

CSC 179/5



**THE PORTION
OF SOMALI TERRITORY
UNDER
ETHIOPIAN COLONIZATION**

**GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS
SOMALI DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC
MOGADISHU
JUNE 1974**

CSC 179/7

CONTENTS

Page

Introduction

Pre-Colonial Period 1

Colonial Period 3

Inter-War Period 26

Second World War and after 27

Post Independence Period 30

Nature of Ethiopian Colonial Rule 34

Spurious Arguments by Ethiopia 35

Invalidity of Colonial «Agreements» between Ethiopia, Britain, France and Italy 41

Ethiopia's opposition to the Somali People's struggle for freedom and unity 43

Final Observations 47

Conclusions 48

Appendices 51

Maps attached.



APPENDICES

Appendix	Page
A. (1) Treaties of Protection between Britain and Somalis 1884-1886	51
(2) Treaty of Protection of 1896 concerning Ogaden region of the Somali territory	54
(3) Treaty of Protection between France and Issa Somalis of 1885	55
(4) Treaty of Protection between Italy and the Sultan of Majirten of 1889	56
B. (1) Petitions of the Somali people for re-unification to the Four Power Commission in 1948	57
(2) Resolution of All Somali Conference on 1st February, 1948	63
(3) Resolution of African Peoples' Conference in 1958 and 1960	65
C. Efforts of the Somali Democratic Republic for peaceful unity	67

INTRODUCTION

The Somali territory known as the Horn of Africa is situated in North East Africa and is bounded on the North by the Red Sea and Gulf of Aden, on the East by the Indian Ocean, on the West by the Somali Plateau bordering on Ethiopia and on the South and South-West by Kenya. For countless ages this territory had an identity and was known as Somaliland and the people of the land known as Somalis from one end of the country to the other.

Late in the 19th Century, the Somali territory was forcefully cut up and apportioned amongst Britain, Italy, France and Ethiopia. In July 1960, the former British Somaliland and former Italian Somaliland were united on attaining their independence. For the first time since the 1880's it became possible for the Somali nation to have its protests lodged officially against the division of people and territories by the above-named colonisers. It was in this division that Ethiopia shared and it is this portion of the Somali territory that forms the substance of the Ethiopia-Somali Territorial dispute now under discussion. Armed uprising and other forms of protests were being made over the last 80 years by the Somali nation but the Somali voice was excluded from official expression in the international forums by the repressive actions of the interested colonial powers including Ethiopia.

Since the formation of independent Somalia everything possible was done by the successive Somali governments to reach a peaceful and lasting settlement based on justice and the true interests of the people concerned. The last step in the process was the appeal of the President of the Supreme Revolutionary Council of the Somali Democratic Republic, Jaalle Major General Mohamed Siad Barre to the 10th Summit Conference, in May 1973 which resulted in the Assembly of Heads of State and Government taking cognisance of the Council of Ministers' discussion of the Somali case decided: «to establish a Committee comprising Nigeria, Liberia, Senegal, Sudan, Cameroun, Tanzania, Mauritania and Lesotho entrusted to refer its good offices for the peaceful settlement of the dispute». (Document AHQ-DEC-94 (XI)).

The primary aim of this publication, therefore, is to illuminate the factual aspects and the unique and fundamental basis of the Somali question which had hitherto been misunderstood in some quarters because of the distortion of facts and misinterpretations of history contained in propaganda materials circulated by the imperialists and colonialists whose purpose and strategy had always been to oppose the cause of independence, national unity and progress of the Somali people.

The Imperial Ethiopian Government which is illegally exercising authority over a large section of the Somali territory argues that any motivation or desire by the Somalis to unite with their brethren is unjustified and constitutes a threat to her sovereignty and territorial integrity. This ignores the glaring facts of history which reveal that the Somalis under Ethiopian rule have always been an integral part of the Somali nation dismembered by Euro-Abyssinian colonial conspiracy.

The crux of the matter is:

a) The Somali case is essentially a colonial one. Ethiopia at the end of the 19th Century, was one of the only two African independent countries. Unlike the other independent State, namely, Liberia, Imperial Ethiopia joined hands with the European colonialists to partition the Somali territory and acquired what it now claims as an integral part of Ethiopia. The situation in the Somali territory under Ethiopian domination represents a typical colonial case. Today the Somali people under Ethiopian control are subjected to constant tyranny and oppression and denial of all forms of political expressions and have as much right to self-determination and freedom as any other African people under colonial domination. There is, therefore, justification on grounds of justice and fundamental human rights to permit these people to determine their political future and shape their own destiny.

This Ethiopian domination of a part of the Somali territory creates enormous difficulties to the economic, communication, social and cultural development of the Somali nation while the territory in question has no meaningful impact on the development of «Ethiopia» which clings to it only for purpose of prestige.

b) Secondly the basic economic needs of the Somali nation are radically affected. Amongst the Somali people the economic, cultural and social patterns are so interwoven in the very fabric of their every day

life that any serious break has a crippling effect on the well-being and natural development of the people as a whole. Right across the Somali territory, the Somali people are an indivisible unit inter-dependent on each other in all the basic needs for the fulfilment of a nation's life.

The Somali people, as a whole, depend mainly on their pastoral way of life for their very livelihood and national wealth. They have been living in this way from time immemorial and have moved about freely with their livestock without let or hindrance. Since the colonial partition of the Somali territory, artificial boundaries have been established. The nomads still go to their traditional grazing areas and in doing so cross the arbitrary and artificial borders from one side to the other and vice-versa. The Somalis across one of these colonial barriers were considered to be British, French, Ethiopian or Italian subjects according to how they were placed by a stroke of a pen made by a foreign colonialist far away from the realities of life of the people most concerned. The Somali nomads have never accepted this mechanical definition of their status. As far as they are concerned they are in their own country living the kind of life that they and their forefathers have followed for countless generations into the remote past.

c) The Somali case is a human problem concerning a homogenous people with the same national characteristics whose citizenship and national allegiance had been falsified by arbitrary and indiscriminate «Colonial Boundary Arrangements». Geographically, the Somali people occupy the same terrain of land which is normally referred to as the «Somali Plateau». They belong to the same origin and speak the same language. They pursue the same pastoral economy and way of life. The feeling of oneness so dominates Somali national outlook that when the former Somaliland Protectorate and Somalia attained independence in 1960 their first step was to unite under one flag on 1st July, 1960 thus bringing one half of the Somali territory under one free and independent State. The other half still remains under foreign domination.

The African people looked upon Ethiopia as the symbol of hope for African independence and admired her struggle against Italian occupation in 1935. When Ethiopia was defeated by Italy and her people subjugated into colonialism, the politically conscious Somali people felt the pain and humiliation intensely as it was an experience they had already suffered.

The accident of World War II brought about the liberation of Ethiopia by the British. Responsible Somali opinion expected the emergence

of an enlightened Ethiopia purified by its searing descent into the depths of colonial subjugation. It was a horrifying shock to find that Ethiopia was not satisfied with the restoration of her freedom but wished to retain its role as a colonialist by insisting on the share she had gained when the Somali territory was partitioned by the European colonialists and Ethiopia. Our objection, therefore, is against an African state which aspires to the leadership of free Africa and yet in her role as colonialist denies to that part of the Somali territory under her domination, the independence and freedom which other Somalis obtained from European colonialists.

In order to make clear the nature of the problem, it is essential to refer to the colonial origins of the dispute and the relevant developments which began at the end of the 19th Century during the scramble for Africa. This will reveal that the characteristic features of the dispute and its historical background are completely unique and have no parallel in the rest of Africa.

PRE-COLONIAL PERIOD

In ancient history the Horn of Africa, occupied by the Somalis, was known as the Land of Punt. It was historically well-known to the ancient Egyptians and Greeks. The relationship with Egypt resulted in close commercial and cultural contacts which reached their height during the reign of Queen Hatshep-Sut the fourth monarch of the 18 Dynasty (about 1700 B. C.). It was also famous as the Land of Frankincense and Myrrh.

The Greeks and later the Roman sailors and traders also had contacts with the Somalis along the Red Sea and the Indian Ocean and were fortunate enough to be advised by Somali sailors on the periodic changes of the monsoon winds in this area. Thus many Greek and Roman Chronicles and books amply described the Somali coast particularly the ports and the trade centres along the coast. The most important book written in about 40. A.D. is «The Periplus of the Erythrean Sea» which gave an account of the customs, trade, political and religious institutions existing at the time in the Somali territory. Besides reporting on the far-flung commercial connections of the Somali peninsula, the author of the *Periplus of the Erythrean Sea* also commented on the independence of the cities he visited and the strikingly democratic nature of the Somali political institutions. In this, he is lent strong support by Ptolemy writing his *Geography* a century later.


These early contacts which the Somalis had with the outside world were further extended following the rise of Islam, the dissemination of information among the Arabs about neighbouring territories, and the consequent expansion of Arab influence which accompanied the spread of Islam.

A large body of historical literature extent, much of it in the form of eyewitness accounts and from different countries separated by wide distances, which gives progressively more detailed information about the Somali Peninsula's ethnic complexion, political and religious affiliation, and trade opportunities, gives evidence to the existence of feverish trade activities sparked off by the rise of Islam in the 7th Century and flourishing until disrupted by the 19th Century partitioning of the Somali territory by Euro-Ethiopian colonialism.

Zeila, the first capital of the Somali State of Adal and the chief Emporium for the trade of the Northern areas, had most written about it by medieval Arabs and other Muslim scholars. Al-Masudi (955), Al-Istakhri (960) Ibn Hawqal (977), Al-Birruni (1050), Al-Bakri (1067), Al-Idrissi (1154), Yaqut (1229), Ibna Said (1344), Ibna Battuta (1331), Al-Harrarani (1344) Ibna Khaldun (late 14th Century), all attest to the actuality of a rigorous and independent Somali culture. Moreover, Ibna Said who had interviewed a delegation from Adal, Ibna Battuta who paid a visit to both Zeila and Mogadishu, and Al-Idrissi described the Somalis as independent of foreign rule and their country as extending throughout the coastal length of the Horn of Africa. *The Annals of Oman*, the *Chronicles of Lamu* and *Pate* the anonymously authors of *Kitab Al Zanuj* and Joao De Barros are other sources which validate the reports of these Arab scholars.


The significance of these commercial relations and other contacts which the Somalis maintained with the outside world can be judged from the existence of numerous Chinese manuscripts treating of them. The Chinese Empire, at the time certainly the most developed culturally most well-off nation in the world, and purporting not without some justification to have had no need for the goods of other nations, nevertheless saw well in her interest to import from Somalia such trading items as livestock, ivory, clothes and spices. The reports of travellers, starting with Ibna Battuta who in 1331 witnessed Somali cloth being exported from Mogadishu to places as far as Egypt, including 16th and 17th Century Portuguese accounts and continuing in the 19th Century with the findings of European scientific and exploratory missions all give testimonies substantially in harmony with the assertions of the earlier authorities.

Locally, oral traditions and archeological remains, mythologic and fossil remnants of this bygone age, render all the needed corroborative



(33) AFRICA AS KNOWN TO EUROPEANS IN THE MID-XVIIIth CENTURY





W. Blackwood & Sons, June 1864.

MAP II

evidence for the reconstruction of conditions obtaining then in the Somali peninsula.

The picture we perceive is one of an independent and prosperous Somali nation, commercially linked with much of the known world, and with the cities of Harar, Zeila, Berbera, Mogadiscio, Marka and Brava flourishing as centres of trade and culture of relatively unparalleled dimension. The principal political centres were Zeila in the North and Mogadishu in the South.

The Somali independence symbolized by the State of Adal (See Map I) which for many centuries acted as a bulwark against foreign intervention in the Somali affairs reached its heights in the 16th Century under the leadership of Ahmed Ibrahim Gurey. During his reign as the ruler of Adal, the Somali forces under his command repulsed a number of attacks waged by the Abyssinians as well as a combined Abyssinian-Portuguese force.

After a series of engagements with the Abyssinians, he was in the end able to score decisive victories. By 1533, Ahmed Ibrahim Gurey was in complete control of the South and centre of Abyssinia including the highlands. In the following years he further penetrated to the North and effectively occupied almost the whole of Abyssinia for nearly two decades.

Available documents prove that the Somali territory, subsequently acquired by Abyssinia, has never been part of Abyssinia before the scramble for Africa. The records of foreign travellers including maps drawn (See Map II) during the early part of the 19th Century prove beyond any doubt that the Somali territory covered an area from the coast to the Somali territory now held by Ethiopia. In 1885, the famous British explorer Sir Richard Burton explored and mapped parts of the Somali territory for geographical and trade purposes. In his book entitled «The First Footsteps in East Africa», he recorded accurately the results of his journey from Zeila to Harar and rightly described all the areas visited as Somali territory.

THE COLONIAL PERIOD

The events which led to the destruction of the centuries old independence of the Somali people began in 1866 when the Khadive of Egypt obtained a Firman empowering him to establish control over the

Red Sea ports on the African coast from his sovereign, the Sultan of Turkey. Though never exercising direct sovereignty there, the Turks had ever since their conquest of Arabia early the 16th Century and their successful rivalry with the Portuguese for the mastery of the Red Sea, regarded these ports as dependencies of their Yemanite Province. Now the expansionist minded Egyptian Khadive, equipped with this dubious document and no doubt in part spurred on by an accurate assessment of the enhanced geo-political value of the Red Sea coasts following the opening of the Suez Canal, lost no time in putting the Fireman to effect. The Egyptian Governor of the Sudan visited Zeila and Berbera among other Red Sea ports to personally evaluate for himself the commercial and strategic potentials of these towns. Convinced by the report of his servant and liberally interpreting the Sultan's concession so as to include the entire Northern Somali coast within the dependencies of Yemen, the Khadive appointed in 1870 an Egyptian Governor for the whole coast from Suez to Cape Guardafui, and in the same year dispatched agents to Berbera and Bulhar.

Between 1870 and 1874 the British strenuously objected to the Turkish claims to suzerainty over the Somali coast and by sponsoring the opposing claim of the Sultan of Zanzibar over the Somali coast between Ras Hafun and the Juba River helped frustrate an Egyptian attempt in 1875 to occupy and expand inland from the Indian Ocean Somali ports of Marka and Brava.

While the negotiations were going on between the Egyptians and the British, the former were gradually consolidating their power in Zeila, Bulhar and Berbera. And after securing their control they marched inland in 1875, and added the rich Emirate of Harar to their possessions.

The Anglo-Egyptian negotiations finally ended with the conclusion in 1877 of a convention between these two Governments by which the British conditionally recognized Egyptian jurisdiction over the Somali coast from Zeila to Ras Hafun. This Egyptian occupation of Somali territory was destined to be short lived. The outbreak in the Sudan of the successful movement led by the Mahdi, and the threatening posture which the Caliphate forces had assumed along the Southern border of Egypt, thus endangering the very independence and security of the latter forced the Khadive in 1885 to recall his troops in Somaliland as

their services were badly needed back home. With this departure of Egyptian troops and the restoration to power of a direct descendant of the deposed Emir, Harar regained her independence, if only fleetingly.

THE TREATIES OF PROTECTION.

On the arrival of the European powers, and hence the scramble for Africa, the Somali people including those who are at present under Abyssinian rule were free and had their own civilization like the rest of their brothers in the African continent. Abyssinia was then only a fraction of the present size of Ethiopia. Then suddenly Somali independence was disrupted when simultaneously the Abyssinians, the British, the French and the Italians descended upon the Somali territory and effected its cruel partition.

In the year 1884 Britain concluded treaties of protection with the Somalis. These treaties, in their preamble, refer to the impending withdrawal of the troops of «His Highness the Khadive» of Egypt and made it clear that the Somalis were mainly concerned to arrive at an arrangement with the British Government which could be effective in the maintenance of their «independence and the preservation of order». It must be borne in mind that these treaties also covered Harar and Ogaden regions. (See Appendix A 1 & 2).

While Britain was concluding treaties of protection with the Somalis, the French were busy in doing likewise with the Somali and Danakils. These treaties concluded in 1884-1886 made it abundantly clear that the Somalis and Danakils were placing their territories under French protection so that «she may protect them against all foreigners». (See Appendix A 3).

In 1889 Italy came to the Somali coast along the Indian Ocean and made treaties with Somali rulers who placed their territory under Italian protection. Having succeeded in its endeavour to acquire the Benadir coast, Italy by the end of the 1889 established her influence from Bender Ziada in the Gulf of Aden in the North to Kismayo in the South. However, Italy did not confine herself to coastal areas but extended her authority inland. Although she met a lot of opposition from the Somalis, Italy was finally able to conclude treaties of protection with the Somalis in Western Somalia (Ogaden) in 1891. (See Appendix A 4).

The French poet and arms dealer, Arthur Rimbaud, who arrived at Ankobar on 6th February, 1887 discovered that «from Harar, it was..... eight or the nine days journey to the *Hawashe River, the boundary of Menelik's Kingdom*».

This drives home the fact that no part of the Somali territory was ever part of Abyssinia before the colonial partition.

Abyssinian Expansion.

For a long time European powers have shown a keen interest in the affairs of Abyssinia which they regarded as a «Christian Island in an Ocean of Pagans». Abyssinia had for centuries exploited its claim to Christianity for political and sentimental reasons and capitalised fully in this religious factor in order to obtain active support from the great European Powers and Organizations for her expansion against the Somali nation and other Africans. As a result, these European powers dispatched Embassies and other missions to Abyssinia. Private organization such as commercial firms, churches and the anti-slavery societies sent their own representatives to the Kings of Abyssinian. For the most part these governmental and private missions were treated well in Abyssinia and in the end acted as a communication media between Abyssinia and European organizations and governments. They have forwarded the letters of the Kings of Abyssinia and had solicited support for these Kings from their governments and parent organizations.

At the same time they persuaded the Abyssinian Kings particularly King Menelik of Shoa to write to European powers and ask for armaments to enable him to extend his frontiers. Thus in 1878 King Menelik of Shoa wrote a letter to most of the European monarchs forwarded for him by the two Evangelican Missionaries.

The same two missionaries forwarded another letter of Menelik to the British Anti-Slavery Society. Menelik concluded this letter by saying:

«My country is far distant from your country. My road to the coast, to Zeila, Tadjoura, and Aden is at present closed to me by the Musulmans, to wit, the Egyptain Government. They prevent my receiving into my country either provisions, arms,..... Will you kindly raise your powerful voice in order that I may have this opened for me.....».

In response to this letter of Menelik, the British Anti-Slavery Society wrote to the British Prime Minister in which it stated:

«In conclusion, we would respectfully submit to your Lordship's consideration whether amongst those changes, political and territorial, which may be awaiting Egypt, it may not be a wise policy on the part of Her Majesty's Government to promote a cession of the ports of Massowah, Zeila and Tadjoura to Northern and Southern Abyssinia, as being a measure which, on the one hand, will remove from those countries a perennial incentive to wars and bloodshed, and on the other will powerfully conduce to the extension of European commerce and civilization to those most productive but now isolated regions».

King John of Abyssinia in his turn wrote a letter to Queen Victoria in 1879 in which he admitted that «with God's power, I became strong by your Majesty's cannons and guns, and set on the throne of my fathers. After I was crowned, there were Heathens who worship idols, and I went to submit them and to bring them to Christianism».

The arrival of the European powers on the coast after the 1884 Berlin Act speeded up the massive armament of Abyssinia and enabled her to go all out in the execution of her expansionist policy. This expansionist policy initiated mainly by King Menelik of Shoa in the 1880's converted in the course of the next 20 years the tiny Abyssinian Kingdom into a rambling Ethiopian Empire.

The Abyssinian motivation for acquiring such huge quantities of arms was to enable her to embark on a ruthless policy of territorial aggrandizement at the cost of neighbouring African peoples. This Abyssinian expansionist policy was clearly shown in a letter dated 17th December, 1878 from the two Missionaries Johannes Mayer and John Greiner. In their letter addressed to the British Foreign Secretary, the two missionaries explained that King Menelik needed fire-arms «for the maintenance of peace, and offensive position towards the powerful Galla tribes». In his own words, Menelik maintained that he needed arms to «subject savage heathen people».

The restriction on the importation of arms during the Egyptian control of the Ports of the West coast of the Red Sea were lifted soon after the Europeans acquired possessions along that coast in 1882. In the words of Enidstarkie «As far as the nature of the trade was concerned, one can say without exaggeration that the chief imports into the interior of Abys-

sinia through the Italian and French ports were arms and ammunition». In his report to the British Political Resident in Aden on November 27, 1882 F. M. C. Hunter, the First Assistant Resident, stated «As soon as the port of Assab was opened, the Italians began to pour arms through it in a steady stream into Shoa; the French did the same through their protectorate first at Obock and next at Tadjoura». Available records also show that in one journey on June 27, 1885 the famous French trader Savoure sold to Abyssinia 30,000 cartridges, 600,000 percussion caps and 3,000 muskets and 24 cannons. In that same year even distant Russia contributed to the arming of Abyssinia by furnishing her with «50,000 rifles, 50,000 carbines, 5,000 revolvers, 40 cannons, 5,000 swords and ample ammunition». The French arms dealer Labatut transhipped at Aden on January 21, 1886 «2,230 rifles, 194,200 cartridges, 80,000 percussion caps. Ten days later he imported 360 further rifles and 4,000 cartridges».

The European powers were also engaged in gratuitously supplying huge quantities of arms and ammunition to Abyssinia. Under the Treaty of Alliance of 1887 between Italy and Shoa, the latter was provided 50,000 Remingtons and 10,000,000 cartridges. In the following year, the Italian Plenipotentiary and Menelik's close friend Count Antonelli arranged for the delivery of 10,000 rifles to enable him to «attack the Gallas in Wallo region». Again in 1889, Antonelli delivered to Menelik a present of 5,000 rifles and more than one million cartridges from Hubert, King of Italy. In the same year King Hubert presented to Menelik a gift of 28 cannons, and 38,000 rifles. This gift was received by Menelik's nephew, Ras Makonnen who was in Rome on a mission.

On September 16, 1890 Abyssinia acceded to the Brussels General Act which, among other things provided for the prevention of fire-arms falling into the hands of Africans. Through her accession to this Act, however, Abyssinia was entitled to the unrestricted importation and possession of fire-arms. Abyssinia gained this exceptional privileges through the good-will of Britain, France and other European powers and by the sponsorship and special recommendation of Italy.

The accession of Abyssinia to the Brussels Act removed the last barrier to her full armament and made available to her the port facilities on the Red Sea coast including those held by Britain. This had the effect of accelerating the steady flow of arms and ammunition into Abyssinia. According to a British mission «Report in 1897», the steamship «DOEL-WYCK» alone delivered to Abyssinia 120,000 rifles and 2,500,000 car-

tridges. For three months, April-June 1898 Abyssinia imported from England alone 31,240 rifles and 300,000 safety cartridges on board the steamship «IRENA». In a report dated March, 1900, a French firm at St. Etienne alone supplied 350,000 carbines for Abyssinia. Consul Harrington, a close observer of Abyssinian affairs for many years remarked on May 1, 1900 «it is impossible to travel between Harar and Addis Ababa without repeatedly meeting caravans of rifles and cartridges. I should think there are more rifles, Gras and Remington, in the country than there are men to carry them».

Whilst this massive arming of Abyssinia was being effected by the European colonial powers, the import of any sort of arms was denied to the peoples of the neighbouring African countries against whom these arms were being used.

Fall of Harar.

Considering the declared expansionist policy of Abyssinia, it was not surprising that Menelik sent his army to the Harar Emirate in 1887. Harar is essentially a Somali city which is part and parcel of the Somali territory. Mr. Robert L. Hess in his book «Ethiopia» brought out this fact when he stated «North, East and South of Harar are located the Somali, a nomadic people who for four hundred years have looked to Harar for religious inspirations».

As said earlier, the Egyptians withdrew from Harar in 1885 on the advice of the British Government ruling Egypt since 1882. The evacuation of the Egyptian garrison was organised by Major Hunter assisted by other two British officers Lt. Peyton and Major Heath. Abdulla, a son of the last reigning Amir was selected to head the new Government, and Lt. Peyton was instructed to stay in Harar «pending final settlement of the question of political superintendence of the city and the neighbourhood».

It is, however, interesting to note that immediately after the Egyptian withdrawal, Italy and Abyssinia turned their eyes towards Harar which they coveted because of its great importance as a trading centre and its strategic location. As it turned out Italy and her ally Abyssinia conspired together for the conquest of Harar by Menelik. For this purpose Italy provided 1,500 trained men and some Italian officers. The pretext for the seizure of Harar was to revenge the killing of an Italian expedition led by Count Porro.

Moreover, the seizure of the Harar Emirate was in conformity with Abyssinian expansionist policy as clearly brought out by King Menelik's proposal in April 1885 to the Head of the Italian Mission Count Antonelli amounting to Italo-Abyssinian joint conquest of Somali territory:

«If the Government of Italy occupied Zeila and Berbera and gives me Harar then, we shall certainly have a good channel of commerce».

Thus on February 1887 the joint Italo-Abyssinian force descended on Harar and took over the city after some fierce resistance. This Italo-Abyssinian cooperation was turned into a formal alliance in the Treaty of Alliance of 20th October, 1887. Thus for the first time Abyssinia managed to bring part of the Somali territory under her domain. Incidentally, the first Abyssinian colonial Governor of Harar happened to be the father of Emperor Haile Selassie I and this explains his birth in Harar.

By capturing Harar, Menelik did not only realise partly his expansionist ambitions but also took revenge for the 16th Century conquest of Abyssinia by the Somali State of Adal under the leadership of Ahmed Ibrahim Gurey. On this occasion Menelik sent the following letter to the British Resident in Aden:

«From Menelik, King of Shoa, and of all the Gallas, good and bad! How are you? By the grace of God I am well! Amir Abdulla would suffer no Christian in his country. He was another Gurne. But by the help of God I fought him, destroyed him, and he escaped on horseback. I hoisted my flag in his capital and my troops occupied his city. Gurane died. Abdulla, in our day was his successor».

Similarly Menelik despatched a letter to the Italian Commissioner of Assab, Mr. De Simone after the fall of Harar on 8th January, 1887 stating that:

«Amir Abdulla who murdered our Italians escaped from me on a horseback but thank God I murdered all his men..... and have avenged with many dead the tragic death of the Italians in order to please you».

In this context, it should be borne in mind that although Britain was informed of the planned attack on Harar, she utterly failed to fulfil her obligation towards the Somalis with whom she had concluded treaties to protect the Emirate or even to protest in the face of the Italo-Abyssinian joint attack.



Harar as will be shown presently was from then on used by Abyssinia as a spring-board for her further encroachments and expansion into the Somali territory.

Menelik's Circular letter of 1891.

The ambition of Abyssinia to acquire African territory during the scramble for Africa, can perhaps best be illustrated by an excerpt from a Circular letter (Appendix II) instigated by the Italians and dispatched to the Heads of European States by Emperor Menelik in 1891:

«While tracing today the actual boundaries of my Empire, I shall endeavour, if God gives me life and strength, to re-establish, the ancient frontiers of Ethiopia upto Khartoum, and as far as Lake Nyanza with all the Gallas. Ethiopia has been for fourteen centuries a Christian Island in a Sea of pagans. If powers at a distance come forward to partition Africa between them, I do not intend to be an indifferent spectator».

If anything, this shows that Ethiopia was determined to effectively participate in the scramble for Africa and as such should be treated as a colonial power, since colonialism has no colour. In fact, the European colonial powers themselves accepted Abyssinia as a collaborator and a partner in the partition of Somali territory.

Ethiopia often bases its spurious claim to the Somali territory on the 1891 Menelik's Circular letter. This letter was actually a creation of Italy as is clear from Italian letters containing advice to the Abyssinian Emperor as to the form and contents which the Circular letter for the European Heads of State should incorporate. On 18th July, 1890 the Italian Prime Minister, Mr. Crispi wrote to the Italian Ambassador in Addis Ababa instructing him to inform Menelik of the imminent European plan to divide East African into spheres of influence and to advise him to issue a Circular letter to the European powers, through the Government of Italy, indicating the territories under his control or influence; emphasising that Abyssinia was an ancient Christian Kingdom; indicating the frontier with the Danakils and Somalis but not his frontier with Italy in the North and to make known to Italy of any other territory that he may wish to have an influence over and make for this purpose an acceptable title for Italy to support.

This communication was followed by a letter from Count Antonelli in Rome to Menelik dated 20th August, 1890 amplifying the intentions of the Italian Government: «The countries that your Majesty should put

in the list are specially all the tribes of Adal and Somalis, those of Ogaden, the countries beyond Kaffa and always insist on Gildessa, Harar and Lake Assal». In this connection, it should be noted that Adal, Ogaden, Gildessa and Harar are all parts of the Somali territory and were all at that time outside Abyssinian influence or control with the exception of Harar which fell victim to an Italo-Abyssinian joint attack in 1887.

It was as a result of this Italian initiative that finally Menelik issued the Circular letter of 1891 by which Abyssinia tried to justify her expansionist policy in subsequent years. Moreover, Ethiopia uses this Circular letter to counter the Somali claim for the reunification of the Somali territory.

Abyssinian raids into neighbouring territories.

As said earlier, Abyssinia used Harar as a spring-board for further expansion into the Somali territory and other neighbouring African territories. The first instance of such Abyssinian raid into the Somali territory was reported on 15th December, 1887 by Col. E.V. Stace, British Consul for the Somali coast in his letter addressed to the British Agent and Consul General in Cairo. Referring to this Abyssinian raid, Mr. Stace stated on 4th January, 1888 «Makonnen, Dejjamaj, or Governor of the Province of Harrar, lately made a raid on the Somali to the East of Harar, advanced as far as Darimi and captured a large number of women and children, and animals. It is asserted that his forces on their return towards Harar were assailed by the Somal and cut up, and many rifles taken...». The Abyssinians followed this raid with similar ones at that time confined to the vicinity of Harar.

Mergary Perham in her book — the Government of Ethiopia — stated: «In 1889 an Ethiopian expedition penetrated far to the South of Harar and stripped the country bare of stock and horses». Returning from reconnaissance strip in 1891, the Swayne brothers reported that the Somalis, have been raided on a number of occasions and that «great anxiety was felt» at Hargeisa at the time of their visit because of an imminent Abyssinian attack. They «found the Issa Somalis in a great state of ferment» because they felt that «Abyssinia will treat them like the Harar Somali — seize their flocks, kill their people and burn their villages». To the South of Harar, similar raids were launched by the Abyssinians against the Somali people and territory. In a Memorandum pre-

pared for the British Foreign Office by Mr. P. Bertie in 1893 it is recorded that:

«The Abyssinians from Harar are constantly raiding the Ogaden country and Somalis under our protection. Col. Stace has several times written to Ras Makonnen on the subject; and Captain Swayne, who, in the course of his shooting expedition, went to Harar on a visit to Makonnen, was told to represent unofficially to the Ras the injury inflicted on British interests by Abyssinian aggressions on Somali territory; but our latest information shows that they are *encroaching more and more into the territories occupied by the Somalis under our protection, and oppressing the people*».

The Abyssinians used their fire-arms mercilessly against the Somalis who were armed with spears to destroy their villages, burn their homes, loot their livestock and other possessions, kill those who resisted and take into slavery the youth and able bodied adults.

The reports by geographers and other travellers who passed through the Somali territory in that period amply describe the havoc brought by the Abyssinian raiding parties. The American scientific traveller, Dr. Donaldson Smith referring to a rich agricultural village named Sesabene South of Milmil which he visited in 1894 observed while addressing the Royal Geographical Society on 6th January, 1896:

«You may imagine my shagrin when I heard, few days afterwards, that they have just been raided by the Abyssinians under Makonnen. Their animals have all been driven off, the boys and girls taken as slaves, and the elder people killed or mutilated».

In the same article Dr. Smith also reported on the conditions of the Gallas who were subjected to similar raids. They presented to him «the most abject appearance imaginable». He maintained that «the Arussi Gallas... were regarded as slaves, and were even sold in the market as such...».

Heartily bemoaning the misfortunes of the Somalis and Galla neighbours of Abyssinia, Dr. Smith indignantly exclaimed «we earnestly wished that they (Abyssinians) as savages bearing arms against other poor defenceless Africans, should have such a drubbing that they could not forget it and try to extend their sway further. Let these good people



Legend for the map:

- Conquests from 1800-1850
- Conquests from 1850-1890
- Conquests from 1890-1900
- Jimma submitted 1863, incorporated into Ethiopia in 1937
- Conquests from 1900-1937

who take an interest in un-civilized nations cast a thought on the black neighbours of the Abyssinians who are in the worst plight».

H.S.H. Cavendish, another traveller, who passed through Somaliland two years later (early in 1896) stated whilst reporting to the Royal Geographical Society on January 31st, 1898:

«We came to the town of Lobari. Here we found that we were in the rear of an Abyssinian war-party, which had left only the day before, after looting the surrounding villages and driving off all the unfortunate natives' livestock..... For the next four days we marched through desolate country which had been devastated immediately before by the Abyssinian hordes».

Mr. Cavendish also reported a similar type of destruction of life and mutilation of limb as reported by Dr. Donaldson Smith. He asserted that the Boran Gallas have shown him «numbers of people who had been horribly mutilated by the Abyssinians».

Sir Alfred Pease who visited the Somali territory in 1897 also stated: «We (British) have prevented them (Somalis) from acquiring arms and ammunition and having deprived them of all means of self-defence. . . have left them at the mercy of raiding Abyssinians who have no other employment than that of making raids on Gallas and Somalis».

As a result of these destructive Abyssinian raids, the Western Somali territory was thrown into a state of terror. Travellers of international repute, such as Captain G.C.C. Swayne, Dr. Donaldson Smith, H. S. H. Cavendish, Sir Alfred Pease, Captain Bottego and others have graphically described the encompassing fear and the abiding sense of insecurity prevailing in that territory where-ever the travellers went:

«The natives showed themselves suspicious by reason of alarm spread abroad by the doings of Abyssinian raiding parties».

Through the acquisition of large quantities of fire-arms made possible first by the generous gift of arms by European powers and subsequently by the provisions of the General Act of Brussels to which Abyssinia adhered, Abyssinia was enabled to attack with impunity the neighbouring unarmed Africans, and claim their lands as conquered and an integral part of Abyssinia. (See Map IV). A short list is given below of territories so acquired since 1881.


- 1881- — Kaffa, Jima were attacked and subdued.
- 1882-1895 — Arussi were conquered.
- 1886 — Wallaga were conquered.
- 1887 — Harar was seized Illubbabur was annexed.
- 1889 — Gurage was acquired. Kontaad Kulo were attacked.
- 1891 — Bale and Sidamo were acquired.
- 1894 — Gofa and Walamo were acquired.
- 1897 — Borana were attacked. Ogaden handed over to Abyssinia by Britain and Italy.
- 1898 — Boni-Shangul was taken from the Egyptain-Sudan.

The nature of raids and the cruel treatment meted out to the victims of the Abyssinian raiding parties i.e. looting their property and enslaving the able-bodied youth while indiscriminately murdering or mutilating the aged, establishes beyond any doubt that these victims were treated as enemies and like the European colonialists brutally exploited by the Abyssinian expansionist. If as claimed in the Circular letter, instigated by the Italians, these people were lost brother Abyssinians to be brought back to the fold, this indeed was a barbarous manner of showing brotherly care!

Inter-European colonial «Agreements».

In 1888, Britain and France concluded an agreement which was designed to define the boundaries of French and British protectorates as between Zeila and Jibouti. According to this agreement «the line dividing the coast between Zeila and Jibouti runs by Habasweyn, Biyo-Kaboba, Gildessa, and then towards Harar». (See Map V). The effect of this arrangement was to divide a part of the territory of the Somali people with whom France and Briain had both concluded treaties of protection. Four years later, France established Jibouti as the capital of the French Somali coast — a port which remained a goal for Abyssinian expansionist designs because of its strategic location.

In an attempt to define their respective spheres of influence in East Africa, Britain and Italy in 1891 concluded an agreement which placed almost the entire Somali territory along with Abyssinia, in the Italian



sphere except the French and British protectorates whose interior extensions were to them undefined. This was followed in 1894 another arrangement in which they attempted to complete the 1891 delimitation of the Anglo-Italian spheres of influence.

In spite of these arrangements between the European colonial powers under which the Somali territory was divided into spheres of influence, the European colonial powers hurried in 1897 to conclude with Abyssinia a new set of arrangements in contravention of the Somali-European protection treaties, and the inter-European arrangements. The 1897 Euro-Abyssinia «treaties» enabled Abyssinia to acquire illegally a large part of the Somali territory in addition to Harar which she had already taken by force at the instigation and with the support of the European imperialists.

Franco-Abyssinian «Treaty» of 1897.

France's main interests in the Somali territory were to obtain a port on the Red Sea as a gateway for her commerce to and from Abyssinia and to have a naval foothold to safeguard her imperial interests in the Far East. The French policy with regard to Abyssinia was one of obtaining favourable treatment in furthering her interests in the Nile waters through strong ties of friendship. In doing so France did not neglect the opportunity of gaining a monopoly on railway transport from Djibouti to Addis Ababa, hereby obtaining an exclusive advantage in trade.

It was not surprising, therefore, that a French Mission went to Addis Ababa in 1897 to discuss boundary problems among other things. As a result, the so-called Franco-Abyssinian Treaty of 1897 was signed delimiting the artificial boundary between the French and the Abyssinian possessions of the Somali territory.

This «Treaty» in effect reduced greatly the extent of the Somali territory under French protection. Like Britain, France failed to fulfill her obligations of protection towards the Somali people by abandoning the provisions of the 1888 Franco-British arrangement which purported to define the boundaries of the French and British protectorates. Whereas the 1888 Anglo-French arrangement defined the inland depth of the


French protectorate to Gildessa and beyond towards Harar, the so-called Franco-Abyssinian Treaty of 1897 reduced the depth to Jalelo.

Anglo-Abyssinian «Treaty» of 1897.

At this stage it is pertinent to mention again that Britain had signed treaties of protection in 1884 and 1886 in which she undertook to protect the Somali people and their territory for *the maintenance of their independence*. Developments since then show that Britain has been knowingly remiss in the fulfillment of its solemn undertaking and allowed Abyssinia to occupy Harar and encroach on Jigjiga, Gildessa, Biyo-Kabobe and the Haud, etc. In 1897 Britain also sent a mission to obtain, among other things, Menelik's approval to the «delimitation» of their Somali possession in the Horn of Africa. This mission struck a bargain with Menelik and on May 14, 1897, Britain and Abyssinia reached an «Agreement» (See Map VI). Under this «Agreement» notes were exchanged between the British and the Abyssinian representatives aiming at the delimitation of their frontiers. In this exchange of Notes, Britain clearly gave away Somali territory which had never been part of Abyssinia. Asked by the British Representative, Mr. Rodd for an assurance that it will be his «Special Care» that the Somalis so ceded shall not be «losers by this transfer of suzerainty», Menelik replied that «the Somalis who may by boundary arrangements become subjects of Ethiopia shall be well treated and have orderly government». This so-called Anglo-Abyssinian Treaty amounted to a revocation of the Anglo-Italian arrangement of 1894 and violated the Anglo-Somali Treaties of protection of 1884-86.

At this juncture, it is appropriate to explain the reasons which led Britain to succumb to the Abyssinian expansionist policies:

a) An examination of the British colonial strategy shows that their primary interests in the Somali territory were to secure adequate and fresh supplies for their port in Aden and to ensure the safety of their ships enroute to India and the Far East. As such Britain was only interested in the coastal areas and the hinterland of the Somali territory carried little weight. The remark of the then British Foreign Secretary reflects this strategy when he stated in an interview that he was «not much pre-occupied by Abyssinian encroachments in Somaliland». The disinterestedness of the British Government in the hinterland of the Somali territory and the utter disregard for the interests of the Somali people



whose livelihood depended on the interior was most succinctly expressed by Lord. Hamilton, Viceroy of India, when he stated:

«Her Majesty's Government consider that imperial interests in Somaliland Protectorate are *insufficient* to justify their contributing towards its defence».

Again when the British Government was negotiating with Menelik in the conclusion of the so-called Treaty of 1897, the British representative had the instruction: «*You are authorised, if absolutely necessary, to make concessions in regard to the frontiers of the Somaliland Protectorate as defined in the Anglo-Italian Protocol of 1894 provided such concessions are not of a nature to interfere with the main object for which the protectorate was assumed, namely the securing of adequate supplies for the support of Aden....*».

b) From what has been stated above, it is abundantly clear that any concessions regarding Somali territory made by Britain to Abyssinia were relatively of minor importance if the British representative could succeed in:

- i) Obtaining assurances from Menelik not to allow the passage of arms to the Mahdists in the Sudan.
- ii) Persuading Ethiopia not to allow France, which was engaged in furthering her colonial interests in the Nile, to penetrate through Abyssinia, and
- iii) Safeguarding British commercial interests.

Eventually the British Mission succeeded in securing its objectives of ensuring the goodwill and conciliation of Abyssinia, at the cost of the Somali nation by giving away a large portion of the Somali territory. With regard to the British endeavour to suppress the Mahdist Revolution in the Sudan, Menelik agreed to prevent the passage through Abyssinia of arms and ammunition to the Mahdists whom he declared «the enemies of Ethiopia».

It was clearly brought out by Mr. Ronnel Rodd, the Head of the British Mission to Menelik in his report on the negotiation that the territory surrendered by Britain to Abyssinia under the so-called Treaty of 1897 was a Somali territory and had never been part of Abyssinia. He stated:

«Looking at the way in which the frontier was traced, Menelik exclaimed: But you are advancing right up to the gates of Harar, I pointed out that it was Abyssinia which had advanced up to us; that we were the reversionaries of Egypt in those districts, and had established ourselves then by Treaties with the Somalis before the Abyssinians had come to Harar. The Emperor then again referred to the ancient limits of Ethiopia, I asked him how the Somalis, who had been established in these regions for so many centuries, could possibly be looked down as included within the ancient limits of Ethiopia».

In the same Report, Mr. Rodd admits this fact when he said:

«I,... interpreting the spirit of my instruction to be on the first place the conciliation of Ethiopia during the last phase of the Khartoum campaign, made certain concessions which were criticised by travellers who penetrated into Somaliland».

It is interesting to note that this illegal treaty of 1897 between Abyssinia and Britain was widely criticised at the time particularly by those who were acquainted with the nature of the Somali territory. Sir Alfred Pease who visited Somaliland in 1896-97 commenting on this so-called Agreement stated:

«... To the consternation of all interested in Somaliland, Mr. Rodd handed over to Abyssinia a large area of Somaliland including some of the tribes with whom we had entered into solemn obligations for their protection... The supposed quid pro quo was that portion of the Rodd treaty by which the Emperor Menelik bound himself to prevent arms from reaching the Dervishes, etc.».

This criticism which continued to be levelled against the British Government ever since 1897 prompted the British Minister of State for Colonies to admit in the House of Commons Debate on February 1955 his Government's mistake and the submission to Abyssinian territorial aggrandizement when he stated:

«I think that in many ways the 1897 Treaty with Ethiopia was unfortunate, but it suffered from our limited knowledge of Somaliland at the time and we must see it against a background of that knowledge and of the expansionist tendencies of Ethiopia in 1897».

Again in 1904 Mr. H.R. Fox Bourne, the author of «Civilization of Congoland», in a pamphlet entitled «The Story of Somaliland» referred

to the 1897 Anglo-Abyssinian illegal treaty as, «the scandalous betrayal of the Somalis who, having accepted British protection, were left to be mercilessly dealt with by their Abyssinian enemies».

Italo-Abyssinian «Agreement» of 1897.

Abyssinia and Italy were also directly engaged in the scramble for acquiring Somali territory as already mentioned in early chapters of this Memorandum. Since the Anglo-Italian Protocol of 1891 which allotted to Italy the lion's share of the Somali territory, Abyssinia was more than ever thirsty for territorial aggrandizement and looked on this Protocol as an obstacle to her imperialist designs. The Italo-Abyssinian imperialist scramble for the Somali territory was decided, for the next three and half decades, in favour of Menelik as a result of the Italian defeat at Adowa in 1896.

Having been defeated, Italy struck a so-called agreement with Menelik in 1897 by which Italy abandoned her claim to a large portion of the Somali territory including that part known as Ogaden. This was done by Italy in order to placate and appease Abyssinia so as to restore friendly relations with her after Adowa.

On May 16, 1908 Italy and Abyssinia signed a so-called Convention which delimited artificial frontiers for the Italo-Abyssinian possessions of the Somali territory. However, the exact interpretations of the 1897 and 1908 «agreements» have never been agreed upon by Abyssinia and Italy.

It should be noted that the so-called 1897 and 1908 «Agreements» concluded in violation of prior existing treaties of protection between Italy and the Somali people and were contrary to the interests and welfare of the Somali nation.

European colonial powers guarantee

Abyssinian territorial gains.

A glaring example of imperialist alliance between Abyssinia on the one hand and the European powers namely, Britain, France and Italy on the other could best be illustrated by the 1906 Agreement which was concluded between the three European colonial powers. In the preamble to the said agreement, they pledged to:

«Maintain intact the integrity of Ethiopia, to provide for every kind of disturbance in the political considerations of the Ethiopian Empire...».

In Article I of this Agreement, France, Britain and Italy also agreed to:

«Cooperate in maintaining the political and territorial status quo in Ethiopia...».

Furthermore, in Article IV, these three European colonial powers agreed as follows:

«In the event of the status quo laid down in Article I being disturbed, France, Great Britain and Italy shall make every effort to preserve the integrity of Ethiopia».

It is crystal clear that the European colonial powers not only fully recognised the colonialist role of Abyssinia but also ensured her retention of the portion of the Somali territory that she had illegally gained in the process of partitioning the Somali territory. But since when did the European colonial powers guarantee the integrity of an African country while they were fully putting into practice their «divide and rule» policy in the rest of Africa for their own selfish interests?

SOMALI RESISTENCE TO THE IMPOSITION OF COLONIAL RULE.

The Somalis have a glorious history of struggle for the maintenance of their national independence. Before the scramble, many attempts have been made by foreign powers at one time or another to colonize at least a portion of the Somali territory. All of these earlier imperial designs were denied success by fierce Somali resistance. An account of the events occurring at the Horn of Africa following the scramble would also attest to the independence of spirit and love of freedom of the Somali people.

The British occupation of former British Somaliland was not effected in full until well after the First World War because of Somali opposition. Similarly Italian occupation of Southern Somalia was a slow process spanning a forty year period of Italian campaigns and Somali heroic re-

sistance. Available information indicate that neither France nor Ethiopia — which has yet to fully control her Somali colonial possession — has had a better luck in their vain attempts to impose colonial rule upon the Somalis.

The colonial situation is essentially a conflict-ridden one — a conflict between the will of the Ethio-European imperialist to dominate and the opposing will of the Somalis to be free. From the trade and protection treaties signed with the European colonial powers and in which the Somalis invariably included clauses regarding the inviolability and indivisibility of their territory, it is clear that the Somalis were not willing to part with their sovereignty and territory. And no sooner had the colonial personnel planted their feet on the Somali soil than they were faced with instantaneous revolts country-wide.

In a letter dated 15th December, 1887 to the British Agent and Consul General in Cairo, Lt. Col. E.V. Stace, H.M. Agent and Consul for the Somali Coast reported that Ras Makonnen on attempting to subjugate Somalis just East of Harar had suffered a defeat at the hands of the Somalis with a loss of 1500 men. On January 4th, 1888, Col. Stace declared that he received more substantial information regarding the certainty of this Abyssinian defeat.

Commenting on conditions in French Somaliland, Stace while on one of his periodic visits to Berbera wrote in January of 1888 to his superior in Cairo:

«In my telegram (25th instant) I mentioned my belief that the French would be unable to establish a port without locating a considerable military force owing to the determined and increasing hostility of the Issa Somalis. This hostility has been illustrated by a recent attempt to land and conciliate the Somalis. But I am informed, that owing to the threatening attitude of those Somalis who presented themselves in opposition to the landing party, the French had to withdraw at once».

Having meanwhile paid a visit to French Somaliland, Stace was more authoritative and more revealing in his second Memorandum written March 30, 1888:

«Unfortunately the French are virtually besieged there by the Issa Somalis... No caravans, at present, come near the place and the Issa

Somalis openly declared their intention of doing all they can to injure the settlement and attack it if possible....».

Though «landing with a strong armed party», apologized Col. Stace, «it was impossible to erect any boundary mark» as we «were indeed on the soil of Somalis most bitterly hostile». As late as 1897 Captain E.J.S. Swayne, in his *Secret Notes on a visit to Jibouti in May 1897*, maintained that after 15 years of rule, the French were still insecure at Jibouti. The precariousness of their situation can be seen from the fact that, as reported by Swayne, none of the 36 civil Policemen was from people of that territory.

In the Haud and Ogaden, it is reported that the going for Abyssinian forces was equally tough. On more than one occasion a motely host of hurriedly collected spearmen would boldly challenge the well-armed Abyssinians and inflict heavy defeats upon them. In his *Political Influence Exercised in Somaliland by Great Britain, Italy, France and Abyssinia* prepared for the Secretary to the Political Department of the India Office, Captain H.G.C. Swayne, wrote:

«Somalis in Ogaden have, some two or three years back, inflicted one heavy defeat on the Abyssinians and the latter dare not meddle much with them».

Swayne went on to report that as a consequence of this intransigent Somali resistance, Abyssinian influence was confined to the clans adjacent to Harar.

Indeed there are many reports of the fear and state of nervousness of Abyssinian raiding parties because of the intermittent Somali counter attacks which reflected the extent of Somali resistance. This nervousness on the part of the Abyssinian soldiers at the frontier was most justified in the light of information contained in the *Confidential Appendix to the Administration Report of the Somali Coast Protectorate for the year 1896-97* from Brig Gen. A.C. Cunningham, Political Resident, Aden, No. 77 dated 4th August, 1897 to the Secretary to Government, Political Department, Bombay:

«A large Abyssinian expedition despatched from Harar in November, 1896 to the Ogaden and Galla Arussi country suffered a disastrous defeat and was almost annihilated... Several Abyssinian chiefs, includ-

ing the two leaders of the expedition, Fitwararis Woldo Emmanuel and Desalem, were slain».

Both the British Agent in Abyssinia and Italian sources also corroborate General Cunningham's Report. As an instance of the universality and continuing nature of Somali resistance to the colonialists, it may be cited that even in 1896 the far eastern Somalis of Bargal and Obbia along the coast of the Indian Ocean were promising to collect 50,000 men for the liberation of Harar. Their plan, however, was frustrated by the unwillingness of the Europeans to sell them arms.

Hemmed in on all sides by advancing Abyssino-European forces, and barred from the importation of fire-arms with which to defend their people, land and stock, the Somalis finally rose in unison against these invading colonial forces in 1898, understandably, under Sayid Mohamed Abdulla Hassan, a Somali from the Ogaden who has witnessed the grisly deeds of the marauding Abyssinian bands but who had also travelled throughout Somaliland and observed the indignities of European colonial rule in other parts of the Somali territory. This nationalist movement led by Sayid Mohamed Abdulla Hassan is the best known and certainly the most spectacular though by no means neither the only one nor the earliest movement of all Somali resistance.

In extent the movement covered the whole of Somali territory, and particularly after it joined hands in 1907 with the earlier resistance to Italian occupation in the Southern Somaliland. Centered in the interior of Marka and Mogadishu, the Southern movement had started in 1898 following repeated Abyssinian attacks from the West and the arrival in the Benadir coastal cities of acquisitive Italian colonial administrators. The cost of the war to the colonialists was enormous. Mr. Douglas Jardine in his book on Sayid Mohamed Abdulla Hassan gives an account of the magnitude of the cost of the war to Britain.

«The third and fourth expeditions had cost us much. In treasure, no less than five million Sterling; in blood, the lives of many valuable British officers whom our small professional army could ill-afford to lose».

In fact at one stage the British found the war so costly that Britain decided to withdraw to the coastal towns retiring all her forces and men from the hinterland of the Somaliland Protectorate in 1910. This nation-

From the early 1930's, the nationalist movement, which was subdued temporarily by the combined efforts of the colonialists in the 1920's was gathering momentum as was the case in most African countries. Like their brothers in the rest of Africa, the Somalis formed clubs and associations in the 1930's as a means of conducting secretly their political agitation in the face of the colonial opposition to political organizations. In fact this movement was instrumental in the uprising against the «demarcation» of the colonial frontiers which perfunctorily and arbitrarily divided the Somali territory.

Inspired by the ideals of such great Somali nationalists as Ahmed Ibrahim Gurey and Sayid Mohamed Abdulla Hassan, and also by the innate love for freedom and unity, the Somalis turned the national movement into a fully-fledged political organization during the Second World War to meet the challenge posed by the new scramble for the Somali territory since the beginning of the war.

In 1943 a fully-fledged political party emerged. This was the Somali Youth League which had its Head-quarters in Mogadishu. This party which immediately after its formation developed into a mass party with branches throughout the Somali territory including Harar, Ogaden, and Haud regions of the Somali territory under Ethiopia alien rule, proved, a driving force for Somalis everywhere.

Shortly afterwards, another political party, the Somali National League, with its Headquarters in Burao, emerged as a political force.

In this connection, it should be noted that these two political parties had identical goals i.e. Somali re-unification. In fact the first item in each of the programmes of these two parties sought «to unite all Somalis». This reflected the deep-rooted aspiration of the Somali people everywhere. This long cherished goal of all Somalis manifested itself during the visit of the Four Power Commission in Mogadishu in 1948 when Somalis from every part of the Somali territory submitted petitions and memoranda to indicate their strong feeling for re-unification (See Appendix BII). In order to ascertain the extent of the Somali feeling, the Somali National League and the Somali Youth League jointly organised a Conference in Mogadishu in February, 1948 which was attended by delegations from all over the Somali areas. The result of the Conference, which showed that all the Somali people wished to be united under one flag, was submitted to the visiting Four Power Commission

of Investigation on Ex-Italian Somaliland (See Appendix BII): A Memorandum concerning the need for the unification of the Somali people and the result of the Conference was also submitted to the U.N. Secretary General. Besides, the Somali people regularly dispatched petitioners to the Sessions of the U. N. General Assembly to appeal for the bringing together of the whole of the Somali territory under one administration.

This expressed desire for re-unification into «one political administrative, cultural and economic unit» under joint Trusteeship of the Four Big Powers did not, however, please anyone of the interested colonial powers namely, Britain, Ethiopia and Italy, and it was not long before they started again trading in Somali territory each getting her share of the spoils.

Accordingly, Britain once more acted unilaterally and handed over on September 24, 1948 a portion of the Somali territory including Ogaden and yet another portion of the Haud and the Reserved Area in favour of Abyssinia, now renamed the Ethiopian Empire. This course of action, was adopted by Britain in spite of the expressed wishes of the Somali people of Western Somalia and elsewhere. As soon as this further betrayal of Somali interests was known, riots and spontaneous demonstrations occurred in all parts of the Somali territory. The colonialist forces reacted ruthlessly to this popular uprising and in Jijjiga alone where the British decision was announced, 25 Somalis lost their lives. Thus in 1948 Ethiopia had at last added most of Western Somalia to her ill-gotten gains of the Somali territory as a participant of the new scramble for the Somali territory after the Second World War. By 1950 the General Assembly decided to place Ex-Italian Somaliland under the U.N. Trusteeship to be administered by Italy for a period of 10 years.

To conclude this dismal tale, Britain further conspired with Ethiopia and handed over the remaining part of Western Somalia (the Haud and the Reserved Area) in 1955 to Ethiopia under an illegal and secret agreement of 1954 which was based on the invalid provisions of the so-called Anglo-Ethiopian Agreement of 1897. As in other instances of betrayal, the Somali people reacted violently to this secret and illegal deal and as a result demonstrations were held all over the Somali territory. Furthermore, a delegation was despatched to Britain and to the United Nations to protest against this illegal transaction but the efforts of the Mission were frustrated because of British opposition.

Denied re-unification after the Second World War when most of their territory was under one administration, the Somali people under the various alien rule now began pressing vigorously for their independence so that they may be in a position to re-unite after ridding themselves of the foreign rule. This urge for re-unification was recognised at the African level when the All African Peoples' Conference held in Accra in 1958 «denounced artificial frontiers drawn by imperialist powers to divide the peoples of Africa particularly those which cut across ethnic or divide peoples of the same stock». This Conference called, among other things «for the adjustment of such frontiers at an early date to this problem, founded upon the true wishes of the people».

When on June 26th and July 1st, 1960 the former British Somaliland and the Italian Trust-Territory respectively gained independence, they united on the later date to form the Somali Republic. This re-unification was a natural process which stems from the deep rooted desire of the Somali people for unity.

THE POST INDEPENDENCE PERIOD

On its achievement of independence, *the Somali Republic denounced all the illegal colonial agreements by which the Somali territory was artificially and arbitrarily divided*. The Somali Republic declared that she was not bound by these colonial «agreements» as they were not consistent with the principle of self-determination and the wishes and aspirations of the Somali people. Moreover, as written in the Somali Constitution of 1960, the Somali Republic adopted a policy of seeking re-unification of the Somali territory by peaceful means. Since that time, the Somali Republic has made constant and determined efforts to enter into negotiations with the Ethiopian Government with a view to reaching a lasting and just settlement on the territorial dispute.

Even before independence the Somali leaders made positive efforts to reach agreement with Ethiopia through negotiations. The first major step taken in this direction was the official visit to Addis Ababa in 1957 of the President of the Somali Legislative Assembly and the then Somali Prime Minister. During the course of their visit, the two Somali leaders made a personal approach to the Imperial Ethiopian Government on the territorial dispute, confident that by direct negotiations, there would be better prospects for a settlement. In 1960 as soon as the So-

maliland Protectorate was promised independence, the first act of the four Somali Ministers was to make an official visit to Addis Ababa for talks with the Ethiopian Government authorities. The reaction of the Ethiopian Government to this preliminary overtures was negative.

The Somali Government however, was not discouraged by these initial disappointments but maintained its fundamental policy that the territorial dispute with Ethiopia could be settled by direct negotiations, and should this medium fail, by mediation under the auspices of the OAU. It was in pursuance of this policy that the Somali Government raised the Somali case at the OAU, the United Nations and other international forums and expressed its willingness to accept African mediation if bilateral negotiations bore no result.

While the Somali Government was constantly seeking a peaceful settlement to its territorial dispute with Ethiopia, the Imperial Ethiopian Government adopted hostile policies and deliberately maintained a state of tension along the de facto border by pursuing the following:

- 1) Declaring a state of emergency in the Somali territory under her domination immediately after the birth of the Somali Republic in 1960;
- 2) Carrying out indiscriminate and inhuman massacres against the Somali population including the burning down of entire towns like Aisha, Danot, Dhagahbur and Shillabo with the aim of suppressing their national identity, culture, religion and aspirations;
- 3) Seeking to prevent the traditional seasonal migrations of the Somali population by denying them their legitimate right of access to water and grazing;
- 4) Concentration of large number of troops along the de facto border.

These hostile activities on the part of the Ethiopian Government culminated in a full-scale war of aggression by Ethiopia in February-March 1964. At the request of the Somali Government, the OAU intervened in the conflict and the Council of Foreign Ministers in its Session held at Dar Es Salam and Lagos in 1964 passed resolutions calling for a ceasefire and a settlement of the territorial dispute. A ceasefire agree-

ment was finally negotiated between the two States at Khartoum through the good offices of the then Sudanese President who acted as an intermediary between the parties. However, in the spring of 1965, Ethiopia again concentrated a large number of troops along the de facto border, and imposed repressive measures against the Somali people in the Ethiopian controlled areas.

In order to reduce tension in the area and to open a climate conducive to the peaceful negotiation of the dispute, the Somali Government in March 1965 officially made concrete proposals to the Imperial Ethiopian Government. At the same time, in a Note to the OAU, the Somali Government appealed to the OAU to dispatch a fact-finding Commission to these areas and to send the Committee on Refugees to the refugees camps in Somali Republic into which many thousands of Somalis had fled to escape tyranny and persecution. The Somali Government wanted an impartial, objective inquiry into the facts of the Somali case by the OAU dispatched neither the proposed Fact Finding Mission nor even not agree to any OAU Fact Finding Commission. Consequently, the OAU despatched neither the proposed Fact Finding Mission nor even the Committee on Refugees. Moreover, when the Somali Republic proposed a meeting with the Ethiopian Government at the Foreign Ministers level to be held in Khartoum in May 1965, the venue proved unacceptable to the Ethiopian Government and no agreement on an alternative venue could be reached.

However, at the OAU Summit held in Kinshasa in 1967, the Somali and Ethiopian Governments agreed to enter into direct negotiations on their dispute in the spirit of the OAU Charter. Soon after the Kinshasa Conference, the Somali Government dispatched two delegations to Addis Ababa, the first headed by the then Minister of Interior and the second led by the then Prime Minister. Unfortunately, in both meetings only preliminary issues were considered and there was no discussion of the merits of the territorial dispute.

With the advent of the October Revolution, the Somali Democratic Republic pledged herself under the First Charter of the Revolution, to seek a just and peaceful settlement on the territorial dispute with the Imperial Ethiopian Government. The Somali Democratic Republic's adherence to the policy of peaceful settlement of the dispute could be illustrated by an excerpt from the speech of the President of the Supreme Revolutionary Council, Jaalle Major General Mohamed Siyad Barre on 1st July, 1970 which reads as follows:

«We in the Somali Democratic Republic do not intend to kindle the fire of destruction in the Horn of Africa. We have heard, and some of us have seen the effects and repercussions of war, which twice struck this world and left behind untold sorrow and suffering. What we intend to do is to press for a peaceful and amicable settlement of all disputes which engulf us and our neighbours, and which sow the seeds of suspicion and hatred between the peoples and governments of our part of the world. If these perennial and thorny problems are solved, the efforts of all States concerned will be concentrated on the eradication of all the arch enemies of mankind — disease, ignorance and poverty, and on the economic and social betterment of our peoples.

We shall no longer content ourselves with diplomatic and hypocritical statements to our neighbours. We shall bring to the roundtable Conference concrete and bold proposals that touch the crux of our disputes with our neighbours, aimed at creating prosperity, progress and everlasting peace in the Horn of Africa».

For the past four years, the Somali Government made a series of official contacts with the Ethiopian Government both at Summit and Ministerial levels in order to reach an amicable settlement of the basic dispute with Ethiopia. (Appendix C). Regrettably, the initiatives taken by the Somali Government produced no fruitful results.

The response of the Imperial Ethiopian Government to these friendly moves was most disappointing. More recently, there has been heavy concentration of Ethiopian troops on the de-facto border; numerous violations of the territory of the Somali Democratic Republic by Ethiopian armed forces; and infringements on Somali airspace by Ethiopian planes. The gravity of this tense situation was amply explained by the President of the Supreme Revolutionary Council of the Somali Democratic Republic, Jaalle Major General Mohamed Siyad Barre in his message to the OAU 10th Assembly of Heads of State and Government of May 1973.

In the light of these developments, it is evident that Ethiopia is bent on maintaining a state of tension in the Horn of Africa, and the acts of aggression committed by the Ethiopian Government can only be construed as a concerted plan to precipitate a conflict so that the OAU Mediation Commission may not tackle the root of the problem. In spite of these grave provocations, the Somali Government has taken no retaliatory measures and this in itself reflects its determination to settle the

territorial dispute peacefully in the spirit of the Charter of the Organization of African Unity.

NATURE OF ETHIOPIAN COLONIAL RULE

The nature of Ethiopian colonial rule was seriously felt by the Somali people in the 1960's when the Ethiopian Government attempted to implement the colonial division of the Somali people by imposing an alien and feudal system. If one enquires into the motives behind the Ethiopian attempt, one would realise that Ethiopia was anxious to stop the Somali population under her domination from rallying behind the newly born Somali Republic. With the exception of Harar, Ethiopia had hardly established before this time any semblance of administrative presence in the Somali territory which she had illegally acquired through the secret treaties with the European colonial powers.

Since then however, Ethiopia amassed her troops in the occupied Somali territory and along the de-facto border partly to be in a position to commit acts of aggression against the Somali Democratic Republic and partly to subdue the Somali people on her side of the artificial border.

The cruel practices of the Ethiopian authorities take many forms that can sometimes surpass the worst form of colonial oppression.


Almost daily acts of rape, mutilation, torture and humiliation contrary to the dignity and worth of human person are meted out to the Somali people under Ethiopian domination. The massacring of defenceless Somalis and the poisoning of drinking wells occur frequently in this area where Ethiopian forces indiscriminately shoot and kill innocent Somali men, women and children. These acts can only be described as acts of genocide and outside the pale of human civilization (See attached Photos). Ethiopian authorities continuously harass the Somali population and levy unlimited tax on the livestock of the nomads themselves in the form of head tax known as «GIBIR», something that had never been experienced by Somalis. This abhorant tax on the poor nomads and their livestock is in the end met indirectly by their relatives in the Somali Democratic Republic — a constant burden on almost every Somali family because of the forceful separation of a father from son and brother from sister by the artificial and illegal frontiers imposed upon the Somali nation by Euro-Abyssinian collusion. They also seize and




Somali men tortured and then killed by Ethiopians at Eil-Gaal (in Ogadenia).



Two of the Somalis killed at Eil-Gaal (in Ogadenia)
by Ethiopian soldiers.




A Somali maimed by Ethiopians at Eil Gaal (in Ogadenia).




A Somali man tortured and with grave wounds inflicted upon him while in the hands of Ethiopian authorities.




**A Somali man tortured and gravely injured by Ethiopians
in the Somali territory under Ethiopian domination.**



Callous and wanton destruction of Somali livestock
by Ethiopians.



Callous and wanton destruction of Somali livestock
by Ethiopians.



Callous and wanton destruction of Somali livestock
by Ethiopians.

A well ruined and sealed off by Ethiopians.



A Somali man maimed by Ethiopians at Eil-Gaal
(in Ogadenia).


A well ruined and sealed off by Ethiopians.



A well ruined and sealed off by Ethiopians.



A Somali wounded by Ethiopians and brought to a Hospital
in the Somali Democratic Republic.




Somalis in search of water horrified at the destruction of their well by the Ethiopians.




Somali homes destroyed by Ethiopians at Gura Joome
(in Ogadenia).




A Somali home burnt to the ground by Ethiopian soldiers
at Eit-Gaai (in Ogadenia).



A yeung Somali weman raped and gravely injured at Eil-Gaal
(in Ogadenia).



A young Somali shot at arm by Ethiopians at Gura Joome
(in Ogadenia)



Somali men and women whose homes were destroyed and deprived of their livestock by Ethiopians.

misappropriate their properties and thereby deprive them of their livelihood.

It is rather unfortunate that since the Somali Democratic Republic brought the Somali-Ethiopian territorial dispute to the OAU in May, 1973, Ethiopia has intensified its atrocities and inhuman treatment of the Somali population who now live in a state of constant fear, terror and intimidation.

This state of affairs led to the influx of many Somalis into the Somali Democratic Republic, leaving behind their homes and other properties. That fits, of course, well into the Ethiopian Government's heinous plans aimed at the «de-Somalisation» of the territory concerned and its Amharisation as has already taken place in the Hawash valley where the Somalis were forced to leave their rightful homes. The resettling of Amharas in fertile areas is an integral part of the Shabelle Project now under consideration by the Ethiopian authorities.

Besides, economic and social development is still unknown in this Somali territory under Ethiopian domination. There are hardly any schools or hospitals in the whole of Ethiopian held Somali territory. There are no economic projects to speak of except a number of agricultural schemes for re-settling Amhara ex-servicemen thereby uprooting the rightful owners. The other projects so far accomplished are purely military purposes, for example, strategic airports, roads and wells built by the armed forces to meet Ethiopian plans for perpetuating her colonisation of this Somali territory while facilitating repeated acts of aggression against the Somali Democratic Republic. This complete lack of opportunities coupled with the oppressive rule compelled many Somalis to come over to the Somali Democratic Republic for employment, schooling, hospitalisation security and other basic social services.

SPURIOUS ARGUMENTS BY ETHIOPIA

1. *Ethiopia's so-called Ancient Claim.*

It happens that whenever the Somali people express the desire for re-unification of the Somalis in order to redress the injustices inflicted by Euro-Ethiopian colonialism from the end of the 19th Century, the Ethiopian Government almost invariably advances futile counter arguments based on no more than a historical myth. Thus, in a Memorandum to

the United Nations after the end of the Second World War when the Somali people were struggling for re-unification, Ethiopia stated, among other things, that:

«Prior to the race of the European powers to divide up the continent of Africa, Ethiopia included an extensive coastline along the Red Sea and the Indian Ocean».

This statement is totally baseless and ignores the glaring fact that Abyssinia only acquired Somali territory with the collusion of European colonial powers in 1880's as explained in the preceding chapters. This flimsy and untenable claim propagated by Ethiopia is aimed at justifying its colonial gains. However, the facts of history show beyond any shadow of doubt that the Abyssinian Kingdom was confined to the highlands for centuries before the arrival of the European colonialists as already illustrated by the preceding chapters relating to that period of history (See Maps III and IV).

Margery Perham, a famous scholar and an authority on Ethiopia, in referring to the Memorandum submitted to the United Nations by Ethiopia in 1948 had the following to say in her book on the Government of Ethiopia:

«The present Emperor has taken up the expansionist policy and his Government is now claiming both the whole of modern Eritrea and also Italian Somaliland as «lost provinces» upon grounds that do some violence to history and take insufficient account of present political and religious facts. The claim is based, in the official document, upon rather indefinite references to early history and migration almost every sentence of which cries out for comment or correction».

2. *The question of Alleged Somali «Aggrandizement».*

On many occasions, Ethiopia has accused the Somali Democratic Republic of territorial aggrandizement. She has particularly in recent months been spreading rumours with the assistance of the mass media from certain quarters that the Somali Democratic Republic is preparing for war of aggression against Ethiopia as a means of fulfilling her expansionist ambitions. In fact the reason which Ethiopia gives for her heavy concentration of troops along the de facto border is said to be no

more than a precautionary measure aimed at forestalling Somalia's alleged expansionist designs.

Isn't that making a mockery of the facts of the situation? Does the size, economic and military strength of the Somali Democratic Republic suggest that she is planning aggression against Ethiopia considering the potentiality of that country? Can a small nation such as Somalia included in the 25 least developed among developing countries master the economic, military and manpower resources to invade a rambling Empire who claims to have a population of over 25 million and known to be one of the best militarily equipped countries in Africa? This may be left to the common-sense and judgement of mankind.

Contrary to the baseless Ethiopian accusation, it is a well-known fact that Somalia since independence sought the re-unification of the Somali territory and people through peaceful means as was enshrined in the Constitution of 1960. By doing so the Somali Democratic Republic is only seeking to regain what the Somali people have lost in the process of colonisation and partition. That Ethiopia has acquired this Somali territory as a colonial power and in collusion with the European colonialists, has amply been explained in the preceding Chapters.

Why then is Ethiopia lodging all these accusations against the Somali Democratic Republic?

The answer is that Ethiopia realizes that any consideration of the merits of the territorial dispute between the two countries will automatically bring to light the colonialist role which she shamefully played in the Horn of Africa at the turn of the last century and will, therefore, expose the true image of Ethiopia to Africa and to the world at large. That is why she is bent on hiding behind a smoke-screen of her own creation to mislead Africa as well as world opinion.

3. *Somali Nationhood falsely interpreted.*

In opposing the re-unification of the Somali territory, Ethiopia attempts to portray the Somali people's desire for unity as a form of tribalism or racism. She uses every means at her disposal to rank the Somali people as an ordinary tribe without any rights to nationhood. The Somali people are a nation in every sense of the word. A nation

has been defined as «a people, usually inhabiting a distinct portion of the earth, speaking the same language, using the same customs and possessing historical continuity. It is constituted by inborn qualities which render it indissoluble». Besides having these common characteristics, the Somali people enjoy the sense of togetherness and the sentiment of community and geographically occupy the same terrain of land normally referred to as the Somali Plateau and pursue the same pastoral economy.

In spite of all these natural characteristics which bind the Somali people together as a nation, Euro-Ethiopian colonialism had haphazardly partitioned the Somali people and territory and separated brother from brother and father from son by a series of artificial frontiers. Yet when, with realism, we call for the re-unification of the Somali people and the elimination of the injustices done to the Somali nation thereby removing a chronic source of friction, Ethiopia side-tracks the basic issue and without sincerity confuses it with non-applicable generalities that beg the very uniqueness and essence of the Somali-Ethiopian territorial dispute.

4. *Inapplicability of the principle of territorial integrity to the Somali-Ethiopian dispute.*

The Ethiopian Government always raises the often repeated «Territorial Integrity» principle which is expressed in the Charter of the OAU. It is pertinent to note, however that the said principle is not applicable to the Somali-Ethiopian territorial dispute. *This principle is not applicable when a State is illegally and forcefully exercising sovereignty over a territory belonging to another State.* It will be questionable to apply this principle as a defence against a legitimate territorial claim. In essence, therefore, the «territorial integrity» doctrine cannot be juridically applied by Ethiopia to legitimize her domination of the Somali territory as long as her legal title to the area is not recognized as valid. It is important to note that this flimsy argument is comparable to the same legal jargon that is used by the racist colonialist regime of Lisbon in her relentless determination to suppress the aspirations of the African people in their struggle for dignity and independence.

Ethiopia also emphasises the principle of the inviolability of frontiers. But this doctrine can only be invoked in cases where the boundaries have been delimited on a just and equitable basis and where such delimitation is based on mutual agreement between the parties concerned.

This does not certainly apply in the case of Somali-Ethiopian de facto boundary which had been defined on paper artificially by illegal agreements to which Somalia was not a party.

5. *OAU Resolutions in relation to Somali-Ethiopian Dispute.*

In opposing Somalia's legitimate territorial claim, Ethiopia often resorts to three resolutions adopted respectively in Dar Es Salam, Lagos and Cairo in 1964. In view of this, it is necessary to throw some light on both the historical background and essence of the three resolutions in question.

As mentioned earlier, in 1964, war broke out along the de facto border as a result of blatant and naked aggression on Somalia by Ethiopia. The Organization of African Unity which was at the time one year and a few months old became very seriously concerned with the military conflict and the tense situation in the area. Consequently, the OAU Council of Ministers, in its Second Extra-Ordinary Session, met in Dar Es Salam to deal with the war situation between Somalia and Ethiopia and subsequently adopted in February, 1964 Resolution No. ECM/RES. (II) on the Somali-Ethiopia dispute. The operative part of this Resolution requested the two parties to meet earnestly, to cease hostilities and directed them to find a «peaceful and lasting solution» to the problem in accordance with para. 4 of Article 3 of the Charter of the OAU which stipulated the settlement of all disputes between Member States by peaceful means. The main objective of this resolution was to stop the hostilities along the de facto border between the two countries, and it in no way stipulated Somalia's acceptance of the existence of anything other than territorial dispute.

The above resolution was reaffirmed by the Lagos Ordinary Sessions of the OAU Council of Ministers which requested both Somalia and Ethiopia to maintain the ceasefire already in force, to continue negotiations towards the peaceful settlement of the dispute and to report to the next Conference of Heads of State and Government on the results of their negotiations.

Subsequently, the Conference of Heads of State and Government was held in Cairo in July, 1964. Item 9 of the Agenda of that Confe-

rence referred to the dispute. However, because of a constitutional crisis in Somalia at the time, the President and the Prime Minister were unable to attend the OAU Summit Conference and the Somali Government requested the temporary deletion of item 9 referred to in the Agenda of the Cairo Conference. As a result of this request, and in agreement between Ethiopia and Somalia, in the presence of the Acting Secretary General of the OAU, it was agreed that «none of the interested parties shall undertake action during the Conference which could prejudice the bilateral talks and the position taken by the interested parties in the bilateral negotiations». This was distributed to the Assembly of Heads of State and Government in the form of a Communique on July 15, 1964.

Notwithstanding the above agreement, the Assembly adopted on 21st July, 1964, Resolution no. AHQ/(16) requesting Member States «to respect the frontiers existing at the moment of the achievement of their independence». It is significant to note that the said resolution was passed under an agenda item entitled «The Study of Ways and Means which may help to avoid disputes among African States». When this resolution was proposed for inclusion in the Agenda at the Council of Ministers' Conference, Tanzania made very clear what the scope was intended to be in the following words:

«I understand that the Head of the Somali Government is not going to be here, that is why I said at the beginning «guiding principles», because this has nothing to do with the many negotiations which have taken place and which I myself moved in the Committee of Nine, that we should encourage peaceful solutions and negotiations between Somalia and Ethiopia in order that the OAU should take the credit that they solved their African problems by using African solution».

Taking into consideration the explanation made in the Conference and the title of the Agenda item under which the Resolution was advanced, it is clear that the resolution was not intended to affect disputes already existing. In recognition of this fact, the President of Tanzania, H.E. Julius K. Nyerere made the following comment at the Summit in connection with the resolution after it was passed:

«The resolution merely reaffirmed a principle serving as a guide in future the adoption of which does not pre-judice any discussion in progress».

Further, referring to the Protocol of Conciliation, Arbitration and Mediation Commission which was adopted at the same time by the Cairo

Assembly of Heads of State and Government, the late President Nkrumah of Ghana intervened to state «that the corollary to the principle of inviolability of frontiers is the principle that the established mechanism approved by the Summit effectively enter into action». The linking of the two issues is significant since the Commission had been envisaged not merely as a peacemaking body but also as providing machinery for peaceful settlement of disputes.

The Somali Delegation expressed its reservation to this resolution and drew the attention of the Assembly to the contradiction between the agreement already reached and the adoption of the resolution. In fact Somalia reserved its position and officially declared that it was not bound by the said resolution. The Somali view was based on the fact that the adoption of this resolution would prejudice the sensitive bi-lateral talks between the two countries scheduled to be held in September, 1964. This position was also proclaimed on a number of occasions; in the speech of the Somali Foreign Minister to the Assembly of Heads of State and Government before the resolution was adopted and in subsequent statements made by him in a formal communication to the Secretary General of the OAU dated August 18, 1964 and in a resolution of the Somali National Assembly.

In view of the above and in particular taking into consideration our reservation, it follows, therefore, that the said resolution is in no way applicable to the territorial dispute between Somalia and Ethiopia.

INVALIDITY OF COLONIAL AGREEMENT BETWEEN ETHIOPIA, BRITAIN, ITALY AND FRANCE

As already indicated in the preceding Chapters Ethiopia acquired parts of the Somali territory under illegal agreements concluded with Britain, France and Italy: It is the position of the Somali Democratic Republic as she had always maintained in the past, that she cannot be bound by colonial agreements which she had formally denounced on her attainment of independence.

These agreements are invalid and devoid of any legal effect on a number of grounds:

Firstly, the so-called agreements purported to transfer parts of the Somali territory over which the colonial powers — Britain, France and

Italy — had no valid title. In this connection, it will be recalled that Britain, France and Italy were under an obligation by virtue of prior existing Treaties of Protection (1884-1891) to safeguard the interests of the Somali population and the preservation of their independence. In addition to the obligation on the protecting state to preserve the independence of the protected people, these treaties of protection did not stipulate the transfer of the ownership of Somali territory. In nowhere did these treaties provide for the alienation of Somali territory to a third party state. It follows, therefore, that under the fundamental principles of law «Memo dat quod non habet» so long as the protecting powers had no legal ownership of the Somali territory, they could not transfer a valid title to another state, in this case Ethiopia.

Secondly, since the protected Somali population expressly covenanted not to alienate their territory save to the protecting powers, a reciprocal obligation, not to permit such territory to pass under the sovereignty of any other state, impliedly devolved upon the British, French and Italian Governments.

Thirdly, the Somali people had no knowledge of the colonial agreements under which Ethiopia allegedly acquired Somali territory. Neither had they been consulted in the matter. In fact, it was only after the Anglo-Abyssinian boundary Commission started the illegal demarcation activities in 1931 in the Northern sector of the Somali territory that the Somali people came to know about the British betrayal and as a result the officer-in-charge was killed in the violent riots which followed. *Ever since, incessant protests and petitions were lodged against the usurpation of Somali territory by Ethiopia.* In subsequent years, the Somali people continued to remain in possession of that part of Somali territory which they had inhabited from time immemorial.

Fourthly, these colonial agreements between Italy, Britain, France and Ethiopia are in violation of the principle of self-determination which is given expression in the Charter of the United Nations. In this connection, it should be mentioned that Article 103 of the United Nations Charter expressly states that «in the event of a conflict between the obligations of the members of the United Nations under the present Charter and their obligations under any other international agreement, their obligation under the present Charter shall prevail». It follows therefore that the 1897 and 1908 «treaties» are invalid because of their conflict with Article 103 of the United Nations Charter.

ETHIOPIA'S OPPOSITION TO THE SOMALI PEOPLE'S STRUGGLE FOR FREEDOM AND UNITY

A cursory examination of the history of N.E. Africa would reveal that Abyssinia was always actively opposed to the freedom and unity of the Somali people and never hesitated to enlist the services of all others and any allies ready with support. As early as the 16th Century, Abyssinia entered into an aggressive alliance with Portugal against the Somali nation. Fearful of the Somali State of Adal — the most prominent State in North East Africa — the Abyssinians who had initiated this Abyssino-Portuguese alliance urged the Portuguese early in the 16th Century to attack Adal from the Sea. In compliance with this request the Portuguese bombarded the Somali coastal cities of Mogadishu (1499) Brava (1503) and again in 1506 and in 1517 they burnt Zeila whose troops were at the time engaged in war with Abyssinia, and then proceeded to sack Berbera in the following year. Thanks to the iron determination of the Somali people, the Portuguese efforts to establish a foothold along the Somali coast ended in complete failure.

In the late 1520's the two centuries old cycle of Abyssino-Somali hostilities changed from a series of intermittent raids and counter-raids into a fully-fledged war. In this conflict the Somalis under the resourceful leadership of Ahmed Ibrahim Gurey scored a series of resounding victories which saw the Somali forces over-run the whole of the Abyssinian highlands by the mid 1530's. Now came the Portuguese from Goa with 400 Musketeers under the command of Christopher Da Gama, son of the famous explorer, to the aid of their Abyssinian ally. This Portuguese force indeed represented a great menace to the very existence of the Somali nation in the light of the fact that the use of fire-arms was then unknown to this part of the world. But despite this change in the balance of power in favour of the Abyssinians, the Somali forces were able to defeat the combined Abyssinian-Portuguese enemies, killing in the first major battle over half of the 400 Portuguese musketeers including the leader of the expedition. This victory made the Somali troops rest on their laurels. Taking advantage of this lull in hostilities, the Abyssinians and Portuguese regrouped and rallying behind their fugitive King attacked Ahmed Ibrahim Gurey near Lake Tana. In this battle Ahmed lost his life thus necessitating the ending of the war and the withdrawal of the Somali forces.

The arrival of the colonialists at the end of the 19th Century from all directions was a great challenge to the Somali people. While Britain,

Italy, Abyssinia and France were busy partitioning the Somali territory, an effective national liberation movement was in the making under the leadership of Sayid Mohamed Abdulla Hassan who courageously reacted to the multiple colonisation which posed a threat to the very fabric of Somali society and its national unity. Although the Somali people were not aware of the illegal secret agreements dividing their territory, they have from the beginning violently objected to the forceful presence and divisive intervention of these colonialists in the affairs of their motherland. Hence the Somali people rallied behind the torch bearer of that historic Somali national liberation movement which took the form of an armed struggle against the colonial powers including Abyssinia. This, however, brought about united colonial opposition and particularly a lasting Anglo-Abyssinian collaboration against the Somalis which reminded us of the earlier and similar cooperation between Abyssinia and Britain against the Mahdi of the Sudan.

The Somali resistance was so fierce and effective that five distinct expeditions were mounted each being given to a military Command still more senior and with ever increased number of armed forces.

As soon as it became known that the first expedition was being mounted against this African freedom fighter, Emperor Menelik «*proposed a combined movement of British and Abyssinian forces against the Mullah from the Ogaden*». In fulfilment of this proposal which was accepted, Abyssinia, an African nation, sent her armed forces to fight her African neighbour who was fighting against a European colonialist for the freedom of his country, and did so on every expedition throughout the campaign. In every army that was sent out by Abyssinia there was a group of senior British officers to assist Abyssinia accomplish her dastardly task. Letters of appreciation for the services of these British officers were sent to the British Authorities by Emperor Menelik and Ras Makonnen and many were honoured with high decorations by the Abyssinian Emperor.

The occasions of Abyssinian cooperation with the European colonialists in the task of crushing this freedom movement by brutal colonial forces are too many to be enumerated here. The following extract from D. Jardine book will serve as an example to illustrate an occasion when Abyssinia was paid money for shedding the blood of her soldiers to destroy an African people defending their country against colonialism:

«The Abyssinian army of 4,000 mounting men, including many of Menelik's personal troops, was also being mobilised; and the Emperor's

consent was obtained to seven British officers, under Col. Rochfort, accompanying the army, the command of which was entrusted to Fitawrari Gabri. It was decided to reimburse the Emperor's Government for the expense entailed by the expedition, and a sum of £15,000 was remitted to him on this account».

It was only after the deployment of the British Airforce in 1920 that the combined forces of the colonialists namely Britain, Italy and Abyssinia were able to suppress temporarily this armed struggle in which Abyssinia unscrupulously joined forces with the invading European colonial powers.

It was the same airforce namely, the British Royal Airforce which was instrumental in the destruction of Somali nationalist liberation movement that was used in 1941 in the liberation of Ethiopia. Be that as it may the movement has generated an indomitable force which had left in the Somali consciousness a strong sentiment of nationalism and unity which could not be effaced and had acted as a source of inspiration ever since.

At the end of the Second World War when even the British Government felt some pangs of conscience over the indiscriminate partition of the Somali territory by advancing a proposal to the Council of Foreign Ministers of the Four Powers to re-unify most of the Somalis once more and to place them under United Nations Trusteeship (the Bevin Plan), Ethiopia, as expected adamantly opposed the proposal. Instead, Ethiopia submitted a Memorandum to the Peace Conference in Paris (U.N. Doc. No. A/C.1/W.8) in which she indicated to all, her deeply rooted desire to swallow the remaining portion of the Somali territory. In that Memorandum she maintained that:

«Ethiopia (is) the best fitted to administer Eritrea and Somaliland, the inhabitants of which are the same stock....».

When in 1956 the Somali people strongly expressed their opposition to the partition of their territory by sending a delegation to the United Nations, Britain attempted to persuade Ethiopia to return part of the Somali territory, namely Haud and Reserved Area to its rightful owners, Ethiopia however, once more refused to *relinquish her* colonial gains of the Somali territory.

As a result of the struggle for independence and re-unification, Britain was obliged to indicate her intention of meeting the Somali demands

for independence and also revealed a sympathetic attitude towards the ultimate union between the Italian and British Somalilands. As soon as Ethiopia became aware of these plans, the Emperor became furious and immediately set off for the first time to Western Somaliland under Ethiopian colonisation. In a public speech which he delivered in Gabrida-hare (Western Somaliland) on 25th August, 1956, he tried to turn the genuine desire of the Somali people for re-unification to his advantage by claiming that the Somali people were part of the «Great Ethiopian Family». Speaking of the forthcoming independence of Ex-Italian Somaliland, the Emperor said: «We are confident that they will also remember that unity is strength even as the Eritreans recognise... As to rumours of greater Somalia, we consider that all the Somali people are economically linked with all Ethiopia, and therefore, we do not think that such a state can be viable standing alone separated from Ethiopia».

No wonder then that soon after independence, Ethiopia declared a state of emergency throughout the Somali territory under her domination to stifle by force of arms all political expression in the area. Moreover, Ethiopia started to commit a series of acts of aggression which culminated in her full scale attack against the young Republic in 1963-64 as mentioned earlier.

The opposition of Ethiopia to the freedom and unity of the Somali nation can best be illustrated by her attitude towards the question of decolonisation of French Somaliland.

In a BBC broadcast on 28th August, 1966, Emperor Haile Selassie is reported to have said: «if Somalis gave up claiming French Somaliland, Ethiopia will thank God; I would like France to stay in the French Somali coast for ever». This is one more proof of Ethiopia's consistent opposition to Somali liberation even to the extent of lining up with a European colonial power.

In both 1970 and 1972 when Emperor Haile Selassie paid visits to France, the Emperor explained his Government's policy towards the French Somali coast. On both occasions he asserted his Government's desire for the maintenance of the status quo and in the event of French departure expressed the hope that France will hand over this Somali territory to Ethiopia. If anything, these policy statements made it quite clear that in spite of OAU Resolutions calling for the independence of that Somali territory, Ethiopia does not favour the granting to the people of that territory their inalienable right to freedom and independence.

FINAL OBSERVATIONS

In the light of what has been stated above, the following observations appear to be pertinent:

1. That the Ethiopian Empire as we see it today, is of modern making and that as recently as 1880 Abyssinian territory was confined to the Ethiopian highlands.
2. That Ethiopia was, and is, in every sense of the word a coloniser as much as the Europeans, for she actively participated in the scramble for Africa during the last two decades of the 19th Century and even more recently. As illustrated above, Ethiopia collaborated and colluded with European colonialists in secret arrangements in order to dismember the Somali territory and to deny freedom to its people.
3. That Ethiopia opposed and discouraged liberation movements in some neighbouring African territories, and even openly supported the perpetuation of European rule in French Somaliland.
4. That Ethiopia surprisingly prides herself boldly and unashamedly in front of Africa in claiming territories acquired through secret illegal colonial treaties under which, generally speaking, Africa was partitioned and Somalia in particular.
5. That, when even the European colonialists and imperialists had to accept the application of the principle of self-determination to subjected people so that they could decide their political destiny, Ethiopia consistently and adamantly still refuses to apply this principle to Somali people whose territory she had acquired as her share in the colonial partition.
6. That Ethiopia, in pursuance of her expansionist policy, claimed upto a very recent date those parts of the Somali territory not already under her domination including the Somali Democratic Republic.
7. That Ethiopian occupation of Somali territory is without historic justification and is violation of the basic principles of justice and fundamental human rights.

8. That no portion of the Somali territory has ever been under Abyssinian rule before 1887 when by use of force and with the collusion of Europeans, she acquired Harar.
9. That when the Somalis signed Treaties of Protection with European powers it was done for the preservation of their independence. The Protectorate Treaties did not transfer ownership of the land to the Protecting Powers or empower them to give it away to Ethiopia.
10. That the Somalis under Ethiopian domination still live in the same terrain of land as they traditionally lived before the Euro-Abyssinian partition of the Somali territory although in certain areas there has been the forceful removal of Somalis and their replacement by Ethiopian settlers brought there by the Ethiopian Government.
11. That the quest of the Somali people for unity and their struggle against foreign domination, in all its forms, is not a recent development but has always been a continuous trend throughout the history of the Somali nation.
12. That, as amply detailed in the early Chapters, the Somali people, in particular, suffered infinitely during this period and still suffer at the hands of Ethiopia.
13. That Ethiopia has once again amassed her troops on the de facto border. This is part of her plans to provoke incidents as an excuse of her aggression against the Somali Democratic Republic.

CONCLUSIONS

Finally, it should be pointed out that the continued Ethiopian occupation of Somali territory constitutes a threat to the peace and tranquility in the region and may ultimately lead to disastrous consequences if a peaceful and just settlement is not reached. On its part the Somali Democratic Republic has done everything in its power to find a solution for this problem with Ethiopia bilaterally and also within the framework of the OAU in a spirit of understanding and brotherhood.

As stated earlier, the Somali Democratic Republic has in the past years taken numerous initiatives in the pursuit of peace in the area. Unfortunately however, Ethiopia did not cooperate and did not reciprocate these sincere intentions, thereby failing to enter into peaceful negotiation on the territorial dispute. Regrettably, Ethiopia has always been against any move towards the settlement of the dispute either through direct negotiation or alternatively under the auspices of the OAU.

The Somali Democratic Republic as a member State of the OAU is fully committed to the objectives and principles enshrined in the Charter of the OAU. She has on many occasions demonstrated both in words and in deeds its complete adherence and full support for the cause of African unity, peace, justice and freedom. Our conviction in these lofty principles is aimed at preventing the occurrence of injustices and the denial of human rights which today, as happened in the past, constitutes the source of human conflict and tragedies in our contemporary world. The people of our continent have suffered in the past and still suffer because of the denial of these rights. We fought to win these rights for ourselves and we are still fighting to obtain them for many other fellow Africans who live under colonial domination and racial oppression. The Government of the Somali Democratic Republic earnestly believes that the credibility of these convictions will be in very serious doubt if we do not uphold such principles at all times and in all circumstances and, most important of all, if we do not apply this standard to ourselves. An African coloniser of fellow Africans, is no different than a non-African coloniser. If anything, he is worse, more painful, and for that is all the more deserving of our condemnation! It is time that we must come to grips with our real problems ourselves, face up to our internal issues and devise the appropriate solution. Only by following such a course of action, can we fulfil the hopes and aspirations of the African peoples.

In this regard, it should be a source of great satisfaction to all of us that in recent years, the OAU and African statesmen in general have demonstrated that they were equal to the task of adopting a realistic approach towards inter-African conflicts and disputes. This trend culminated in the conciliation that took place in Rabat in June 1972 and the consequent emergence of what was termed as the spirit of Rabat.

Thus, in accordance with the provisions and spirit of the OAU Charter, and in pursuance of our consistent policy of averting bloodshed bet-

ween African brothers and our quest for peace, the Somali Government has placed this issue before the OAU.

The courageous solution of this Ethiopian-Somali Territorial problem will be a living proof of the fact that Africa practices a universal standard of justice and is as firm with a black coloniser as with a white coloniser. It will not establish an inconvenient precedent, either, as there is no other African country that holds the territory of another under identical or parallel conditions.

TREATIES BETWEEN BRITAIN AND SOMALIS 1884-1885

We, the undersigned elders of (clan inserted here), are desirous of entering into an agreement with the British Government for the maintenance of our independence, the preservation of order and other good and sufficient reasons.

Now it is hereby agreed and convenanted as follows:

Article I

The (clan inserted here) do hereby declare that they are pledged and bound never to cede, sell, mortgage or otherwise give for occupation, save bound never to cede, sell, mortgage or otherwise give for occupation to the British Government, any portion of the territory presently inhabited by them or being under their control.

Article II

All vessels under the British flag shall have free permission to trade at all ports and places within the territories of the (clan inserted here).

Article III

All British subjects, residing in, or visiting, the territories of the (clan inserted here), shall enjoy perfect safety and protection and shall be entitled to travel all over the said limits under the safe conduct of the elders of the (clan).

Article IV

The traffic in slaves throughout the territories of the (clan inserted here) shall cease for ever, and the Commander of any Her Majesty's vessels, or any other British officer duly authorised, shall have the power of requiring the surrender of any slave and of supporting the demand by force of arms by land and sea.

Article V.

The British Government shall have the power to appoint an agent or agents to reside in the territories of the (clan inserted here), and every such agent shall be treated with respect and consideration and be entitled to have for his protection such guard as the British Government deem sufficient.

The above-written treaty shall come into force and have effect from the date of signing this agreement.

In token of the conclusion of this lawful and honourable bond (names of elders inserted here).

and

(name of Assistant Political Resident inserted here together with witnesses) and the latter on behalf of the British Government to each and all in the presence of witnesses affix their signautre, marks, or seals at (place inserted her) on the (date inserted here).

SUPPLEMENTARY GENERAL TREATY, 1886. (BETWEEN BRITAIN AND SOMALI CLANS).

(Clans inserted here).

The British Government and the elders of (clan inserted here) who have signed this agreement being desirous of maintaining and strengthening the relations of peace and friendship existing between them:

The British Government have named and appointed Major Frederick Meycer Hunter, C.S.I., Political Agent for the Somali Coast, to conclude a treaty for this purpose.

The said Major Frederick Mercer Hunter and the said elders of the (clan inserted here) have agreed upon and concluded the following article:

Article I

The British Government, in compliance with the wish of the undersigned elders of (clan inserted here) hereby undertake to extend to

them and to the territories under their authority and jurisdiction the gracious favour and protection of Her Majesty the Queen-Empress.

Article II

The said elders of (clan inserted here) agree and promise to refrain from entering into any correspondence agreement or treaty with any foreing nation, or power except with the knowledge and sanction of Her Majesty's Government.

Article III

This treaty shall come into operation upon the first day of February One Thousand Eight Hundred and Eight-Six.

(Signed F. M. HUNTER, Major,
Political Agent, Somali Coast

(The names of elders inserted here).

AGREEMENT SIGNED BY AHMED MUGAN, CHIEF OF THE OGA-
DEN SOMALIS PLACING HIS COUNTRY UNDER BRITISH
PROTECTION, 1st SEPTEMBER 1896.

I, Ahmed Murgan, the Chief of the Ogaden Somalis, do hereby place myself, my people, and country, with its dependence, under the protection of Her Britannic Majesty the Queen, and do hereby declare that I will not, nor shall my successors or any of my people, cede or alienate any portion of my territories or dependencies, or make any Treaties with any foreign State or person, without the previous knowledge and sanc-

tion of Her Majesty's Government.

Commercial arrangements between me and non-natives shall be subject to the approval of Her Majesty's Representative, who shall regulate all disputes, and by whose advice I will be guided in all my relations with non-natives.

(Signature in Arabic)

Witnesses:

(Signature in Arabic).

TREATY OF FRIENDSHIP AND PROTECTION BETWEEN FRAN-
CE AND THE CHIEFS OF THE ISSA SOMALIS, OBOCK, 26th
MARCH, 1885.

Between M. Lagarde (A.M.J.L.), Governor of the Colony of Obock, acting in the name of the French Government, and the Issa Chiefs hereinafter defined:

Absi Handet, Robbe' Tonk, Bare Ali, Béder Gue'di, Gue'di Dagah, Dirane' Dedis, Roble' Gue'le', Hassan Gue'di, Gue'di Robble', Moussa Seid, Mahe'rame' Egue', Ouacis Gardadoub, Gue'di Hersi, Ghe're' Djilebour, Allale' Ouacis, Assobi Bonis, Oure' Bare', Ouacis Gouled, Bouhe Derrer, who control the territory extending from Gubbet Kharak and beyond Ambaddo, near Zeylah, the following Treaty has been signed:

Art. I — There shall henceforth be eternal friendship between France and the Chiefs of the Issa.

Art. II — The Chief of the Issa hand over their country to France that she may protect it against all foreigners.

Art. III — The French Government undertakes to facilitate commerce on the coast and especially at Ambaddo.

Art. IV — The Issa Chiefs undertake to assist France at all times and to sign no Treaty nor conclude any Agreement, under penalty of nullity, without the consent of the Governor of Obock.

Done at Obock, the 26th March, 1885.

Governor of the Colony.

(Sigd.) LAGARDE,

(Marks of the Issa Chiefs).

APPENDIX A (4)

TREATY OF PROTECTION BETWEEN ITALY AND THE SULTAN
OF THE MIGERTINI (MAJERTAYN SOMALIS) SIGNED AT
BENDER ALULA, 7th APRIL, 1889.

On this 6th day of the month of Shaban, 1306, corresponding to the
7th day of April, 1889.

We, Sultan Osman Mohamoud Yusuf, Sultan of all the Migertini,
have of our own free will put to this Act our hand and seal.

We have placed our country and all our possessions, from Ras Auad
to Ral-El-Kyle (Uadi-Nogal being the farthest limit) under the protection
and government of His Majesty's ship Rapido; and Captain Porcelli,
Commanding His Majesty's ship Staffeta.

We declare that we will not make Treaties or Contracts with any
other Governments or persons.

We declare besides, that we will present as far as we are able, all
unjust acts directed against Italian subjects and their friends in all pos-
sessions.

We have signed this Act of our own free will and full understand-
ing, and this which we have signed will remain binding upon us, our
heirs, brothers, subjects, and their descendants.

We adopted our signatures and seals to this Act in the full posses-
sion of our faculties of mind and body.

Given at Bender Alula, this 6th of the month of Shaban, 1306 (7th
April, 1889.

V. Pilonard, His
Italian Majesty's Consul.

(L. S.) OSMAN MOHAMOUD YUSUF
Sultan of the Migertini

Carlo Amoretti, Capt. of Frigate.
Giuseppe Porcelli, Capt. of Frigate.

(L. S.) YUSUF ALI YUSUF
Sultan of Obbia

APPENDIX B (1)

PETITION FROM THE ISSA SOMALIS

Dated 22nd Jan. 1948.

To:
The Four Powers Commission of Investigation,
MOGADISHU, Somalia.

We, the Issa people, are cut up and divided among three sover-
ign powers — Ethiopia, France and Great Britain. Our grazing and
water rights within the areas held by these powers are covered and pro-
vided for under Treaties. We now realise, that our economic life cannot
improve and we cannot advance socially, or politically whilst we are
broken up by three de facto frontiers; and as long as we remain separa-
ted from the other members of our race.

We are Somalis and share the same language and religion with
other Somalis. We inter-marry freely and have the same mode of life.
It is our firm desire to be joined to the other Somalilands. We are con-
vinced that our present state is ruinous to our future and welfare. We
can form a geographical and racial entity only with a United Somali-
land.

Today after sixty years occupation, the Issa Somalis in British Soma-
liland and French Somaliland have no improvements to show in devel-
opment, education or economic well-being. As to the Ethiopian Govern-
ment, the Amharas despise us as Muslim, they exercise their authority
with a very harsh hand, they deny us freedom of speech. No attention
is paid to our grievances.

There has been no expenditure on our education or welfare. We
have no voice in the Government. We are in the position of a backward
people subject to a backward «alien» Government which has no sympa-
thy for us and wishes to keep us for ever subordinate to them. The
rulers have no racial, cultural or religious affinity with us. We do not
even speak the same language.

It is our considered and confirmed resolve to be united with our
brother Somalis under the protection and guidance of a Government
which can develop our country and give us the modern education and
training necessary until we can take over the administration of our
country.

Harar is an integral part of our territory. It is an important economic and commercial link between the Somalis of the west. As Harar is an important economic unit in our territory we desire its incorporation into a Great Somaliland as such an incorporation is absolutely essential.

We, the undersigned, Sultan Chiefs and Sheikhs of the Issa Somalis do hereby solemnly submit this petition and affix our signatures and marks thereto.

1. Ugas Hassan Hersi, Sultan of the Issa.
2. Adan Kawale
3. Haji Ismail Nur
4. Haji Ismail Awaleh
5. Ali Abubakar
6. Hussein Osman
7. Ahmed Gait
8. Haji Abdi Ali
9. Bulali Ainansh
10. Omar Galeh
11. Alawi Kamif Aqi
12. Ali Bore
13. Kadi Donale Issa
14. Haji Jumali Ibrahim
15. Abdulla Gadid.

*PETITION FOR AMALGAMATION FROM THE JIGJIGA AREA,
WITH THE OTHER SOMALI TERRITORIES.*

Muqdishu, 22nd Jan. 1948

To:

*The Four Powers Commission of Investigation
MOGADISHU, Somalia.*

We the undersigned Sultans, Chiefs and Sheikhs from the Jigjiga area do hereby declare that we want to be united with our brother Somalis. We are bounded on every side by Somalis. Some of our people today are in the unhappy position of being under the jurisdiction of three Powers, each having a part of it. We have the control of supplies regulations and restrictions of at least Two powers. We are subject to Custom Dues on every side in addition to Frontier Dues. The currency of one area is not negotiable in the other area. As we are portion only of the population of each territory no Government considers it worthwhile to spend money or energy on the development or education of our people. We are therefore in the unhappy position of being under the authority of all but the responsibility of none. The greater proportion of our people are in the territory under Ethiopia. It is we Somalis who lived and settled in this territory for centuries and the right of occupation of the Somalis to these areas are covered and safeguarded by Treaties between the Powers We are no longer content to be nominal Ethiopians.

We are over taxed hounded by the Police denied education suitable for Muslem people, restricted and hampered in trade, refused liberty of word and press, and kept out of all important executive posts.

We have been grouped with Ethiopia for a sufficient length of time for its rulers to adjust themselves to the realities of present day life and work out a sensible solution whereby we could live together harmoniously as member of the same Empire. They have selected to ignore our rights and treat us as vassals of a backward Government. We are not prepared to accept this.

We have come to the final conclusion that it is time the present state of affairs was ended and we make this earnest request to be added to our brother Somalis to form a United Somaliland. In this is centred our aspirations. This forced division under which we exist is denying us the right of normal development as a nation. We can have no satisfaction in a life without future. We are asking for the restoration of our birth-right and the preservation of our culture. We can obtain this only by the amalgamation of the Somalilands.

1. SULTAN HASSAN SHEIKH ISMAIL

2. UGAS DUD UGAS ROBLE

Signed:

*THE OGADEN PETITION FOR AMALGAMATION WITH THE
OTHER SOMALI TERRITORIES.*

Mogadishu, 22nd January, 1948

To:

*The Four Powers Commission of Investigation,
MOGADISHU, Somalia.*

We, the undersigned Sultans' Chiefs and Sheiks who are hereditary authorities of the Ogaden Somalis, submit his petition to Your Excellencies, with due respect, for careful and sympathetic consideration.

The territory occupied by our people has been Somali territory from time immemorial. It is the geographical centre of the Somalilands.

The international division which groups us with Ethiopia is artificial and impracticable. Our connection with Imperial Ethiopian Government is purely nominal and cannot be justified on any grounds. On the contrary there is every reason to justify why the Ogaden should not be part of Ethiopia.

- (a) The Ogaden is not an integral part of Ethiopia. It is a territory which the Ethiopians have conquered by invasion half a century ago and over which it can exercise authority only by the use of considerable armed forces.
- (b) The Ethiouians dislike the Somali Muslim, treat them as «out-siders».
- (c) Ethiopia is not in a position to develop our country.
- (d) We do not want to be under Ethiopian Government. As we have no voice in their Government and know that it is hostile to the Somali Muslem. We have no confidence in their administration or justice.
- (e) Our country has never been effectively occupied by the Ethiopian Government.

We now want that our country be united to the other Somali territories to form one administrative, political and economic unit. We want freedom from frontier restrictions which are the worst causes of raids and feuds between tribes. We want to be united into one country so that we shall be able to exercise the right to form a Somali nation, instead of being parcelled up into unrecognisable bits. We wish to have a Government which can develop our country and train us to run it.

We and the other Somalis of the neighbouring territories are one in race, religion, language, culture, mode of living and geography. We inter-marry freely and are therefore inter-related. Our economic interests and political outlook are the same. We are one in family and we want to be allowed to live together as one.

Signed:

1. Ugas Mohamed Ugas Hashi
2. Garad Makhtal Garad Dahir
3. Ugas Mohamed Ugas Sigal
4. Ugas Abdullahi Ugas Yassin
5. Ugas Hassan Da'is
6. Mukhtar Ugas Mohamed
7. Sheikh Ahmed Nur
8. Sheikh Mohamed Haji Hussein
9. Hassan Sheikh Abdulla
10. Dulane Sultan Raffleh
11. Sheikh Adan Warsame
12. Sheikh Ali Sufi.

ALL SOMALI CONFERENCE

1st February, 1948.

The following resolution was passed and forwarded to the Secretary General of the United Nations Organization by the All Somali Conference held in Mogadishu on the future of the Somali nation. The resolution which was unanimously adopted by all the Somali Delegations who participated in the ALL SOMALI CONFERENCE is as follows:

Whereas we, the undersigned Somali Sultans, members of the SOMALI YOUTH LEAGUE, Central Committee and deputations from various parts of the Somali territories stated under have held an ALL SOMALI CONFERENCE at Mogadishu on 1st February, 1948, where it has been unanimously decided to address the following petition to the United Nations Assembly.

That as we Somalis are all Muslem of the same race and language and have the same mode of living and culture, and are all known by the same name «Somali» and number only four million, who do hereby resolve that it is against the true interests of our people to remain separately by de facto frontiers; that in as much we have the natural urge for national self-determination and for the preservation of human right, we wish to live as one with our brother Somalis; that we do hereby record the deeply-rooted desire of the Somali peoples that all the Somali territories, namely Ex-Italian Somaliland, French Somaliland, N.F.D. (Northern Frontier District of Kenya), British Somaliland and Ethiopian Somaliland be united into one political, administrative, cultural and economic unit.

We earnestly appeal for the sympathy and support of the United Nations to help us to put an end to the unnatural situation of one race being divided by external influences into five enclosures against its true interests and welfare.

We are Sir,

1. Ugas Mohamed Ugas Hashi
2. Ugas Abdullahi Ugas Casin

3. Ugas Hassan Di'is
 4. Mukhtar Ugas Mohamed Ugas Omar
 5. Sheikh Ahmed Noor Sh. Yusuf
 7. Garad Makhtal Garad Dahir
 8. Dulaneh Sultan Rafleh — Representating the Ogaden.
-
1. Sultan Hassan Sheikh Ismail and
 2. Sultan Dudj Ugas Rabileh — Representing the Reserved Area.
1. Sultan Abdullahi Sultan Deria, and
 2. Sultan Mohamed Sultan Farah — Representing British Somaliland.

*RESOLUTION OF THE ALL AFRICAN PEOPLES' CONFERENCES:
1958 and 1960.*

(1) First All African Peoples' Conference, Accra, 5-13 December, 1958 Resolution on Frontiers, Boundaries, and Federation:

Whereas artificial barriers and frontiers drawn by imperialists to divide African people operate to the detriment of Africans and should therefore be abolished or adjusted.

Whereas frontiers which cut across ethnic groups or divide people of the same stock are unnatural and are not conducive to peace or stability.

Whereas leaders of neighbouring countries should co-operate towards a permanent solution of such problems which accords with the best interests of the people affected and enhances the prospects of realisation of the ideal of a Pan-African Commonwealth of Free States.

Whereas the 20th February, 1959 will be an important date in the history of the Cameroons, when a special Session of the United Nations General Assembly will discuss the question of unification and independence of the territory.

Be it resolved and it is hereby resolved by the All African Peoples' Conference that the Conference:

- (a) Denounces artificial frontiers drawn by imperialist Powers to divide the peoples of Africa, particularly those which cut across ethnic groups and divide people of the same stock;
- (b) Calls for the abolition or adjustment of such frontier at an early date to this problem founded upon the true wishes of the people;
- (c) Calls upon the Independent States of Africa to support a permanent solution;
- (d) Notes with satisfaction that a special Session of the United Nations General Assembly will discuss the question of unification and independence of the Cameroons on the 20th February, 1959;

- (e) Invites all Africans to observe that date as Cameroons Day.
- (2) Second All African Peoples' Conference, Tunis, 25-30 January, 1960 Resolution on Somaliland:

The Conference, after a carefull survey of the situation in Somaliland artificially divided,

- (a) Denounces the colonial repression which is dealt with in this country;
- (b) Hails and supports the struggle of the people of Somaliland for indepedence and unity in order to give birth to a bigger Somaliland;
- (c) Requests the immediate liberation of detained patriots.

EFFORTS OF THE SOMALI DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC FOR PEACEFUL UNITY.

In the first pronouncement on 21st October, 1969, the Government of the Somali Democratic Republic referred to this long standing dispute and expressed its ardent hope that it will be finalised in a responsible manner and in a spirit of African brotherhood.

In June 1970, the President of the Supreme Revolutionary Council, Maj-Gen. Mohamed Siyad Barre sent our Fereign Secretary, Jaalle Omar Arteh Ghalib to Addis Ababa with a special message to His Imperial Majesty Haile Selassie I concerning the need to finalise our dispute.

On 1st July, 1970 the President of SRC had the following to say in his address to the nation, «We in the S. D. R. do not intend to kindle the fire of destruction in the Horn of Africa. We have heard, and some of us have seen the effects and repercussions of war, which twice struck this world and left behind untold sorrow and suffering. What we intend to do is to press for a peaceful and amicable settlement of all disputes which engulf us and our neighbours, and which sow the seeds of suspicion and hatred between the peoples and governments of our part of the world. If these perennial and thorny problems are solved, the efforts of all States concerned will be concentrated on the eradication of the arch enemies of mankind - disease, ignorance and poverty, and on the economic and social betterment of our peoples.

We shall no longer content ourselves with diplomatic and hypocritical statement to our neighbours. We shall bring to the round-table Conference concrete and bold proposals that touch the crux of our disputes with our neighbours, aimed at creating prosperity, progress and everlasting peace in the Horn of Africa».

In June 1971, the President of the S.R.C. went to Addis Ababa himself partly to participate in the OAU Summit Conference and partly to continue our negotiations with Emperor Haile Selassie I with a view that lasting peace may prevail in the region.

In October 1971, the President of the SRC, Maj. Gen. Mohamed Siad Barre invited Emperor Haile Selassie I to participate in the East

and the Central States Conference in Mogadishu. During his sojourn in Mogadishu, we had another round of talks on this important issue. The visit of Emperor Haile Selassie I to Mogadishu was a historical one because before the Revolution, it was unthinkable for him to set foot on the soil of the Somali Democratic Republic since such a venture was a great risk to his security. Contrary to such apprehensions, however, Emperor Haile Selassie I did arrive in Mogadishu and had a warm and sincere welcome while great hopes were placed in the President of SRC and in the Emperor to find a just solution to this chronic problem which is haunting the present generations of our people and will create great insecurity and distress to posterity.

In May 1972, the President of SRC, Maj. Gen. Mohamed Siad Barre dispatched a special message with an envoy in the person of Dr. Mohamed Adan Sheikh, Secretary of State for Health who held important discussions with Emperor Haile Selassie I in continuation of the previous conversations.

In June 1972, the President of SRC, met His Imperial Majesty in Rabat where they discussed again the best ways and means of solving the territorial dispute between Somalia and Ethiopia.

In December 1972, the President of SRC, Maj-General Mohamed Siyad Barre once again entrusted our Foreign Minister, Jaalle Omar Arteh Ghalib with the task of conveying a special message to Emperor Haile Selassie I to continue the negotiations initiated since 1969 on ways and means of reducing tension with a view to peacefully settling the territorial dispute.

As a result of the various missions made by Somali personalities to Addis Ababa, the Ethiopian Foreign Minister arrived in Mogadishu in December 1972, to continue the negotiations. It is regrettable to report here that no concrete results had been achieved.

Again in February 1973, the President of SRC, Maj-General Mohamed Siyad Barre have decided once again to send our Foreign Minister, Jaalle Omar Arteh Ghalib to Addis Ababa with another message concerning the rising tension between the two countries created by concentration of Ethiopian troops near the de facto border and other military provocations.

In this connection, an extract from the message of the President of the Supreme Revolutionary Council to the Emperor may be quoted:

1) «Aware of human frailty and vanity of man which may some times hold the tongues of brave men and thereby prevent them from taking actions dictated by the realities of a situation, I have decided not to be persuaded by such vain considerations for I am convinced that there is no braver act nor is there a prouder stand than to seek peace and prevent war». — December, 1972.

2) «We have a duty towards the present generations so that they may be totally free. We have also an obligation towards the future generations so that they may enjoy the fruits of what we achieve in our tasks for their future progress and prosperity. We should never be pushed by those who do not value the special responsibility placed on our shoulders by millions of Africans still languishing under colonial and racial subjugation. We should never be outwitted by the imperialists who are craving to see us quarrel, weak and dis-united». — February, 1973.



M