

*ANALYSIS OF 2003 DAFUR CONFLICTS AND ITS IMPLICATIONS ON SECURITY OF DARFURIS*

**Okereke, Emmanuel Ugochukwu**

**08093089170**

**[flashugoz@gmail.com](mailto:flashugoz@gmail.com)**

**And**

**Okoli, Ugochukwu Richard**

**09022200894**

**[Okoliugo43@yahoo.com](mailto:Okoliugo43@yahoo.com)**

**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 limited resources to ethnic and political conflict. The aim of the paper is to analyse the effects of 2003 Darfur conflict on the wellbeing of the people of Darfur. Data for the paper was collected from textbooks, journals, and internet materials and analysed using narrative-analytic method. ABC Triangle and Hourglass were used in the understanding of the dynamics and impacts of Darfur conflict on the wellbeing of the people. It was found that the politicisation of the emergence of deteriorating economy in 2012 and 2013 brought about intensified fighting between diverse Arab tribes over land as well as resources in the Central, North and South Darfur. Nearly 3,000,000 people were displaced within the first five months of 2013 only, the figure which outweighs the number recorded from 2010 to 2012. About 400,000 refugees have fled the region to neighbouring Chad alone. Also, over 300,000 people in the region have died as a result of starvation, violence, and diseases. From 2003 to 2005, more than 2,000 villages were destroyed. The means of livelihood of the people were equally destroyed as the sedentary 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 all levels did not take care of the root causes of the conflict which is located at Contradictions manifested as turn/order, position and distribution of resources. 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.

**Key Words:** Security, Security Implications, Conflict, Darfur Conflict

**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 rights 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 as 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 over 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, continental and universal levels 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 on the wellbeing of the Darfuris.

## **Conceptual Review**

### **Concept of Security**

Mesjasz (2004) traced the origin of the concept of security to the English word. For Mesjasz, 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.

According to Alaga (2010), 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 defined geographical space. Security

also includes issues such as environmental safety, democracy and democratic consolidation, economic development and social justice. Shinoda (2004) noted that security means protection of a state from external attacks and making sure that every individual within a state lives in safety. This shows that security of the individual is focused on ensuring that individuals enjoy freedom from mental torture, freedom from violence, and financial loss aimed at maintaining a preferred standard of living.

Akbar (2012) 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 neutralisation of all threats to the individuals, their culture and the interest of the state.

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

Explicitly, the concept of security has traditionally integrated territorial integrity as well as political independence as values to be protected, but other values are sometimes supplementary. Security from what threats? Security may be directed at possible terrorists and national security systems are sometimes targeted at other states. Threat to acquired values can answer the question in what time? Time value could be in short-run or long-run (Baldwin, 1997).

Therefore, security in this paper is defined as protection of the people from threats to life, threats of lack of access to education, threats of poverty, rape, mental and physical torture, injustice, starvation, discrimination in sharing of states resources, among others. Security is also defined in this paper to comprise protection of the state from threats to integration and peaceful co-existence of different ethnic nationalities or affiliations in the country.

### **Concept of 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. In this regard, one of the dominant schools of thought in North America defined conflict as clash of interests between two parties. 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. For Galtung, absence of physical violence as well as direct confrontation between different actors does not necessarily suggest that structural violence is entirely eliminated. Adam Curie defined conflict in a broader way. For him, conflict represents a situation where possible progress of one party is impeded by another party. Similarly, Michael Nicholson perceives conflict as 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.

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 to oppose or negatively affect its interests, which usually ends with competing, compromising, collaborating and avoiding. Conflict is inevitable because it is a normal path of life. Conflict is multi-dimensional (Chand, 2018).

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 country do 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 present time 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 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 retrogression, so parties try to a



conflict must make compromises in resolving their conflicts. In the resolution phase, many options are explored with a view to resolving the conflict (Management Study Guide, 2019).

Therefore, conflict, is a process in which one party to a dispute perceives that its interests are being opposed or negatively affected by another party. Reasons for conflict include differences in values, perceptions, as well as cultural differences and incompatible needs for limited resources. Conflict, in this paper, means disagreements between pastoralists and sedentary farmers as well as different ethnic nationalities in Darfur over land ownership patterns.

### **Analytical frameworks**

This paper is built around the Johan Galtung's ABC Triangle tool for conflict analysis and Hourglass. The ABC triangle was developed by Johan Galtung in 1969 stating that conflicts are initiated through attitudes, physical behaviour and contradictory goals of the actors (Pathak, 2016). The triangle is used to show that conflict situations have three major components or parts, which are symbolised as ABC, where A stands for attitudes, B stands for Behaviour and C stands for Contradictions. The upper part of the triangle is manifest because it is empirically observable as action, physical violence, and communication (Behaviour). On the contrary, A and C are latent because they are hidden and can only be theoretically discerned as feelings, thoughts, and will (Attitude) and resource distribution, position, order/turn (Contradiction). The central argument by Galtung in the theory is that conflict is a dynamic process, which involves interaction between Attitudes, Contradictions and Behaviour because each of the components changes rapidly as all the three components of the triangle influence one another. Problems arise in "turn" and "order" because it is usually written as agreements, making it difficult to be changed. Therefore, when a party to a conflict is attacked, what is important is not the attack, but the motive behind the attack (Asobie, 2020).

The three components A, B, and C are interrelated because any one of the points may be the starting points of conflicts. For example, an incompatibility in goals over territory, may lead to hostile attitudes, then to violent behaviour. Similarly, hostile attitudes between the parties in conflict can result in behaviour that creates an incompatible goals. This shows that conflict can start from any of the three points, but must involve the three points. Conflict leads to violation of fundamental human rights. Structural violence causes direct violence. Freedom from structural violence helps in restoring and sustaining peace. Freedom from structural violence ensures freedom from exploitation, separation, and repression (Pathak, 2016).

The ABC Triangle by Galtung is crucial in this paper because it helps our understanding of the role of Darfur government in the conflict especially in determining how best to resolve the conflict in such a way that would

bring about lasting peace in the country. Also, the analytical tool is important in identifying the root causes of the Darfur conflict further than the apparent causes. Also, the triangle is crucial in the understanding of the perception and attitude of Omar al-Bashir in the conflict, who wanted to perpetuate himself in power by reinforcing the division in the state already created by scarcity of resources. Al-Bashir equally perceived the non-Arabs as people that merged animism and selfism with Islam who should be made to practice real Islam. At the international level, the attitude of the African Union to the conflict suggests that Africa is being intimidated by the developed countries through the use of the International Criminal Courts (ICC) to intimidate African leaders without critically examining the root causes of Darfur conflict in particular and Africa in general. The fact that the international system is complex and anarchical, the advanced countries that manufacture arms and ammunitions would want wars, especially in developing countries so that they can sale their arms and create more wealth for their people.

The Hourglass is useful in this paper because it is crucial in ensuring that there is conflict transformation, conflict settlement and conflict containment which would lead to reconciliation of differences and contradictions among the disputing parties in a conflict. The central assumption of Hourglass physical violence should be contained through peace-keeping and peace-making, while structural violence should be contained through structural peacebuilding. Similarly, cultural violence should be contained through cultural peacebuilding. The Hourglass is useful in the analysis of management as well as resolution of Darfur conflict because it explains the ineffective role of the African Peacekeeping Force sent to Darfur to maintain peace during the conflict, while the root cause of Darfur conflict is structural violence by nomadic-pastoralists backed by the government against the sedentary farmers.

### **Conflict analysis**

#### **Epigrammatic history of Darfur conflicts**

Darfur is derived from "dafur" which is an Arabic word for "land of the Fur". By tradition, dafur was an Islamic sultanate which, was situated in the Western parts of Sudan. Prior to 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 before being totally subjugated by the British in 1916, the Darfur Sultanate remained independent. Darfur is comprised of about 80 diverse tribes and ethnic affiliations separated between sedentary communities and nomads. The rebels were drawn from largely 3 communities of the Zaghawa, the Fur, and the Massalit tribes. However, the indigenous peoples of Darfur comprising of the Fur and many other ethnic groups and 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).

According to Evans (2009), the people of Darfur suffered largely from famine of 1984-1985, which brought about major loss of crop land and overall resources. The foregoing prepared the grounds for conflicts usually 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 and police stations in Darfur. Since the membership of the SLM/A and JEM largely consisted of non-Arab tribes such as the Fur, Zanghawa, and the Massalit in the west, while the state is mainly ruled by Arab Muslims, the conflict soon took ethnic and racial overtones.

### **Actors involved in Darfur conflicts and their perspectives**

The major actors in the conflict were pastoralists and sedentary farmers. Pastoralist nomadism is the major means of livelihood for many Darfuris. 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 contrary, 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 Janjaweds is another major factor 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 more grazing land for their animals and 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 immediate 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. 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. The originally formed part of the Arab population that migrated from the north, but they got married 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).

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 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-independent 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 from between northern and southern parts of the region was facilitated through specific arrangement for animal routes 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 shrunk. 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 immediate 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. However, Darfur had traditionally experienced conflicts between nomadic herdsman 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).

### **Dynamism of Darfur conflicts**

The conflict started between African farmers 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 Janjaweds 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 not 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 characterised by religious dimensions because grievances emanated from a mixture of ethnic and economic tensions rather than 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 2013 brought 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 outweighs 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 emerged increase in discontent within Sudan's paramilitary forces, the Central Reserve Police (CRP), Border Guards (BG), and Popular Defense Forces (PDF) (Tran, 2014).

### **Implications of Darfur conflicts on wellbeing of Darfuris**

The population of Darfur is about 7.5 million which is spread across many ethnic nationalities in the country. Since the commencement of the conflict in Darfur, nearly 2 million Darfuris, 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. About 300,000 people in the region have died as a result of violence, starvation and diseases, while about 2,600,000 people were internally displaced. Sexual violence was commonplace as rape was systematically used as a weapon of warfare (Zissis, 2006). Between 2003 and 2005, more than 2,000 villages were destroyed (Evans, 2009).

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. In 2017, African Union-United Nations Hybrid Operation in Darfur documented 152 incidences of conflicts linked to sexual abuse which affected 84 women and 66 girls as well as 2 boys (Jewish World Watch, 2019).

The conflict in Darfur had serious security implications on the Darfuris. 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 pastoralism 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 Darfuris, 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. Therefore, Darfur conflict of 2003, as a politically motivated conflict, has negative security implications on the people of Darfur.

### **Management as well as resolution of Darfur conflicts**

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 distribution of land between the pastoralists and sedentary farmers supported the pastoralists against the sedentary farmers on the basis of ethnicity.

On the 14th of July, 2008, the International Criminal Court (ICC) filled charges of war crimes against al-Bashir. However, without international military intervention, attacks on the civilians continued unabated (Copnall, 2013). From March 2009 to July 2010, the ICC issued arrest warrants for former President Omar al-Bashir for alleged crimes committed in Darfur, including cases of genocide, crimes against humanity and

war crimes. At the continental level, the African Union (AU) sent 7,000 troops to the country to protect the refugees. However, the troops were poorly equipped and could not effectively protect the refugees in the neighbouring Chad. At the national level, al-Bashir was charged with corruption and money laundering for his role in the conflict, which he exacerbated in order to perpetuate himself in power through playing of racial politics (Jewish 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). Therefore, 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 and recommendations**

#### **Conclusion**

This paper has been an attempt to analyse the Darfur conflict of 2003 with a view to determining and analysing the implications of the conflict on the wellbeing of Darfurians. 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 and playing of racial politics by al-Bashir. The conflict was dynamic in nature because it started as struggle between pastoralists and sedentary farmers, but was given ethnic and political colorations 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, continental and international levels 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 (wellbeing) of Darfuris would continue to be under threat.

#### **Recommendations**

The following recommendations are vital in mitigating security threats on the Darfuris 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. At the continental level, member states of the African Union (AU) should increase the number of troops they contribute for peacekeeping operation in Africa to enable the AU peacekeeping role in Darfur successful;



- iii. The member states of the AU should set aside adequate amount of money for the purchase of military equipment to help the organisation effectively carry out its role of conflict management;
- iv. The Assembly of African Union should immediately establish an African Standby Force which would help in prompt response to conflicts with particular reference to Darfur; and
- v. The Peace and Security Council (PSC) of the AU should facilitate timely response to conflicts in Darfur with a view to preventing human rights abuses against non-Arabs in Darfur.

## References

- Akbar, M. (2012). *Concept of national security*. Retrieved from <http://bei-bd.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/>
- Akpuru-Aja, A. (1998). *Fundamentals of modern political economy & international economic relations... changing with the times*. Owerri, Nigeria: Data-Globe Nigeria
- 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
- Baldwin, D. (1997). *The concept of security*. Retrieved from <http://princeton.edu/~dbaldwin/selectedarticles/>
- Boggs, C. (2017). *The Darfur genocide in Sudan- history facts & causes*. Retrieved from <https://study.com/academy/lessons/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>
- Copnall, J. (2013). *Darfur conflict: Sudan's bloody stalemate*. Retrieved from <https://www.bbc.com/news/world>
- 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/>
- Evans, M. (2009). *Darfur genocide (2003-)*. Retrieved from <https://www.blackpast.org/global-african-history>
- International Center for the Responsibility to Protect (2016). *The crisis in Darfur*. Retrieved from <https://www.responsibilitytoprotect.org/index.php/crisis/>
- 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
- Pathak, B. (2016). *Johan Galtung conflict transformation theory for peaceful world: Top and ceiling of traditional peacemaking*. Retrieved from <https://www.transcend.org/tms/2016/08/johan.galtung-conflict>

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

Shinoda, H. (2004). *The concept of human security: Historical and theoretical implications*. Retrieved from <http://home.hiroshima-u.ac.jp/heiwa/pub/e19>

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

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

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

