Security Implications for 2003 Darfur Conflict on Darfurese

Okereke, Emmanuel Ugochukwu; & Agbai Eke Agbai

Department of Political Science, Nasarawa State University, Keffi, Nasarawa State.

Abstract

The backing of the Janjaweed by the government of Omar al-Bashir against the Sudan Liberation Movement/Army and Justice and Equity Movement further changed the character of Darfur conflict by moving it entirely from struggle over resource distribution to ethnic conflict. The aim of the paper was to analyse the implications for the 2003 Darfur conflict on security of the people of Darfur. Data for the paper were collected from textbooks, journals, and internet materials and analysed using content analysis. Findings showed that the emergence of deteriorating economy in 2012 and 2013brought about intensified fighting between diverse Arab tribes over land as well as resources in the Central, North and South Darfur. Nearly 300,000 people were displaced within the first five months of 2013 only, the figure which outweighs the number recorded from 2010 to 2012. About 200,000 refugees fled the region to neighbouring Chad alone. Also, about 350,000 people in the region died as a result of starvation, violence, and diseases. From 2003 to 2005, more than 2,000 villages were destroyed, while about 500,000 people were killed. The means of livelihood of the people were equally destroyed as the farmers were disconnected from their means of livelihood, a situation that led to malnutrition and hunger. Unfortunately, conflict resolution and management techniques adopted in resolving the conflicts at national level did not take care of the root causes

of the conflict which is located at Contradictions. It was recommended, among other things, that the government of Sudan should urgently address the issue of marginalisation of non-Arabs in resource distribution in the country.

Keywords: *Security, Security Implications, Conflict, Darfur Conflict, Ethnicity, Religion*

Introduction

Security of the people of Darfur has been confronted with threats arising from the Darfur conflicts of 2003. Though the conflict in Darfur between pastoralists and sedentary farmers was caused in part by environmental pressure as well as changing land ownership patterns, the claim by farmers in Darfur that the National Islamic Front no longer protected their interests since Omar al-Bashir assumed office as the President of the country worsened the relationship between the Arabs (pastoralists) and non-Arabs (sedentary farmers). Omar did not pay adequate attention to the right violations perpetuated by the nomadic tribes against the sedentary farmers. The nomads committed crimes, violated property rights and even hurt the people living there, while the government of al-Bashir did not protect the non-Arabs instead the government supported and armed the Janjaweed to confront the people of Darfur who formed two different rebel groups known as Sudan Liberation Movement/Army (SLM/A) and Equality and Justice Movement (JEM) (Boggs, 2017).

The spate of killings and destruction of properties of the people of Darfur assumed disastrous level from 2003 to 2004 as the conflict resulted in the displacement of many people in the conflict areas. In fact, the major strategy of the conflict was deliberate displacement of the people. Starting from 2003, nearly half of the population in the distressed areas have been compulsorily displaced with many of them moving from neighbouring states to Darfur. In 2006 and 2011, peace agreements were entered into, but the conflicts continued unabated (Oguone & Ezeibe, 2014).

In 2014, the character as well as the strategy of the violence in Darfur changed when the Sudanese

government carried out a major offensive attack against the JEM and a splinter group of SLM/A led by Minni Minawi. This attack brought about increase in the intensity of fighting in Darfur leading to loss of more lives and properties among the civilian population that was not witnessed from 2003 to 2004 (Joshua & Olerenwaju, 2017). Essentially, the conflict in Darfur has resulted to the death of over 300,000 people, while about 3,000,000 were displaced, with 2,600,000 of them internally displaced and the remainder fled to the neighbouring state of Chad (International Refugee Rights Initiative, 2016).

A number of measures were adopted at the national to resolve and manage Darfur conflict, but such measures focused on tackling the "behaviour" of actors manifested as communications, actions and physical violence without theoretically discerning and solving the root causes of the conflict relating to injustice in the distribution of resources in Darfur, which was skewed against the non-Arab tribes. In view of the foregoing, this paper is geared towards analysis of the Darfur conflicts with a view to understanding its security implications for Darfurese.

Conceptual Review
Security
The concept of security has been viewed by different scholars and commentators in different ways. According to Holmes (2015), the modern concept of security emerged in the 17th century during the epoch of Thirty Years War in Europe. The signing of the Westphalia Peace Treaty in 1648 created the idea of nation-state, which has given sovereign states control over domestic as well as international security.

For Mesjasz (2004), security originated from the Latin word "se-curus", "se" means "without" and "curus" means "uneasiness". Security originally means freedom from uneasiness, or a peaceful condition without risks or threats. The English word "security" has an array of meanings including "to feel safe" as well as "to be protected". This shows that security is used to describe a situation without any risk or worry, making the concept a positive value. The Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria (1999) states in Section 14 (2) (b) that security as well as welfare of the people shall be the primary purpose of governments. The foregoing definitions of security give us a hint about fundamental components of the concept of security, but did not meet our definition for security in this paper. Also, the Nigerian constitution merely

perceives security as the duty of the government without recognising the role of individuals, organisations and other stakeholders in ensuring security in the country..

Security can also be defined to include defence of vital interests of individuals, different groups in the society, communities as well as institutions in a specified geographical space. Security also includes issues such as environmental safety, democracy and democratic consolidation, economic development and social justice. Security is perceived as protection of a state from foreign attacks and ensuring that every individual within the territory of a state lives in safety. This shows that security of the individual is hinged on ensuring that individuals enjoy freedom from violence, freedom from mental torture, and financial loss in order to maintain a preferred standard of living (Alaga, 2010).

It is important to distinguished between traditional security and non-traditional security. Traditional security means safeguard of a state and its important interests from attacks by other state-actors as created by the Westphalia Treaty of 1648. On the contrary, non-traditional perspective to security sees security as the as neutralisation of all threats to the individuals, their culture and the interest of the state (Akbar, 2012).

Similarly, Ngwube (2016) noted that security is the ability of a state to promote the fundamental needs and interests of individuals as well as those of the state with a view to protecting them from economic, political, social, environmental or any other source of threats that they may be exposed to. This shows that the general concept of security is comprised of human security which focuses on protection of the individual as well as the state from attacks. Human security is perceived as the protection of individuals from poverty, illiteracy, disease, and violence (Tanaka, 2017). This shows that human security focuses on elimination or reduction of those factors that constitute threats to the survival of the individuals and their dignity.

Due to the difficulty in arriving at a generally acceptable definition of security, Baldwin came up with specification on the definition of security focusing on security for whom? Since security is an absolute value, there is need to balance it against other key values such as liberty, territorial integrity, economic welfare and environmental protection. Nevertheless, Baldwin acknowledges that no matter how important the specification may be to the definition of security, the specification is not adequate enough in providing more precise guidance for its pursuit. Hence, Baldwin identified the need for more specifications as how

much security? Security from what threats? By what means? At what cost? and in what time period? (Degaut, 2015).

In view of the foregoing, security in this paper, is defined as protection of the people from threats of lack of access to education, threats to life, threat of poverty, denial of freedom of movement, mental and physical torture, rape, starvation, injustice, discrimination in sharing of states resources, among others. Security is equally defined, in this paper, to include protection of the state from threats to integration and peaceful co-existence of different ethnic groups in the country.

Conflict

There is no unanimous definition of conflict by scholars specifying what constitutes conflict because many of them define it in diverse ways. This makes many schools of thoughts to define conflicts differently from other schools of thought. For Kenneth Building, conflict is defined over interests to mean situations in which some changes make at least one party better-off and the other party worse-off, each in their own estimation. For Johan Galtung, who represents another school of thought, conflict arise from injustice and structural violence. Adam Curie defined conflict in a broader way. For him, conflict represents a situation where possible progress of one party is impeded by that of another party. Similarly, Michael Nicholson perceives conflict as a situation that exists when two people desire to take part in acts that are mutually inconsistent. The definition of conflict by Nicholson can be extended from single individuals to groups of people because more than two people can be involved in a conflict (Shant, 2019). From the foregoing definitions of conflict, the common elements that are manifest in all the definitions of conflict are divergent goals and interests of two or more actors or parties who employ various means in realising their objectives.

Similarly, Chand (2018) noted that conflict can be expressed as a process where perception whether real or otherwise leads to disruption of desirable state of harmony as well as stability in a sovereign state. Characteristics of conflict include that conflict is a process because it occurs in layers. The first layer is always characterised by misunderstanding between the divers parties. The other layers are characterised by differences of values, differences of viewpoints, differences of interests as well as interpersonal differences. Conflict is called a process because it begins with one party, perceiving the other party as opposing

or negatively affecting its interests, which usually ends with competing, compromising, collaborating and avoiding. Conflict is inevitable because it is a normal path of life. Conflict is also multidimensional.

Conflict is also defined as clash between individuals arising out of a disparity in thought process, understanding, attitudes, interests, requirements, and sometimes perceptions. A conflict arises from heated arguments, physical abuses and certainly loss of harmony and peace. A conflict does not only arise between individuals, but also between or among countries, political parties, states or group within a state. A small conflict not controlled at the early phase may lead to a large war as well as rifts among states, leading to major unrest and disharmony. A conflict has five phases (i) prelude to conflict: This phase involves all factors that possibly arise in conflict among individuals such as differences in interests, lack of coordination, dissimilarity in cultural, educational, and religious backgrounds. (ii) Triggering events: There is no conflict that arise without being triggered by one event or another. (iii) Initiation phase: It is at this phase that conflict begins and it is characterised by heated arguments, abuses, verbal disagreement, which are all warning alarms that show that fight is already on. (iv) Differentiation phase: This is the phase where parties to a conflict voice out their differences against each other, stating reasons for their conflict. (v) Resolution phase: The need for conflict resolution arises through the realisation that conflict leads parties to retrogression, so parties try to make compromises in resolving their conflicts. Therefore, in the resolution phase, many options are explored with a view to resolving the conflict (Management Study Guide, 2019).

More so, conflict is defined as the outcome of a disagreement between different actors on the basis of perceived incompatible goals. Conflicts as well as disagreements are inevitable in human society and their resolution can result in constructive change. Conflicts are usually analysed at different levels including interpersonal, group or community and national as well as in terms of how the different levels interact with each other. Conflicts can turn into violent conflicts when there are poor channels for dialogue and disengagement or when dissenting voices and deeply-held grievances cannot be heard or addressed, as well as in environments characterised by injustice, instability and fear. Therefore, conflict prevention and conflict resolution approaches are aimed at resolving conflicts through non-violent means. Conflict analysis is a structured analysis of conflicts aimed at understanding of conflict profile (history of

conflict), the actors involved in a conflict and their perspectives; the structural and proximate cause; and the dynamics of how these elements interact. Structural causes of conflicts are the root causes or underlying causes are systemic or long-term causes of violent conflict that have become entrenched into norms, structures as well as policies of a society (also known as immediate causes) are more recent causes that change more quickly and can highlight structural causes, leading to an escalation of violent conflicts (GSDRC, 2017). From the foregoing, conflict is defined as mutual disagreement between two or more parties. Conflict arise because of incompatible goals of the parties and believe by one or more of the parties that the behaviour of the other parties obstructs them from achieving their goals. Therefore, conflict is a process in which one party to a dispute perceives that its interests are being opposed or negatively affected by the other party. Reasons for conflict include disparities in perceptions, values, and cultural differences as well as incompatible needs for limited resources. In this paper, conflict is defined as disagreements between pastoralists and sedentary farmers as well as divergent ethnic nationalities in Darfur over land ownership patterns resulting into violent attacks.

Methodology
The design for this study was historical research design involving data collection from secondary sources of data on the 2003 Darfur conflict and its implications on security of the people of Darfur. Reliability and validity of the data were achieved by ensuring that only relevant and related data were consulted as well as citing all materials consulted appropriately. Data collected were analysed using content analysis.

Brief History of Darfur Conflicts
The name Darfur is derived from "dafur" which is an Arabic word for "land of the Fur". Traditionally, dafur was an Islamic sultanate which was located in the Western parts of Sudan. Before 1916, the Fur were the ruling ethnic nationality in Sudan and they started converting to Islam as far back as 1300s. Islam was declared a state religion with the establishment of Darfur Sultanate in 1956. Even with many conflicts in Sudan including the Anglo-Egyptian occupation of the Sudan in 1898 and before being totally subjugated by the British in 1916, the Darfur Sultanate remained independent. Darfur is comprised of about 80 diverse tribes as well as ethnic nationalities divided between sedentary

communities and nomads. The rebels appear to be drawn from largely 3 communities of the Fur, the Zaghawa and Massalit tribes. However, the indigenous peoples of Darfur comprising of the Fur and many other ethnic nationalities as well as the Arabs have comparatively distinct identities, they largely related well until resources became scarce, then ethnicity and race became a factor in the conflict (Reliefweb, 2005).

Essentially, the people of Darfur suffered largely from famine of 1984-1985, which brought about major loss of crop land as well as overall resources. The foregoing prepared the grounds for conflicts often between diverse racial groups. While the conflicts took place throughout the 1990s, physical violence swiftly escalated after two rebel groups, the Sudan Liberation Movement/Army (SLM/A) and the Justice and Equity Movement (JEM) carried out attacks on military bases as well as police stations in Darfur. Since the membership of the SLM/A and JEM largely consisted of non-Arab tribes such as the Zanghawa, the Fur, and the Massalit in the west, while the state is mainly governed by Arab Muslims, the conflict soon took ethnic as well as racial overtones (Evans, 2009).

Actors involved in Darfur Conflicts and their Perspectives

Some of the actors in the conflict were pastoralists and sedentary farmers. Pastoralist nomadism is the major means of livelihood for many Darfurese. One of the major cattle-herding groups in Darfur is the Arabic-speaking Baqqara, who are scattered between Korodofa and Darfur Provinces (Sikainga, 2009). The pastoralists needed more land for rearing of their animals in the areas originally occupied by the sedentary farmers. On the other hand, the sedentary farmers needed more land for crop production due to threats posed by climate change.

Other actors in the Darfur conflict were the government of Omar al-Bashir, the Sudan Liberation Movement/Army (SLM/A), and the Justice and Equity Movement (JEM). Also, the Janjaweeds is another actor in the Darfur conflict. The membership of the SLM/A and JEM largely consisted of non-Arab tribes such as the Zanghawa, the Fur, and the Massalit in the west who wanted regime change, while the membership of Janjaweed is comprised of mainly Arab-Muslims who wanted perpetuation of the existing order so as to have more grazing land for their animals as well as maintenance of the existing power configuration in the country. The Janjaweed was armed and backed by the government against the SLM/A and JEM (Evans, 2009). The government

wanted to suppress the resistance by the non-Arabs and maintain the existing order as against regime change clamored by the non-Arabs.

Structural and Proximate causes of Darfur Conflicts

One of the structural causes of the Darfur conflict is the diversity of the people of Darfur. The Western part of Darfur is populated by many ethnic nationalities such as Zaghawas, Furs, Baggaras, Tunjurs, Fallatas, Massalits, among others. The naming of Darfur after Fur, which is connected with Arabic word "dar" meaning home and "Fur" name of the major ethnic group that has lived in the area since pre-modern epochs contributed in preparing enabling atmosphere for the conflict. Therefore, Darfur means the home of the Furs, even though the country is comprised of heterogeneous population or many other ethnic nationalities. The Arabs in Darfur are not natives because they settled there later. The prominent cultural difference between Arabs and native Africans is nomadism. Africans are known as settled farmers while the Arabs are known as nomadic shepherds goats and camel. The Furs belong to the Nilo-Saharan language family and they are Muslims. The majority of them are farmers. The people that comprise the Masalit ethnic nationality are farmers too, but the two groups were largely influenced by the conflict because many of their villages were destroyed, making them to join the rebels. The Tunjures are also like the Furs and Masalits because they are also settled farmers. Also, many of them were killed or their properties destroyed in the conflict. On the other hand, Baggaras are nomads who settled down in Darfur because of good natural conditions consistent with the type of life they live. They originally formed part of the Arab population that migrated from the north, but they got marries to the native Africans and became assimilated. More so, Zaghawaras are known as semi-nomads because of their long travel through the desert towards the border with Libya. The tribe sell herds of camels as well as salt. They live on the border with Chad, where many of them sought refuge after ground attacks on them during the war (Danielova, 2014).

In addition, the SLM/A and the JEM started a major offensive targeted against the government of Sudan resulting in capturing a number of government installations including the EL Fasher Airport. The two rebel groups had the support of the SLM/A, which is another major rebel group fighting in the western part of the country during the Second Sudanese Civil War. The rebels scored high points against the government during the early days of the attack

because the government forces were already over-stretched between fighting the SPLA in the south as well as fighting the Eritrean-sponsored rebels in the East. In response to the foregoing, the government forces began aerial bombardment of Darfur, while at the same time, enlisting the support of a nomadic militia group, the Janjaweed which the government began arming in 1985. Another structural cause of the conflict is that instead of the government of Sudan directly attacking the rebel forces, it launched a blanket attacks at the non-Arabs (settled farmers) by draining the sea regardless of whether they were rebel forces or civilians (International Center for the Responsibility to Protect, 2016).

The government used the Janjaweed militias to attack the villages largely populated by African Masalit, Fur and Zaghawa people where the SLM/A and JEM largely draw their support from. Although the foregoing African are largely Muslims, they also practice a form of religion that is infused with sefism and animism and that was held in contempt by the Arab Islamic government in Khartoum. Therefore, the conflict in Darfur could equally be perceived as a combination of efforts aimed at converting Muslims who are perceived as going astray by driving them off the land (Zissis, 2006).

The conflict in Darfur is a combination of political, environmental and economic factors. The environmental degradation as well as competition over dwindling natural resources played and continues to play pivotal role in Darfur. The Darfur region is comprised of many climatic zones. While the southern part of the country lies within the rich Savannah, which receives adequate amount of rainfall, the central part of the region is a plateau where the mountain of Jabel Marra dominates the landscape. The northern part of Sudan is a desert, which extends all the way to Libyan and Egyptian borders. Crop farming is the major economic activity of majority of the population, but cultivation of land largely depends on rainfall as well as on soil fertility, making the population vulnerable to climatic changes and natural disasters. In the 1980s and 1990s, drought, desertification as well as population growth combined to produce a dangerous decline in food production and widespread famine. Also, at the heart of the competition over resources is the question of land ownership. Over the years, the land tenure system has changed leading to increase in inter-communal tensions. In the Fur kingdom, local ownership of land was based on the Hakura system, which came from Arabic Hikr which means ownership. The system allows each group to be given a Hakura or Dar, which was regarded as the

property of the entire community. The local chief was the sole custodian of the Dar and allocated same to the people for the purpose of cultivation, and belonging to a Dar was an integral part of a person's identity. At the same time, successive chiefs allocated lands to influential members of the community for private owners. Under the British colonial rule, the land tenure system was modified to suit the indirect rule system known as native administration. During this epoch, each chief was allocated different territories to administer for administrative convenience. The local chiefs were equally given the authority to allocate land to the residents. During the post-colonial epoch, the system of land tenure as well as native administration underwent major changes. The post-independence Sudanese rulers perceived native administration as an archaic system that was part of the colonial legacy and slowly dismantled it. The policy, most importantly, brought about erosion of the local chief's authority. The changes to the land tenure system drastically reduced the ability of local chiefs to settle inter-communal conflicts (Sikainga, 2009).

The nomads were not part of the Hakura system, hence the nomads had to rely on customary rights to wander and pasture their animals in areas largely dominated by farmers. The movement of the nomads between northern and southern parts of the region was facilitated through specific arrangement for animal routs by the leaders of both the nomads and the farmers, but such arrangements were scrutinised by the government. The system worked for decades but was dismantled by the drought of the 1980s. With the deterioration of climate change, the maturity date of crops harvest became uncertain, and this made many farmers to gradually embrace animal husbandry and needed grazing land. At the same time, the pastoralists were equally feeling the effects of the drought as grazing land in the northern part of Darfur had largely shrank. Confronted with the foregoing, camel nomads insisted on maintaining the traditional arrangement, which became one of the major factors that drove the clashes (Sikainga, 2009).

With respect to the proximate causes of the conflict, in some parts of South Kordofan and Blue Nile States, armed rebel groups were fighting for more autonomy for their religion and tribe as well as for regime change. Starting from 2003, former President Al-Bashir as well as Sudanese forces carried out genocide against several non-Arab, rebel tribes in Darfur. Therefore, the conflict in Darfur started in 2003 when non-Arabs rebelled against the Arab-led government. Nevertheless, Darfur had traditionally experienced conflicts

between nomadic herdsmen and sedentary farmers. Also, after the secession of South Sudan in 2011, some pro-southern rebel groups remained in Sudan and continued to clash with Sudanese army leading to displacement of about 900,000 people in South Kordofan border region (Project Ploughshares, 2017).

Dynamics of Interactions among different Causes of Darfur Conflicts
The conflict started between African formers and Arabic nomads over limited resources in Darfur region following a prolonged drought in 1983. With the Muslim government in the north fighting a civil war with rebels in the Christian/animist south, there was perception of attacks by the government on the non-Arabs. Also, the funding of Janjaweeds by the government of Sudan to fight rebels inflamed Arab-African tensions in Darfur. In other words, Omar al-Bashir transformed a competition for scarce resources into a large-scale violent confrontations which was fueled by extreme ethnic and racial overtones. This triggered the February 2003 Darfur conflicts which came almost immediately the government started peace negotiations to resolve the civil war with the South Sudan. The conflict made a loosely aligned SLM/A and JEM rebels attack government targets in central Darfur, demanding autonomy (Zissis, 2006).

The conflict in Sudan occurred on at least three fronts. In the Darfur area of Western Sudan, rebels fought to overthrow former President Omar al-Bashir. Tribal clashes were equally commonplace. In the border areas of South Kordofan States and Blue Nile, rebel groups fought for regime change and sometimes engaged in ethnic killings. The capital of Sudan, Khartoum, did no experience much physical violence starting from 2003, but the area was replete with patches of protests and police brutality over the government's cut on fuel subsidy. The public as well as opposition groups in Khartoum were equally frustrated with the regime of Omar al-Bashir (1989-2017) over serious financial indiscipline (Project Ploughshares, 2017).

Unlike the Second Sudanese Civil War in the South, the conflict in Darfur was not charaterised by religious dimensions because grievances emanated from a mixture of ethnic and economic tensions rather than from religious acrimony. Also, the regime of al-Bashir used Arab networks to extend its control over the country through the use of identity politics in the mobilisation of support, hence causing more schism among diverse ethnic nationalities in the country. The feelings that came from the foregoing were worsened by the policies of government which appeared to discriminate non-Arabs as well as divide Darfur

into three different regions in order to break the unity existing amongst Darfur tribes. Members of marginalised Fur and Zaghawa tribes formed rebel groups to challenge the contradictions occasioned by structural violence by the al-Bashir administration against the Darfur tribes(International Center for Responsibility to Protect, 2016).

Over the years, the dynamics of the Darfur conflicts have changed. A dwindling economy in 2012 and 2013brought about increased fighting between diverse Arab tribes over land and resources in the Central, North and South Darfur. About 300,000 people were displaced within the first five months of 2013 alone, the number that outweigh the figure recorded from 2010 to 2012. Following the secession of South Sudan in 2011, Sudan lost majority of its oil revenues. With the dwindling of the country's economy exemplified by rising inflation and massive unemployment, there emerge increase in discontent within Sudan's paramilitary forces, the Central Reserve Police (CRP), Border Guards (BG), and Popular Defense Forces (PDF) (Tran, 2014).

Implications for 2003 Darfur Conflicts on Security of Darfurese

Since the commencement of the conflict in Darfur, more than 2 million Darfurese, representing one-third of the region's population, have been internally displaced as a consequence of systematic destruction of their villages. Also, about 400,000 refugees have fled the region to neighbouring Chad, hence impinging on their fundamental human rights. Over 300,000 people in the region have died as a result of violence, starvation and diseases which largely affected their health security and food security. Sexual violence was commonplace as rape was systematically used as a weapon of warfare (Zissis, 2006).

In 2013, the Sudanese government launched the Rapid Support Forces (RSF), many of whom were members of the Janjaweed, who actively carried out genocide against the people of Darfur. This further led to massive displacement of the people from their homes. A major ground and aerial offensive by the government of Sudan led to increase in the number of casualties and displaced people (Jewish World Watch, 2019).

The conflict in Darfur had serious security implications on the Darfurese. Apart from the number of people killed and displaced in the conflict, the means of livelihood of the people were equally destroyed. Since the main occupation in Darfur is pastorialism and sedentary agriculture, the farmers were disconnected

from their means of livelihood, leading to hunger and malnutrition. Disease arising from rape is likely to have negative implications on the reproductive health of the victims in Darfur. Since security means freedom from fear and want, Darfur conflict brought poverty and fear on the Darfurese, hence affecting their security.

Injustice arising from distribution of limited resources that had the approval of al-Bashir's government further posed threat to the security of the people. The exploitation and violence meted out on the non-Arabs who are largely sedentary farmers by pastoralists who are largely Arabs backed by the Bashir's regime, is a serious security concern since it is rooted in structural violence. Therefore, Darfur conflict has negative security implications for the people of Darfur.

Management and Resolution of Darfur Conflicts

To resolve the conflicts, the Sudanese government promised to end the problem posed by displacement of the people arising from the conflicts in Darfur. The International Community set up an Independent Commission of Inquiry into Darfur conflicts, which found compelling evidence of war crimes and genocide against the Sudanese President, Al Bashir. In addition, African Union Mission in Sudan (AMIS) was deployed to the troubled zones of the country, and Ndjamena ceasefire agreement was also entered into on April 8, 2004 in order to manage the conflict. In 2005, the African Union deployed 7,000 peacekeepers to Darfur to contain security situations there, but the number of peacekeepers sent was too little compared to the intensity of conflicts in the area, making the conflicts to continue though at a reduced intensity (International Refugee Rights Initiative, 2016).

The management of Darfur conflict did not address the root causes of the conflict which is contradictions arising from injustice in the distribution of land resources in Darfur. The government, instead of addressing the issue of injustice in the distribution of land between the pastoralists and sedentary farmers supported the pastoralists against the sedentary farmers on the basis of ethnicity. Also at the national level, al-Bashir was charged with corruption and money laundering, which were not adequate in solving the root causes of the conflict (Jwish World Watch, 2019).

The foregoing conflict management and conflict resolution strategies adopted in Darfur conflicts did not touch on the root causes of the conflict which was injustice in the distribution of land resources and demand for regime change by

non-Arabs (largely sedentary farmers). The conflict resolution strategies adopted in resolving the Darfur conflicts focused on neutralising physical violence, actions (behaviour), but that was even made more ineffective by structural violence perpetuated against the non-Arabs by the al-Bashir regime.

Conclusion

This paper has been an attempt to analyse the Darfur conflict of 2003 with a view to determining and analysing the implications for the conflict on the security of Darfurese. Focusing on state level analysis, it was discovered that the 2003 Darfur conflicts, contrary to the views of some scholars, emanated from contest or struggle over limited land resources brought about by prolonged drought. The conflict was dynamic in nature because it started as struggle between pastoralists and sedentary farmers over land resources, but was given ethnic coloration when the al-Bashir supported and backed the Arab-militia group, Janjaweed against non-Arab SLM/A and JEM. The conflict resulted in wanton destruction of lives and properties of the people of Darfur, hence posing huge security threat on their wellbeing. The conflict resolution and management techniques adopted at national level did not address the fundamental issues in the conflict which are injustice in resource distribution, desire for regime change arising from exclusion of non-Arabs from the assuming the office of president (turn/order), and the position of non-Arab tribes in the country. In view of the foregoing, it is concluded that unless the fundamental issues in the conflict are addressed, the security or wellbeing of Darfurese would continue to be under threat.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are vital in mitigating security threats on the Darfurese following the 2003 Darfur conflicts:

i. The government of Sudan should urgently address the issue of marginalisation of non-Arabs in resource distribution in the country;

ii. The government should ensure through constitutional provisions that all ethnic nationalities in Sudan are given equal opportunities to carry out economic production;

iii. Omar Al-Bashir should be tried in the court for his role in Darfur conflict to serve as a deterrent to future leaders in the country who may want to toe his paths;

iv. Recruitment into the military in Sudan should be based on merit and balance to ensure that power is evenly distributed between Arabs and non-Arab tribes in the country in order to avoid intimidation of one group by another group; and

v.   Members of rebel groups that participated in the conflict should be de-radicalised and reintegrated into the society to avoid resurgence of the conflict in the near future.

References

Akbar, M. (2012). *Concept of national security.* Retrieved from http://bei-bd.org/wp content/uploads/2015/03/

Alaga, F. (2010). The security of Nigeria's image and its economy within the context of media publications and broadcasts. In M. Yusuf (Ed.), *The military, the media, and Nigeria's national security* (pp.100-115). Ibadan, Nigeria: Gold Press Ltd

Boggs, C. (2017). *The Darfur genocide in Sudan- history facts & causes.* Retrieved from https://study.com/academy/leasons/the-darfur-genocide-in-sudan-

Chand, S. (2018). *Conflict management: Characteristics, types, stages, causes and other details.* Retrieved from https://www.yourarticlelibrary.com/business/conflict-management

Danielova, V. (2014). *Darfur crisis of 2003: Analysis of the Darfur conflict from the time of the first clash to the present day.* Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/

Degaut, M. (2015). *What is security?* Retrieved from https://www.research gate.net/publications

Evans, M. (2009). *Darfur genocide (2003-).* Retrieved from   https://www.blackpast.org/global-african-history

Federal Government of Nigeria. (1999). *Constitution of the federal republic of Nigeria.* Abuja, Nigeria: Federal Government of Nigeria

GSDRC. (2017). *Definitions and conflicts.* Retrieved from https://gadre.org/topic-guides/conflict-analysis

Holmes, K. (2015). *What is national security?* Retrieved from http://index.heritage.org/

International Center for the Responsibility to Protest (2016). *The crisis in Darfur.* Retrieved from https://www.responsibilitytoprotect.org/index.php/crisis/

International Refugee rights Initiative. (2016). *The challenges of peacekeeping in Darfur.* Retrieved from http://www.refugee-rights.org

Jewish World Watch. (2019). *Darfur genocide.* Retrieved from https://www.jww.org/conflict-areas/sudan/darfur

Madamombe, I. (2005). *Darfur crisis challenges Africa world.* Retrieved from https://www.un.org/africarewardsmagazine

Management Study Guide. (2019). *Understanding conflict- meaning and phases of conflict.* Retrieved from https://www.managementstudyguide.com/understanding-conflict.htm

Ngwube, A. (2016). *Threats to security.* Ekiti, Nigeria: Federal University Oye-Ekiti

Project Ploughshares. (2017). *Sudan-Darfur 2003 first combat death.* Retrieved from https://ploughshare.com/pl

Sikainga, A. (2009). *The world's worst humanitarian crisis: Understanding the Darfur conflict.* Retrieved from https://origins.osu.edu/article/words

Tanaka, A. (2017). *Security: Human, natural, and international.* Retrieved from https://ww2.jiia.org.jp/en/digital-liberary/japan-diplomacy

Tran, M. (2014). *Darfur conflict: Civilians deliberately targeted as tribal violence escalates.* Retrieved from https://www.thegurdian.com/global-development/2014/

Zissis, C. (2006). *Darfur: Crisis continues.* Retrieved from https://www.cfr.org/backgrounder/darfur-crisis