

Dynamics of Conflict Management and Peace Building in Sudan

Odo Samuel Ituma and Chinedu O. Ebonyi

Department of Political Science, Ebonyi State University, Abakaliki, Nigeria

Abstract: This study examines the dynamics of conflict management and peace building in Sudan conflicts. It investigates the dynamics of Sudan conflicts; the nature of post conflict peace building in Sudan; It assessed the Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) 2005; and the roles of international communities in Sudan peace building. The author argues that Sudan inherited from colonial master highly centralized authoritarian governance and an uneven pattern of regional development and discrimination of south and north. The conflicts reflect the long standing economic disparities, political exclusion, social and cultural deprivation in the distribution of political and economic power between the centre and the peripheries.

Key words: Dynamics • Conflict • Peace • Sudan

INTRODUCTION

The great numbers of contemporary armed conflicts in Africa are characterized by ethnic, religious and cultural dynamics and underlying social, political and economic undertone. [1] looked at such conflicts as inevitable barbarian struggles between groups that cannot coexist due to their ancestral and primordial ethnic, religious or cultural differences. In same view [2] argued that, “Differences in perceived interests, values and needs are perhaps the most basic elements in the motivations behind social conflict and inter-groups conflict often represents different ways of life and ideologies with implications for incongruent views about relationships with others. He notes that feelings of injustice emerge from the suppression of inherent social needs and values that have existential meanings and which cannot be compromised. He further argued that inter- group relations are constrained by a superimposed political structure in addition to their own internal dynamics and thus the analysis of social conflict needs to focus on how group processes are linked to structural conditions such as oppressive social relations and exploitative economic systems”.

In this view, the result has been the creation of the conditions for the emergence of ‘new civil wars’ for instance the two worst outbreaks of massive violence in the 1990s – Angola in 1993 and Rwanda in 1994, in both cases, the death and destruction were so high, also the first civil war in Sudan was a struggle to free Southern

Sudan from the Islamic Northern part and lasted from 1955-1972. Between 750, 000 and 1, 500, 000 Southern Sudanese died in this war and Sudan's second civil war started on May 16th, 1983. This civil war was largely about the desire on the part of the northern Sudanese to impose Islamic (Sharia) law on the entire country. Even though most of the people in the northern part of Sudan are Arab Muslims, Arab Muslims make up only around 33% of the total population of Sudan. In that civil war more than 2 million Sudanese Christians who lived in the south of Sudan were killed [1].

Also the outbreak of armed conflicts in Darfur when the government authorities in Khartoum were preoccupied with negotiations with the Sudan People’s Liberation Movement (SPLM/A) in the South added another front of internal contestation for the Government of Sudan (GoS). Johnny (2012) noted that the outbreak in early 2003 of armed hostilities between the government’s Sudan Armed Forces (SAF), also supported by the militia group called the Janjawiid and some of the indigenous rebel groups such as the Sudan Liberation Movement/Army (SLM/A) and the Justice and Equality Movement (JEM) and further including a plethora of other smaller groups, led to thousands of deaths and the creation of a massive humanitarian crisis in the region.

The war was largely on an uneven pattern of regional development and discrimination of South and North, political power dominations, imposition of Islamic religion, struggling over meagre and dwindling natural resources and marginalization of South by the north that controlled

central government which continued until an interim peace agreement was negotiated and signed in 2005. This landmark achievement of January 2005, was after the two devastating civil war, as the Sudanese central government in Khartoum and the Sudan People's Liberation Army in the south signed a historic Comprehensive Peace Agreement and was followed by the adoption of an Interim Constitution which brought peace to most part of the country for the first time.

In recognizing the importance of these landmark achievement, the task of peacebuilding and response to violent on long-lasting internal conflicts in Sudan, this paper critically analyse and evaluate the dynamics of Sudan conflicts, nature of post conflict peacebuilding in Sudan, assessment of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) of 2005, the roles of international communities in Sudan peacebuilding and the status of crises in the newest sovereign state of south Sudan. These factors discussed gave insight on dynamics of conflict management and peacebuilding in Africa, appraising Sudan conflicts.

Dynamics of Sudan Conflicts: The entity "Sudan" can be traced back to biblical times when it was known as "Cush," the Republic of the Sudan got its name from the word "Bilaad-el-sud" which in the Aramaic means "Country of the Blacks." In 450AD Christianity spread through Northern Sudan and the religion flourished there for about 1,000 years. Meanwhile, in about 700AD, Arab invaders invaded the land and spread Islam. In 1820 a second Islamic expansion occurred and Sudan became a country full of cruelty and inhumanity. The Sudanese were taken as slaves and were called, "black gold." Finally, the British and the Egyptians sent troops to Sudan to stop the slavery and separated Northern and Southern Sudan. (www.Savedarfur.org).

Northern Sudan was populated by people who practiced Islam, while Southern Sudan became rich in African culture and Christianity. In 1947, however, the British decided that Northern and Southern Sudan should unite to become one country. The British amalgamation of Northern and Southern Sudan, people with different, especially religion, culture and so on was seen as big mistake which led to the first civil war in Sudan in 1955. From colonial to independence, Sudan had experienced chronic political instability and armed conflicts. The first civil war in Sudan was a struggle to free Southern Sudan from the Islamic Northern part and lasted from 1955-1972. [4], concurred that the history of recent violent conflict in

Sudan goes back to the August 1955 mutiny by the Torit Garrison (headquarters of the army's Equatorial corps in Southern Sudan). This mutiny was as a result of discontent and disappointment over the Sudanization process dominated by the Northern Arab-Islamic elites in the centre who dominated the civil service, the army and the police. He argued that apart from Southerners perceived this as Northern domination and colonization there were other groups in marginalized regions in both Northern and Southern Sudan, namely: the Beja Congress formed in 1958 to advocate for the marginalized Beja region in Eastern Sudan, the October 1964 uprising against the military regime of General Aboud, led by professional associations and trade unions, the Darfur Development Front, the General Union of the Nuba Mountains and the North and South Blue Nile Unions, all joined forces in a common Sudan Rural Solidarity Party against political, economic and cultural marginalization.

In the same view, [1] notes that throughout Sudanese history, several groups have been repeatedly and systematically excluded from the social, economic, cultural and political life of the country, a trend that was perpetuated and reshaped since the colonial periods in the nineteenth and twentieth century and that continued after independence in 1956. Synchronising the views [5] agreed that Sudan is a clearly heterogeneous territory, structured ethnically – 52 percent Blacks, 39 percent Arabs, 6 percent Beja, 2 percent foreigners, others 1 percent- and religiously- 70 percent Sunit Muslims, 25 percent Animist, 5 percent Christians. These ethnic and religious divisions are also very well reflected geographically: Muslim Arabs situated predominantly in the North and African Christians and other traditional religious mainly located in the South.

Given this diversity, the historical roots of the conflict between the Northern and Southern Sudan have often been misrepresented. [6] argued that the superficial and primordial interpretations and explanations based on the primary role of ethnicity and religion caused second civil war which started on May 16th, 1983 in response to the Nimeiri regime's unilateral re-division of the South into three regions, a violation of the Addis Ababa Agreement, concluded between the military regime in its leftist phase and the rebel movement, the South Sudan Liberation Movement in February 4th 1972. The second civil war largely because of the desire on the part of the Northern Sudanese to impose Islamic (Sharia) law on the entire country and the civil war claimed more than 2 million Southern Sudanese Christians lives.

The protracted conflict in the Darfur region, which is in the western part of Sudan, continues to create an unstable and volatile geo-political architecture. The outbreak in early 2003 of armed hostilities between the government's Sudan Armed Forces (SAF), also supported by the militia group called the Janjawiid and some of the indigenous rebel groups such as the Sudan Liberation Movement/Army (SLM/A) and the Justice and Equality Movement (JEM) and further including a plethora of other smaller groups, led to thousands of deaths and the creation of a massive humanitarian crisis in the region.

Beyond what had been considered as a war between Muslims and Christians in Sudan, was the dynamics widening struggles at the centre which characterized by diverse violent changes because of the extraordinary diversity of the ethnic chronic political power struggle to occupy central governments and a vicious politics that made the conflict very difficult to handle throughout Sudan for decades.

In fact, the deep structural imbalance was one of the most known causes of the Sudanese North-South conflict. The intractability in conflicts of the imbalance made the conflicts resolution and peace building especially since independence, obscure the much more complex dynamics as the inequalities have sustained and reproduced conflict. The deep socio-economic and political inequalities end up reproducing and perpetuating more invisible and complex fragile groups.

[1] affirms that peacemaking in Sudan, rather than being based on complementary and coordinated processes that promote the inclusion of a full range of groups in the Sudanese society, has served divisiveness, based on the government's 'sequencing policy' of tackling 'rebellions' piece by piece and armed groups' failure to look beyond their own factional interests and commit to a national democratic project. He further notes that in a post-independent South Sudan scenario, the situation is aggravated by a considerable level of uncertainty related to the political and economic viability of a territory, despite its richness in fundamental resources for development (oil, in particular), lacks not only the necessary infrastructures to explore and potentiate them, but also a strong government capable of dealing with the various internal, regional and external pressures that have helped perpetuate inequalities and uneven growth. These structural problems in the South are reinforced since both parties have not yet been able to resolve their dispute over oil transit fees despite efforts made by various external and regional actors, such as the African Union [7].

Consolidating the fragile multiple groups identities both in the North and in the South even in secession and independence, the widening gap of inequality, the violence and tension as groups feel continuing marginalization and neglect and the challenges in managing oil resources, require sustainable and durable post peace building and management.

The Nature of Post Conflict Peace Building in Sudan:

The prolonged violent conflicts in Sudan reflect the lingering political exclusion, economic disparities and social-cultural deprivation in the allocation of governance between the centre and the peripheries. According to [4], Sudan inherited from colonialism a highly centralized authoritarian governance system and an uneven pattern of regional development. These structural elements shaped the later evolution of the modern Sudanese state and contributed to the marginalization of the peripheries, especially in the South. He notes that both factors are mutually reinforcing, since in authoritarian systems economic and social development is often dependent on political leverage and access to political power.

The intractability of these violent conflicts made all the conventional mechanisms to address the conflicts and its underlying dynamics drive to sustain till 2005. Sudan conflict was one of the third party mediated peacebuilding and self-enforcing peacebuilding models. The longest and highly violent armed conflicts in Africa was formally brought to an end as Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) was signed between the Government of Sudan (GoS) and the Sudan People's Liberation Movement/Army (SPLM/A) on the 9th January of 2005.

The fit was achieved by the self-enforcing peacemaking and with the help of international actors such as the AU, UN, EU and USA who applied significant pressure on both the GoS and the SPLM/A to reach a conflict settlement in January 2005. Moreover, the peace agreement would probably not have been signed without the concerted efforts of the regional governments group known as IGAD and other international actors who Partners with IGAD. The Friends of the IGAD Group was transformed and renamed the IGAD Partner's Forum (IPF) and was expanded in 1998 to incorporate a wide range of states, including Egypt and UN agencies.

In 1999, IGAD Secretariat for the peace process was established this was the beginning of continuous and sustained mediation efforts between the two parties. The fruits of this process were the Machakos Protocol of July 2002 and the Naivasha Agreement. The IGAD played a supervisory role through the evaluation commission

which was established by the Presidency, while the United Nations Mission in Sudan (UNMIS) has the mandate to monitor the implementation of the peace process. The United Nations Mission in Sudan (UNMIS) operating within the overall UN goal of achieving peace, development and human rights for all, the United Nations Mission in Sudan (UNMIS) is the latest element in the UN system in Sudan and was established by Security Council Resolution 1590 of 24 March 2005, under Chapter VI of the UN Charter, as a peacekeeping mission and lead agency for all UN agencies in Sudan [4].

Their mandate comprises also human rights- and democracy monitoring. They were active in all parts of the country and monitored the activities at different levels and parts and were also involved in awareness raising and education activities with parliamentarians, politicians and activists using workshops and seminars on peace building and human rights.

[1], added that the African Union (AU) played an important role as a facilitator in the negotiations between the GoS and the armed opposition in Darfur. He said that ceasefire agreement was signed in 2004 in N'djamena and the AU deployed troops to monitor the ceasefire and also UNMIS participated in the AU mediated Abuja peace talks which led to AU, signed Declaration of Principles (DOP) on 5th June 2005 and EU also supported AU logistically. The extent of EU donated 400 million Euros for the Sudan through the European Development Fund (EDF) to the African Peace Facility (APF).

Consequently, the sustenance of post conflict agreement and peacebuilding plans in Sudan was carried out by the Joint Assessment Mission (JAM). The JAM which composed of representatives from the government and SPLM/A, with the support of the World Bank and the UNDP worked for 14 months since 2003 they assessed the reconstruction and development needs of Sudan within the interim period, Multi Donors Trust Funds (MDTF) handled North Sudanese project while South Sudan was administered by the World Bank. Also many activities of international civil society organizations (CSOs) have to be mentioned such as the workshops of the Max Planck Institute of International Law on constitutional arrangements before and after the signing of the CPA, meetings of the African Renaissance Institute and the International Relations Institution, the Civil Society for Peace Initiative of the Friedrich Ebert Foundation (FES), the Civic Society Forum and Justice for Africa in London, including Southern civil society groups and some international NGOs which created networks at the grass roots level in Juba. The Juba Network is known as Sudan Relief and Rehabilitation Commission (SRRC).

The processes establish a civil administration in the liberated areas and also the traditional civil society structures such as the traditional courts operated. The New Sudan Council of Churches (NSCC) successfully used the traditional processes for conflict resolution in the People to People Peace Process that resolved the long standing feuds between the Nuer and Dinka tribes in both Bahr el Ghazal and Upper Nile regions, involving traditional leaders, [4]. noted that Peacebuilding activities at grassroots level, involved traditional mechanisms of conflict resolution, were launched all over the country, but on a rather limited scale. He further notes that in West Darfur some community based peace initiatives, such as those led by tribal leaders, were launched in January 2005 and the initiatives were meant to address three main areas: (1) conflict resolution through maintenance of peace and law and order in the affected villages/communities, (2) civic education and (3) awareness. All the three initiatives aimed to promote community involvement to achieve peace and security through monitoring events and providing reliable channels of information and building confidence, to reduce uncertainty, improve communication and defuse alleged violations. The international societies, churches and civil society were very active in promoting reconciliation initiatives of varying depth and duration.

Assessment of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) 2005: The mandate to achieve peace and sustainable development in Sudan was the main goal of UN and the African Union and other international agencies which came to light on 9th January 2005 when the Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) was signed between the Government of Sudan (GoS) and the Sudan People's Liberation Movement/Army (SPLM/A). Berghof (2006) point out that the CPA brought an end to the war and bloodshed, thus offering an opportunity to re-draw the power structure and achieve the much sought peace, justice and sustainable development as the agreement attempts to deal with the root causes of the conflict, especially those related to the system of governance by ensuring the right of self-determination for the South together with separation of religion from the state, preceded by self government and by devolving more powers to the states in Northern Sudan. He further notes, that the two co-signatories have declared their full commitment towards implementation of the CPA, indicating their commitment to radically altering the political, economic and social landscape of the country and the CPA brought about fundamental changes in

traditional power structures to accommodate the new alignment of power signalled which primarily benefited the NCP and SPLM/A and other political forces as well.

The negotiation between North and South Sudan started in Nairobi, Kenya in January 2000. The Government of Sudan and the Sudanese People's Liberation Movement (SPLM) had reached critical stages and had made significant strides after experiencing major obstacles. The negotiation in Naivasha, Kenya recorded success that led to the signing of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement on 9 January 2005. [6] argued that CPA included a number of protocols which were earlier concluded and signed and which inter alia set up a framework on matters related to peace, transitional arrangements, referendums, self-determination, security arrangements, wealth sharing, power sharing, status of civil servants and resolution of conflicts in Abyei, South Kordofan and Blue Nile States. The outstanding matters concluded and agreed on, in January 2005 related to the integration of the SPLA into the national army, permanent cessation of hostilities and the modalities for the implementation of the peace agreement.

While [3] viewed the very content and substance of the CPA, as a general agreement, meant that it inevitably compelled the government to treat all Sudanese conflicts as whole. Focus on such issues as wealth-sharing, fiscal federalism, power-sharing, security arrangements were also central to the aspirations of Sudanese. The CPA, when it was signed, put more attention on the GoS and the SPLM/A. Khartoum viewed the North-South issue as the defining step in resolving the grievances in Sudan.

According to Williams [4]: It is significant that the rebellion in Darfur coincided with the time that the transitional areas (Abyei, Blue Nile State and Nuba Mountains) were first put on the Agenda in the Machakos/Naivasha talks in Kenya. In other words, it is likely that Darfur rebels mobilized to ensure that their grievances against the Khartoum government were considered as part of the Naivasha process.

However, there is no clear agreement on what constitute sequences and priorities in successful process of CPA implementation but commissions were established for successful implementation of the CPA these include: The Joint National Transition Team (JNTT). The JNTT was established to cover wealth and power sharing, Two Multi-Donor Trust Funds (MDTFs), administered by the World Bank, include: The National Reconstruction and Development Fund (NRDF), whose duty includes both war affected areas and least developed areas outside Southern Sudan and the Southern Sudan Reconstruction

and Development Fund (SSRDF) dedicated to Southern Sudan reconstruction and financed by the Government of Southern Sudan (GoSS) and so on.

The commissions also prioritized the demobilisation of soldiers and demilitarisation of politics, invested on civilian security, through police and judicial reform and building local capacity for human rights and development.

The Roles of International Communities in Sudan Peacebuilding:

The Sudanese conflicts have been an internal conflicts, but there has been active external involvement from the beginning which made the second civil war in 1983 difficult, its major backers were Libya, south Yemen, Ethiopia, Egypt and other countries who were the allies of Sudan government while Eritrea has had a hostile relationship to Khartoum and had provided facilities for the Sudanese opposition in Asmara, Kenya has played an important role and Uganda has enjoyed good relations with SPLM/A. This internal security and political power base manoeuvres by the neighbouring countries hampered regional collective peace process in Sudan.

The involvement of third party peace interventions was dominated by IGAD, UN, AU, EU and the rest of other international community actors who were committed to rapid results necessitated the sustainable peace process; they strategized for peace agreement and political stability and invested substantial resources. They coordinated the cooperation between the Government of National Unity (GNU) and GOSS and achieved full free movements of people.

The long lasted Sudanese peace process was initiated in 1994, to resolve over five decades of civil war in the formation of Inter-Governmental Authority on Development (IGAD) which started its serious mediation in 1997. The leaders of IGAD countries in Djibouti in November 1996 made conflict prevention, management, resolution and humanitarian affairs as a top priority for the sub-region. [4] noted that from 1997 until 1999 the IGAD was managed by ministerial sub-committee and the Foreign Affairs Ministry staff of IGAD member states but in 1999 IGAD Secretariat for the peace process was established - this was the beginning of continuous and sustained mediation efforts between the two parties. He noted that the Friends of the IGAD Group was transformed and renamed the IGAD Partner's Forum (IPF) and was expanded in 1998 to incorporate a wide range of states, including Egypt and UN agencies''. The expansion of IGAD, achieved Machakos Protocol of July 2002 and the Naivasha Agreement and the intervention on Darfur

crises in 2003, though the leadership role of the AU and the involvement of African non-IGAD countries, such as Libya, Chad and Nigeria in the peace process in Darfur have certainly sidelined the IGAD but the effort in the region has been commended.

The African Union (AU) in 2004 raised the tempo of facilitating mediation between the GoS and the armed opposition and ceasefire agreement was signed in N'djamena in 2004. AU deployed troops to monitor the ceasefire, AU equally mediated Abuja peace talks jointly with UNMIS. After several rounds of peace talks, the warring parties, under the auspices of the AU, signed a Declaration of Principles (DOP) on 5th June 2005. UNMIS assists the AU with planning and assessment of its mission in Darfur, while the EU supports the AU logistically and through the African Peace Facility (APF).

[4] argued that the United Nations Mission in Sudan (UNMIS) Operated within the overall UN goal of achieving peace, development and human rights for all, the United Nations Mission in Sudan (UNMIS) is the latest element in the UN system in Sudan. UNMIS was established by Security Council Resolution 1590 of 24 March 2005, under Chapter VI of the UN Charter, as a peacekeeping mission and lead agency for all UN agencies in Sudan.

The intervention of European Union (EU) enhanced finances of the peace building process EU allocated 400 million Euros through the European Development Fund (EDF) for the Sudan. These funds are held under the Cotonou Partnership Agreement between African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) States and the European Union signed on the 23rd of July 2000 with the focal themes of food security and capacity building.

Also in aspect of funding was the Oslo Donors Conference held in April 2005, which the sum US \$4.5 Billion were pledged at the conference; United States was the largest contributor followed by European countries. The pledges were tied to the 23 development frameworks of Joint Assessment Mission (JAM) to Sudan composed of representatives from the government and SPLM/A, with the support of the World Bank and the UNDP, in late 2003. The program worked for 14 months to assess the reconstruction and development needs of the country during the interim period.

The contributions of civil society organisations (CSO) cannot over emphasize, Berghof (2006) argued that its activities in Sudan revolve around the following 1. Strategic move towards structural societal change by defining the root causes of conflicts in Sudan, which are inequitable development and centralized exclusive system

of governance, as indicated in the CPA. 2. Public awareness of the CPA and popularization of peace culture and human rights. 3. Provision of inputs for the Commissions identified in the CPA and for CSOs. Moreover these organizations and institutions have succeeded in establishing dialogue forums for civil society activists, thinkers, politicians, researchers and journalists - men, women and youth – to brain-storm, political enlightenment and popularization of peace culture and democracy.

The intervention of international communities and the civil society organisations in Sudan conflicts had enhanced monitoring events and had provided reliable channels of information, help built confidence, reduce uncertainty, improve communication and defused the conflicts, achieved comprehensive peace agreement and has address many undermine implementation processes of Sudan peace.

CONCLUSION

Political power dominations, imposition of Islamic religion, struggling over meagre and dwindling natural resources and marginalization of the peripheries, especially in the South by the North that controlled central government were root causes of Sudan conflicts. Sudan inherited from colonial masters' highly centralized authoritarian governance and an uneven pattern of regional development, consequently, discrimination of South and North, these led to the longest civil war in African countries.

In fact, the protracted conflict in Sudan which took lives of many citizens and damaged much property reflects the long standing economic disparities, political exclusion and social and cultural deprivation in the distribution of political and economic power between the centre and the peripheries.

The intervention of international communities, which mediated on those factors that reinforces regional and inter-tribal communal conflicts achieved Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) signed on the 9th January, 2005 between the Government of Sudan (GoS) and the Sudan People's Liberation Movement/Army (SPLM/A). The CPA formally ended the highly violent armed conflicts in Sudan and created new sovereign state of South Sudan.

Recommendations: The continued conflicts both in Sudan and South Sudan after the independent of South Sudan still has its root causes on political power dominations, imposition of religion, struggling over

meagre and dwindling natural resources and marginalization of some ethnic groups, which can be resolved by the following recommendations:

- Rehabilitation mechanisms and adequate service delivery should be adopted by both government of Sudan and South Sudan to cushion the effects of the long conflict.
- Capacity building initiatives to address the internal conflicts, such programs that can build the agricultural sector, improve educational opportunities and ensure access to ownership of land for returnees IDPs and vulnerable citizens are necessary.
- There should be transparent and accountable government institutions who will respect the citizen's rights and dignity to encourage its legitimacy and participation.
- Sudan and South Sudan should coexist more peacefully and work to address the root causes of the conflicts, such as marginalization, poverty and increased access to natural resources and more sustainable livelihood.

REFERENCES

1. Daniela Nascimento, 2011. the (in) visibilities of War and Peace: A Critical Analysis of Dominant Conflict Prevention and Peacebuilding Strategies in the Case of Sudan. *International Journal of Peace Studies*, Volume 16, Number 2, Winter 2011.
2. Jeong, Ho-Won, 2008. *Understanding Conflict and Conflict Analysis*. London: Sage Publishers.
3. Johnny Thabo Pitswane, 2014. *The Dynamics of Mediation and Conflict Resolution in Darfur, Sudan: 2004-2011*. Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) research presented to Department of International Relations School of Social Sciences Faculty of Humanities University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg.
4. Berghof, 2006. *Sudan: Conflict Analysis and Options for Systemic Conflict Transformation: A Northern and a Southern View*.
5. Sosa, Rodrigo, 2004. "Sudán, un conflicto sin fin." *Papeles de Cuestiones Internacionales*, 86: 123-137.
6. Johnson, Douglas, 2003. *The Root Causes of Sudan's Civil War*, African Issues. The International African Institute in Association with James Currey, Oxford.
7. Sudan Tribune, 2012. "Juba tells Bashir not to beat the drums of war". February 6 [available at <http://www.sudantribune.com/Juba-tells-Bashir-not-to-beat-the,41520>].