011 at Ohio State University. The speech can be accessed online at: http://somalia.usvpp.gov/sp_110911.html
[58] Ibid.

track involves engagement with civil society groups who share "the same goal of defeating al-Shabaab and bringing peace and stability back to Somalia."[59]

Swan defines the first year of the Dual Track policy successful. Regarding track one, he states that the Transitional Federal Government (TFG) has retaken ninety-eight percent of Mogadishu from al-Shabaab, together with AMISOM. Regarding track two, Swan states that the U.S has increased both outreach and support with the regional administrations of Puntland and Somaliland. Matt Goshka[60] explains this strategy by saying that "[the U.S will be] broadening our engagement to include all those who reject both the ideologies of hate and terror spread by al-Shabaab and other extremists."

Bruton criticized the U.S government for "clinging on to supporting the TFG, which stems from Washington's mistaken belief that state building is the best response to terrorism" (2010: 80). Although the Dual Track Strategy does focus on state building, is different from previous U.S policy in that the U.S no longer only supports top-down state building approaches, but is willing to cooperate with bottom-up initiatives as well.

Also, this is much more an approach of diplomacy and engagement, rather than a military one. However, the U.S military presence in Somalia was still strong.

6.2 U.S Military presence in Somalia

Months after Obama came into office, the administration announced that they were to ship 40 tons of weapons and ammunition to the TFG. Presumably, the U.S worried that al-Shabaab would once again take control of central Mogadishu. In 2010, Carson describes this in a 2010 Special briefing U.S policy in Somalia:[61] as "limited military support to the Transitional Federal Government." He explains: "We do so in the firm belief that the TFG seeks to end the violence in Somalia that is caused by al-Shabaab and other extremist organizations. However, the United States does not plan, does not direct, and does not coordinate the military operations of the TFG, and we have not and we will not be providing direct support for any potential military offensives."

[59] Ibid.
[60] Matt Goshka is Somalia Unit Spokesperson for the US Embassy in Nairobi
[61] Special briefing U.S policy in Somalia, Johnnie Cason (Assisstant Secretary, Bureau of African Affairs), Ertharin Cousin, ambassador to the UN Mission in Rome, Washington DC, March 12, 2010: www.state.gov/p/af/rls/rm/2010/138314.htm

Obama focused on 'light footprint' options like drones, Special Forces and cyber attacks in Somalia, in order to not Americanize the conflict (Rothkopf, 2013). But drone attacks had a much heavier impact than a 'light' footprint would suggest. Where the U.S Army only owned 200 drones in 2001, of which a handful was armed, this has grown to 7500 drones nowadays, of which a few hundred are armed (Zenko, 2012). Peter Pham[62] warned that the use of drone attacks "may well have the effect of advancing more nationalist elements within the Islamist insurgency, thus rendering it actually more attractive to Somalis." Thus, the use of drones could possibly have the opposite effect of what the U.S is trying to achieve, which is to destroy al-Shabaab and its links to al-Qaida.

John Prendergast describes these military actions of the U.S in Somalia as a "whack-a-mole approach" which is a "gross imbalance between military and non-military reactions to extremism and terrorist organizations." Also, he argues "where everyone gives lip service to a hearts and minds campaign, we're doing very little on the hearts and minds, and we're doing a lot with missiles and drones."

6.3 In Fear of Terrorism: Blocking Humanitarian Aid

What Menkhaus describes as the "one of the most dramatic policy shifts affecting humanitarian access" (2010: 337), was already briefly discussed at the end of the fourth new chapter. In September 2009, the U.S government had announced that it would withhold new food aid deliveries in areas controlled by al-Shabaab. Between 2009 and 2011, U.S aid to Somalia dropped with 88 percent, from 237 million dollars to 20 million dollars (Charity & Security Network, 2013).

In July 2011, U.S laws cited a barrier to the delivery of further humanitarian assistance. Two weeks later, the UN had now officially declared that some areas of Somalia were under famine. This changed the position of the U.S slightly, who announced in August that U.S aid groups would not be prosecuted for delivering humanitarian assistance to areas controlled by al-Shabaab, as long as they acted in "good faith" (Ibid.). However, in November of the same year, the U.S government denied a request made by InterAction (an association of over 200 NGOs) who applied for a licence to provide assistance to Somalis who lived in al-

[62] J. Peter Pham is the director of the Michael S. Ansari Africa Center of the Atlantic Council and was invited to testify before the United States House of Representatives, Committee on Foreign Affairs during the meeting on "Assessing the Consequences of the Failed State of Somalia" on July 7, 2011.

Shabaab controlled areas. Recently, in April 2013, Obama announced there would be no change in the current restrictions regarding delivering humanitarian assistance.

This example shows how the U.S government is still very much led by fear of terrorists, and that the U.S is unwilling to provide humanitarian assistance in areas where terrorists are still active, despite the crisis situation Somali civilians were in at the time.

6.4 Recognizing the Somali Government

August 20 2012 marked the end of the TFG. On this date, Somali's first formal parliament in more than twenty years was sworn in, with as its new President Hassan Sheikh Mohamud. The U.S officially recognized this government in January 2013. "Today, we recognize that there is a new story to tell about Somalia," said Donald Steinberg on this day.[63]

Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton on January 17, 2013[64]: "I am delighted to announce that for the first time since 1991, the United States is recognizing the Government of Somalia." (…) "Somalia's leaders worked to create a functioning democratic government." (…) "So Somalia has the chance to write a new chapter" (…). "We will also continue, as we well know, to face the threat of terrorism and violent extremism. It is not just a problem in Somalia; it is a problem across the region. The terrorists, as we have learned one again in the last days, are not resting, and neither will we. (…) But let's make no mistake: There is a continuing effort by the terrorists, whether they call themselves one name or al-Qaida, to try to destroy the stability, the peace and security, of the people of this region."

6.5 Conclusion

The choice for the Dual Track policy showed that the U.S had realized that supporting top-down created government was not working in Somalia. Instead, the U.S announced to also support bottom-up approaches and pleaded for the involvement of semi-autonomous regions as Somaliland and Puntland in the political landscape of the country. It also showed an acknowledgement that the most successful peace building efforts in the country were not externally imposed, but were local initiatives.

---

[63] Statement by USAID deputy administrator Donald Steinberg, on January 17, 2013. www.usaid.gov/news-information/press-release/statement-usaid-deputy-administrator-donald-steinberg-recognition

[64] Clinton said this during a press moment after her meeting with newly elected Somali President Hassan Sheikh Mohamud on January 17, 2013. The full speech is available online at: http://www.state.gov/secretary/rm/2013/01/202998.htm

Even though this Dual Track Strategy seemed to move away from the War on Terror discourse, the strong U.S military presence in Somalia suggests otherwise. The many drone attacks and the heavy military support to the TFG, again in fear of a rise of al-Shabaab, showed that U.S foreign policy in Somalia is still very, if not mostly, militaristic. The reasoning behind shutting down humanitarian access implies the same fear for the rise of terrorism in the region.

It can be concluded that it seems as if the War on Terror discourse decreased in U.S foreign policy actions in Somalia, but it definitely did not disappear. Instead, the U.S is still fighting this war against al-Qaida, also in Somalia, still choosing a militaristic approach, even though the U.S is now also engaging more diplomatically with Somalia.

Conclusions

The purpose of this thesis was to debunk the rise and decline of the War on Terror discourse in U.S foreign policy and how this has impacted U.S foreign policy on the ground. This led to the following research question: "In what way has the rise and decline of the War on Terror discourse impacted U.S foreign policy actions in Somalia?" The research question was technically split up in two different questions throughout this thesis, and therefore the thesis was split up in two different sections as well: First the rise of the War on Terror discourse (chapter 3) and the impact on U.S foreign policy in Somalia (chapter 4). Second, the decline of the War on Terror discourse (chapter 5) and its impact on U.S foreign policy in Somalia.

The sketching of the context in Somalia before 2001 showed the complex dynamics in Somalia and how these contributed to state collapse. The involvement of the U.S in Somalia in those years showed that the U.S had very high ambitions and were eager to intervene with a humanitarian mission in Africa "to save thousands of innocents from death," said former president George H.W. Bush (Annan, 2012: 42). But despite these ambitions, the fighting in Somalia still continued and ultimately, the U.S got dragged into the conflict. The images of dead U.S soldiers being dragged through the streets of Mogadishu traumatized the U.S and led to the so-called Somalia Syndrome that would define U.S foreign policy in the years that followed.

The events of 9/11 changed U.S foreign policy drastically, which was shown in the third chapter of this thesis. Former President George W. Bush immediately defined the attacks as acts of war, and soon the War on Terror was a phrase that fully entered the vocabulary of the U.S media, the American people as well as U.S foreign policy. The War on Terror had fully integrated U.S foreign policy within a year after the attacks. What this meant for U.S foreign policy was that the U.S took a proactive stance with a clear ambition to actively fight terrorists and terrorist havens. Also, the U.S focussed on democracy, arguing that democracy would be the best way to counter terrorism.

The War on Terror discourse strongly impacted U.S foreign policy actions on the ground in Somalia, as was shown in chapter 4. The U.S increased their military presence in the country and in the rest of the Horn of Africa "in order to protect and defend the national

security interests of the United States."[65] What Menkhaus described as a "distorted vision" (2002: 218), is the way the U.S seemed to perceive everything that happened in Somalia through the lens of terrorism. The rise of the ICU, even though they provided safety and stability in the country and at the time, were not as extremist as the radical wing that split off later, was seen as a great danger and as a terrorist threat. In attempt to counter the ICU, the U.S went as far as cooperating with Somali warlords, which was described as a "policy time bomb" by Salopek (2008). The U.S had recast the local conflict into an ideological battle between secular democracy and Islam.

In the second part of this thesis, the decline of the War on Terror discourse was discussed. President Barack Obama had announced that he was bringing substantive change. With regard to U.S foreign policy, he did not want to embrace the War on Terror discourse. Instead, he rephrased this to the War against al-Qaida and its affiliates (Sanger, 2012: 19). However, the objectives of U.S foreign policy did not drastically change. Obama's approach of his War against al-Qaida seemed to be a continuation of Bush's policy on most points.

In Somalia, the decline of the War on Terror discourse appeared to have impacted U.S foreign policy when the U.S announced its Dual Track Strategy that focused much more on diplomacy and engagement, rather than military presence. However, the Obama administration had supplied the TFG with 40 tons of guns and ammunition in order to counter al-Shabaab and executed many drone attacks in the years that followed. Prendergast described this as a "gross imbalance between military and non-military measures."[66] It can be concluded that the War on Terror discourse did decline in presence in U.S foreign policy on the ground in Somalia, which is shown by the pursuit of the Dual Track Strategy. However, the War on Terror discourse has not fully declined or disappeared from U.S foreign policy in Somalia.

It can be concluded that the rise and decline of the War on Terror discourse definitely impacted U.S foreign policy in Somalia. The decisions the U.S made towards their policy in Somalia were all made through the lens of the War on Terror. Even when the Obama administration actively announced to stop using the phrase, the policy on the ground was still mostly militaristic with a strong focus on countering terrorism. The U.S is still fighting the

[65] See 45.
[66] See 55

war against terrorists, and the policy of the Obama administration has not changed as drastically as its discourse did.

With the new Somalia government sworn in on August 20 2012, "Somalia has the chance to write a new chapter," said Hilary Clinton[67]. However, when Obama promised "change" when he came into office, he had the chance to write a new chapter in Somalia as well. Nonetheless, the change of the War on Terror discourse to a War on al-Qaida discourse led to little difference in U.S foreign policy on the ground in Somalia. The U.S main priority has always been countering terrorism in Somalia, and the conflict of Somalia has always been perceived through that lens, even when the Obama administration had stopped using the phrase of the 'War on Terror.'

[67] See 66

Literature

Allard, K. (1995). Somalia Operations: Lessons Learned. *CCRE Publication Series*

Annan, K. A. (2012). *Interventions: A Life in War and Peace*. London: The Pinguin Press.

Björkdahl, A. (2007). Constructing a Swedish Conflict Prevention Policy Based on a Powerful Idea and Successful Practice. *Cooperation and Conflict, 42*(2)*,* 169-185

Brunk, D.C. (2008). Curing the Somalia Syndrome: Analogy, Foreign Policy Decision Making, and the Rwandan Genocide. *Foreign Policy Analysis, 4,* 301-320

Bryden, M. (2003). No quick fixes: Coming to terms with terrorism, Islam, and statelessness in Somalia. *Journal of Conflict Studies*, *23*(2), 1-18.

Bruton, B.E. (2010). Somalia: A New Approach. *Council Special Report No. 52.*

Charity & Security Network. (2013). *Timeline: Crisis in Somalia.* Fact Sheet May 2013.

Dagne, T. (2002). *Somalia: Current Conditions and Prospects for a Lasting Peace.* CRS Report for Congress.

Dannreuther, R. (2007). *International Security: The Contemporary Agenda*. Malden, MA: Polity Press.

Elmi, A. A. (2010). *Understanding the Somalia Conflagration: Identity, Political Islam and Peacebuilding*. London: Pluto Press.

Entman, R. M. (2010). Cascading Activiation: Contesting the White House's Frame After 9/11. *Political Communication, 20*(4), 415-432.

Gettleman, J. (2009). The Most Dangerous Place in the World. *Foreign Policy,* March/April, 62-69.

Giddens, A. (1984). *The Constitution of Society. Outline of the Theory of Structuration.* Cambridge: Polity.

Gray, C. (2011). President Obama's 2010 United States National Security Strategy and International Law on the use of Force. *Chinese Journal of International Law*, 35-53.

Harper, M. (2012). *Getting Somalia Wrong? Faith, War and Hope in a Shattered State*. New York, NY: International African Institute.

Hesse, B. J. (2010). Introduction: The myth 'Somalia'. *Journal of Contemporary African Studies, 28*(3), 247-259

Hutcheson, J., Domke, D., Billeaudeaux, A. & Garland, P. (2010). U.S National Identity, Politcal Elites, and a Patriotic Press Following September 11. *Political Communication, 21*(1), 27-50.

Indyk, M. S., Lieberthal, K. G., & O'Hanlon, M. E. (2012). *Bending History: Barack Obama's Foreign Policy.* Washington D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.

Jackson, R. (2011). Culture, Identity and Hegemony: Continuity and (the lack of) Change in US Counterterrorism Policy from Bush to Obama. *International Politics*, *48*(2), 390-411.

Jørgensen, M. W., & Phillips, L. J. (2002). The Field of Discourse Analysis. In M. Jørgensen & L. Phillips (red.). *Discourse analysis as theory and method* (pp 1-24). Sage.

Krebs, R.R. & Lobasz, J. K. (2007). Fixing the Meaning of 9/11: Hegemony, Coercion, and the Road to War in Iraq. *Security Studies, 16*(3), 409-451.

Lederach, J.P., Clos, R., Ansel, D., Johnson, A., Weis, L., Brandwein, J., Lee, S. (2011). *Somalia: Creating Space for Fresh Approaches to Peacebuilding.* Life & Peace Institute.

Lewis, I. (2008). *Understanding Somalia and Somaliland.* London: Hurst & Company.

Lyons, T. & Samatar, A. I. (1995). Somalia: State Collapse, Multilateral Intervention, and Strategies for Political Reconstruction. Washington, D.C: Brookings Institution Press

McCrisken, T. (2011). Ten Years on: Obama's War on Terrorism in Rhetoric an Practice. *International Affairs*, *87*(4), 781-801.

Menkhaus, K. J. (2006). Governance without Government in Somalia: Spoilers, State Building and the Politics of Coping. *International Security*, *31*(3), 74-106.

Menkhaus, K. J. (2007). The Crisis in Somalia: Tragedy in five acts. *African Affairs*, *106*, 357-390.

Menkhaus, K. J. (2010). Stabilisation and Humanitarian Access in a Collapsed State: the Somali case. *Disaster*s, *34*(3), 320-341.

Menkhaus, K. J. (2012). Somalia at the Tipping Point? *Current History,* 169-174.

Milliken, J. (1999). The Study of Discourse in International Relations: A Critique of Research and Methods. *European Journal of International Relations, 5*(2), 225-254.

Newman, E. (2007). Weak States, State Failure, and Terrorism, *Terrorism and Political Violence, 19*(4), 463-488.

Reese, S.D & Lewis, S.C. (2009). Framing the War on Terror: The Internalization of Policy in the US press. *Journalism, 10*(9), 777-797.

Rothkopf, D. (2013). Lessons Learned (and Not). *Foreign Policy,* March/April

Salopek, P. (2008). Nobody is Watching. *Chicago Tribune.* Online available at: http://articles.chicagotribune.com/2008-11-24/news/0811240109_1_islamic-courts-union-ken-menkhaus-islamic-militants

Sanger, D. E. (2012). *Confront and Conceal.* New York, NY: Crown Publishing Group.

Snow, D.A. & Benford, R.D. (1992). *Master Frames and Cycles of Protest.* In Morris, A.D. & Mueller, C.M. (eds). *Frontiers in Social Movement Theory.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 133-155.

Smith, S., Hadfield, A., & Dunne, T. (2008). *Foreign Policy.* Oxford: University Press.

U.S Government. (2004). 9/11 Commission Report

U.S Government. (2002). National Security Strategy Report

U.S Government. (2003). National Strategy for Combating Terrorism

U.S Government. (2006). National Security Strategy Report

U.S Government. (2010). National Security Strategy Report

U.S Government. (2006). National Strategy for Combating Terrorism

U.S Government. (2001). Patterns of Global Terrorism

U.S Government. (2011). National Strategy for Combating Terrorism.

U.S Government. (2012). Sustaining U.S Global Leadership: Priorities for 21st Century Defense.

U.S Government. (2006). Country Reports on Terrorism 2006

Traub, J. (2010). In the Beginning: There Was Somalia. *Foreign Policy,* July/August.

Walt, S.M. (1998). International Relations: One World, Many Theories. *Foreign Policy,* Spring, 29-46.

Wendt, A. (1999). *Social Theory of International Politics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Zenko, M. (2012). 'A Period of Persistent Conflict'. *Foreign Policy,* November.