

**DEATH AND DISENGAGEMENT: A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF THE
INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY'S INTERVENTION EFFORT IN
DARFUR**

by

VICTOR H. HODGES

B.A. University of Central Florida, 2007

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Masters of Arts
in the Department of History
in the College of Arts and Humanities
at the University of Central Florida
Orlando, Florida

Summer Term
2010

ABSTRACT

This thesis seeks to analyze the international community's conflict management capabilities through its response to the Darfur crisis. Primarily, it aims to show through the lens of the Darfur crisis, which is widely accepted as the first genocide of the twenty-first century, that the international community has yet to develop a framework to collectively intervene in and resolve crimes against humanity. Additionally, this thesis will show the international community's recognition of their shortcomings through the gradual transformation of policies undertaken by several of its leading entities in response to the crisis. The research will pinpoint several major factors behind the lack of a unified global community acting in Darfur, such as geopolitical fragility between major international organizations, fragmentation caused by wars in Iraq and Afghanistan as well as the global War on Terror which occurred concurrently with the genocide in Darfur, and the underlying political and economic alliances that many major countries including the United States and China, enjoy with the Government of Sudan.

The work will focus specifically on the United States, the United Nations, the European Union, and the African Union, analyzing the actions of each respective group in facilitating an end to the Darfur conflict. Ultimately, this thesis will use the research to conclude that the international community was willing to accept the Darfur genocide, with its death toll nearing four-hundred thousand and well over two million internally displaced peoples, in order to advance their respective global interests and preserve the status quo of global affairs in the early twenty-first century.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The relief and invigoration that has surfaced within me as a result of the completion of this project are sensations that would not have been felt without those individuals in my life who have been there to encourage and empower me throughout this process.

I owe much gratitude to my advisor, Dr. Ezekiel Walker, who from the beginning of my graduate career has been a major influence on my thinking. Dr. Walker suggested this topic early within my first semester and has since guided my research, performed as my faculty mentor for a mentoring fellowship, and taken on the role of my thesis advisor, all of which were crucial factors in both my academic development and the development of this work. I am also indebted to my thesis committee members, Dr. Fon Gordon and Dr. Hakan Ozoglu who have given time and effort to direct me through this process, consequently affecting my research. Dr. Gordon, through a separate project revealed to me the importance of asking questions; not only of my own research but also of the sources on which I rely most heavily. Dr. Ozoglu's insistence that I take a closer look at the Armenian Genocide had a direct influence on this work, helping to solidify my definition of genocide and provide a past example to correlate with Darfur. I am obliged to my closest friends and girlfriend, who endured the sacrifices and hardships of this project with me, supporting and motivating me throughout. Finally, I am truly grateful to my family for keeping me centered and focused throughout the entirety of my educational life; I thank God for their presence in my life as they have indeed been my greatest catalyst.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER ONE: THE UNITED STATES- THE STRUGGLE BETWEEN RHETORIC AND ACTION	20
CHAPTER TWO: THE UNITED NATIONS- NO SHOULDERS TO BEAR THE BLAME	37
CHAPTER THREE: THE EUROPEAN UNION AND DARFUR- THE TRANSITION FROM APATHETIC BENEFACTION TO PERIPHERAL ENGAGEMENT.....	56
CHAPTER FOUR: THE AFRICAN UNION- AN IMPOSSIBLE TASK ON A SHOESTRING BUDGET	72
CONCLUSION.....	86
APPENDIX: MAP OF DARFUR, SUDAN	91
BIBLIOGRAPHY	93

INTRODUCTION

Within the first three years of the new millennium, a major conflict erupted from an already volatile situation in Western Sudan, and the world was about to become witness to the first potential genocide of the twenty-first century. Since European colonization, the relationship between the Arab and African inhabitants of Darfur, a vast and arid region of Western Sudan, has been an unstable one. Institutionalized racism and cultural prejudices were ever-present amongst many other factors responsible for the volatility. In spite of the frailty, relations between sedentary Africans and nomadic Arabs were somewhat manageable; this changed after 1984. The encroaching Sahara rapidly deteriorated the troubled relationship of Africans and Arabs in Darfur, transforming it over the span of two decades, from one of uneasy truce, to one of violent conflict.

The historical dichotomy of the Darfur region between mostly settled African farmers and their nomadic Arab counterparts quickly dissolved as a result of desertification. Darfuri rebel groups pushing for more recognition and less marginalization began mobilizing and confronting government garrisons in Northern Darfur in 2002. The rebel movement in Darfur grew in strength and momentum, scoring a number of resounding victories against a surprised and beleaguered Sudanese army. Instead of negotiations, this prompted the Sudanese government to sponsor a campaign of ethnic cleansing in Darfur, with the ultimate aim of removing or eliminating all ethnic African elements in the region and replacing them with ethnic

groups that identified themselves as Arab in culture and lineage.¹ To accomplish this aim, the Sudanese regime under Omar al-Bashir utilized a number of alarming tactics. The occasional use of conventional military troops and equipment including rocket propelled grenades and helicopter gunships, took a devastating toll on Darfur and its native inhabitants.² Non-government militiamen, known as Janjawid, were used as ground forces by the government and did indeed live up to the meaning of their moniker, *devil on horseback*, with disturbing success.

The mission given to the Janjawid and their strategy was very simple; destroy everything and scorch the earth rendering the area inhospitable.³ Villages were surrounded and brutally destroyed. All livestock were rounded up and killed. Wells were poisoned with the bodies of decaying animals. Buildings, particularly those important to culture and politics, were burned. Women and young girls were repeatedly raped and mutilated. Men and young boys were rounded up and summarily executed by generally low-tech methods such as shooting, stabbing, clubbing, or decapitation. Children were thrown into burning buildings, or chained to them. Tortures and disappearances were common place. The Janjawid carried out their mission with ruthless efficiency; through this process more rebels were created, “justifying” Khartoum’s actions.

This precarious development did not happen within the vacuum of desertification however. To fully understand the origins of the conflict, we would need to become well-versed in the history and ethnography of Darfur, Sudan, and East Africa on a whole. There are several

¹ Gerard Prunier, *Darfur: A 21st Century Genocide*, 3rd ed. (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2008), 152.

² M.W. Daly, *Darfur’s Sorrow: A History of Destruction and Genocide* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 282-3.

³ *Ibid.*, 278.

factors that are widely accepted as key in triggering the events that led to the crisis. One such factor is the racial classification system introduced by colonial British administrators which effectively marginalized the native population of sedentary Africans and installed Arab nobles as governors of the region. Regarding the racial classification system, there are two important distinctions that should be noted. First, in terms of skin color, everyone is black. A dark-skinned large-featured livestock herder could be considered “Arab” and a fair-skinned thin featured farmer could be considered “African.”⁴ The ambiguity of racial classification is more based on the way of life. Second, not all African ethnic groups in Sudan subscribe to the rebel cause and some were in fact aligned with the government. Likewise, some of the strongest and most influential Arab ethnic groups were not involved with the conflict and some were even quiet allies of the Darfuri rebels.⁵

Another crucial factor was the pro-Arab Sudanese government based in Khartoum. This government, under the leadership of Omar al-Bashir has been in de facto power since 1965 and continued a policy of neglecting Darfur, building little infrastructure and investing virtually no aid in the region. Although full comprehension of the origins of the Darfur crisis would prove helpful in understanding the fractured intervention process that followed, the amount of research and attention required to complete this task satisfactorily is out of the realm of this thesis and the scope of its requirements. This work will instead focus primarily on the international community’s attempted facilitation of a suitable peace in Darfur.

⁴ Prunier, 5.

⁵ Kevin Funk and Steven Fake, *Scramble for Africa: Darfur Intervention and the USA* (Montreal: Black Rose Books, 2009), 25.

The historical trend of international intervention has been vibrant. With its official origins in the Nuremburg Tribunal of 1945, the interventionist argument gained significant momentum as a result of two World Wars, both of which bore witness to grand scale systematic murder in the Armenian Genocide and the Jewish Holocaust. The assimilation of crimes against humanity into international law at the Nuremburg Tribunal was followed by the successes of the Genocide Convention of 1948. The ratification of this law, which legally defined the crime of genocide and advised participating countries to intercede in the most extreme cases of crimes against humanity, was an important step in the development of the international intervention framework.⁶

Motivated by past horrors of genocide and crimes against humanity, and legitimized by the United Nations signing into effect Genocide Resolution 260, it appeared as if the global community, on the back of two World Wars and boosted by great scientific and technological advancement, would be proactive in preventing large-scale atrocities and war crimes from taking place. However since its advent, the international community has only found two incidents to be in breach of the law; Rwanda and Yugoslavia.⁷ Universally accepted incidents that certainly violated the parameters of Resolution 260, like the Khmer Rouge's massacre of Cambodians or Saddam Hussein's near annihilation of the Kurds in Northern Iraq have either been overlooked, under-examined, or acted upon too late. Yet another great violation of human rights which has

⁶ Gareth Evans, "The Responsibility to Protect: From an Idea to an International Norm," in *Responsibility to Protect: The Global Moral Compact for the 21st Century*, ed. Richard H. Cooper and Juliette Voinov Kohler (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), 16-7.

⁷ *Ibid.*

undoubtedly caught the attention of the world media, intellectuals, and the international community and entered the genocide debate is the Darfur Crisis.

For many countries, events in Darfur erupted at the most inopportune time. Most developed countries, led by the United States and the United Kingdom, were heavily invested in the Global War on Terror. Internationally, the economic situation was fragile due to the global recession of 2001-2002; economic forecasts for the remainder of the decade did not boost confidences.⁸ Complications and outright failures in certain facets of the handling of the Rwandan and Bosnian Genocides left a bitter taste in the mouths of policymakers responsible for the facilitation of their resolutions. Nonetheless, to blame the international community's failures in Darfur primarily on other international conflicts and bad economic forecasts would be a fallacy. These aspects certainly had an adverse influence on the Darfur intervention effort, yet other more realpolitik-based factors hold equal or even greater importance.

If we approach the Darfur intervention effort from the perspective of separate countries or organizations, such as the United Nations or African Union, we will better understand how political ideology, economics, and to an understated degree, race played a negative role in the process. The international community's intervention effort in Darfur was not monolithic or unified. Key global interests, like those previously mentioned, of individual states acting independently or within the structure of international organizations such as the United Nations, created a significant divide on how to move forward on the Darfur question. This thesis will attempt to identify these and other factors, analyze them, and place them within the context of

⁸ Robert Gilpin, "The Challenge of Global Capitalism: The World Economy in the 21st Century," in *Globalization and the Poor: Exploitation or Equalizer?*, ed. William Driscoll and Julie Clark (New York: The International Debate Education Association, 2003), 63-5.

genocide studies from an international intervention perspective. Ultimately, this work will show, through the analysis of the international community's experience in Darfur, that despite the attempts of the Genocide Convention and the Responsibility to Protect norm, the international community has yet to develop a framework through which to adequately respond to genocides.

In the specific case of Darfur, this work will show that the global community was unable to arrive at a unified response due to the national goals and self-interests of its members. These interests outweighed the interests of organizations such as the UN, and helped to portray an international community composed of states which were unwilling to sacrifice the geopolitical status quo and risk the global political fragmentation that may have arisen were they to pressure Khartoum and its backers, thereby addressing the problem.

The importance of this work is twofold. There is a limited but burgeoning amount of historiographic analysis on the Darfur genocide due to the modernity of the topic. Previous publications have tended to focus more on the humanitarian aspect of the failed intervention effort in Darfur and less on the political complexities that shape the dilemma. This is likely due to the emotional tensions that surface in the literature as a result of the recentness of the topic. This work utilizes many of the same sources identified by previous scholars, but recognizes the political aspect as most paramount, and analyzes the respective policies of each international entity discussed herein, from that perspective. Political unity, in essence, begets successful humanitarianism in regards to global humanitarian crises. Likewise, this thesis seeks to add to the developing literature concerning the international response to the genocide by contextualizing the failed international response as a trend in all humanitarian crises. Recognized failure for the international community has been a realization not only for the

ongoing Darfur crisis, which to date has not been fully resolved, but also the drawn out genocides in Rwanda and Bosnia a decade before, and possibly any future crises that may occur until a verifiable international response structure is configured.

In addition to the introduction, this thesis contains four chapters and a conclusion section. The first chapter, entitled “The United States: the Struggle between Rhetoric and Action” examines the United States pervasive role in the international community’s irresolute response to the Darfur question. It ponders the effects an election year and involvement in two international wars had on the American effort and posits that the US was forced, for a number of reasons, into responding to the crisis that it originally intended to avoid. The second chapter, “The United Nations: No Shoulders to Bear the Blame” depicts a United Nations waning in power and influence that feared the international community would make it solely responsible for resolving the crisis without giving it the tools to do so. As a result, the United Nations actions were dictated by a number of its member states as well as the Sudanese government, impeding it from developing a strong approach to the matter.

The third chapter is titled, “The European Union and Darfur: the transition from Apathetic Benefaction to Peripheral Engagement” and analyzes the transformation of the EU’s response from its beginnings as a passive source of humanitarian aid, to its later efforts which saw it mobilize troops whose goal was to contain, but not resolve the crisis which was threatening to spread into neighboring East African nations. The final chapter, “The African Union: an Impossible Task on a Shoestring Budget” explores the young organization’s mishandling of the Darfur genocide, which was the Union’s first major test and had repercussions on its primary aim of becoming a global leader. The section looks at the effect

underfunding, a poorly planned operation, and a political split within the organization based on ethnicity had on the success, or lack thereof, of the African Union's Mission in Sudan. Finally, the conclusion provides a synopsis of the arguments and seeks to connect the main points of the thesis to recent genocides in Rwanda and Bosnia, and to a greater extent, the historiography of genocide.

Within this introduction, it is important to analyze genocide theory and why I believe, based on the principal concepts of genocide studies, the situation in Darfur from 2003 to 2008 constitutes the use of such heavy terminology. Alain Destexhe, in his important work on the three quintessential genocides of the twentieth century, identifies several connecting factors within all three genocides that were also present in Darfur, helping to confirm my perception. In his study, *Rwanda and Genocide in the Twentieth Century*, Destexhe rigidly defines genocide by defining first what genocide is and is not, and second, how genocide is allowed to occur. He states that the word "genocide" has lost its meaning due to verbal inflation; the overuse of the word to describe events that have little or nothing in common with the actual meaning. In such, there is a distortion of the importance of the word, evident in the use of it in the media to describe natural disasters, or worse yet, financial meltdowns.⁹ He explains that disasters and events that cost many lives, such as the bombing of Hiroshima, must be distinguished from genocides because they lack a deliberate policy of intent to eliminate a specific group. Acts of extreme barbarism likewise cannot be defined as genocide because such acts are engrossed in emotion and are generally spontaneous, which cannot be compared with the cold-blooded

⁹ Alain Destexhe, *Rwanda and Genocide in the Twentieth Century* (London: Pluto Press, 1995), 9-13.

planning and calculation involved in implementing genocide; barbarism absolves responsibility while genocide bestows collective guilt.¹⁰

Destexhe's description of the meaning of genocide centers around one key aspect, intent. Genocide, according to the author, is the destruction of a nation or ethnic group with the existence of a coordinated plan, aimed at total annihilation.¹¹ Genocide is not a war crime; however it is hidden within war and is a crime against the rules of war and against humanity itself. Genocide is a crime against humanity in the same sense that a homicide is a crime against the individual; both are denied the natural right to exist by the perpetrator. Genocide should be distinguished from mass murder however, because mass murder generally does not account for motive and preparation and places too much emphasis on numbers involved (the intent to completely destroy a specific group is indeed the crime). Whether for expansionist aims, political and economic motivations, or cultural differences, according to Destexhe, the unique determinant of genocide is motive.

There are several features, according to Destexhe and other scholars on genocide study including Richard G. Hovannisian, that have been pinpointed as similarities amongst all cases of successful genocide in the modern era. In every instance, the perpetrators conduct genocide under the cover of major international conflicts, diverting international attention thereby minimizing the possibility for intervention. There is also the existence in each case of an ideology instilled by the perpetrating government that is based on racism, xenophobia, and intolerance that propagates the idea that the victim group is unworthy of assimilation or

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ Ibid., 4.

existence. Another similarity is the vulnerability of the targeted group to paramilitary forces backed by the government. Other similarities include the promotion of looting and confiscation of the victim group's lands by other groups, the vehement denial of any wrong doing by the perpetrating government, and extreme punishments for individuals sympathetic to the plight of the victim group.¹² Genocides in the modern era typically followed this pattern and were successfully implemented through the use of these tactics.

Many authors, most notably Mahmood Mamdani, would argue that the situation in Darfur does not represent genocide because there is a recognizable resistance or insurgency, the Arab assailants are mostly paramilitary, and because the entire Arab population of Sudan does not support its government's action nor is the entire black population of Sudan attacked. This view deliberately overlooks intent, which as previously mentioned, is the main qualifying component of genocide. Nomadic Arab settlement of Western Sudan, which is the ancestral homeland of a number of indigenous African peoples, has led to a long lasting conflict. The conflict shifted in 2003 when the Arab-dominant Sudanese government under Omar al-Bashir adopted a policy of a deliberate and premeditated destruction of black African ethnic groups in Darfur, with intent to afterward populate the land with Arab settlers (to use the region as grazing land for their herds) and thus create a near homogeneous state in the region. This would in turn eliminate resistance to the government, which at the time emanated from Darfur, and would strengthen Arab hegemony over the region.

¹² Richard G. Hovannisian, "Historical Dimensions, 1878-1923" in *The Armenian Genocide in Perspective*, ed. Richard G. Hovannisian (New Brunswick: Transaction Books, 1986), 30.

Despite detractors, the Darfur crisis fits concisely with Destexhe's definition of genocide. It is a theorized and studied campaign implemented by the Government of Sudan to eliminate an entire racial group from their ancestral homeland. It is also centrally planned, indicative of the involvement of high ranking government officials, including al-Bashir. Although the entire population does not support the operation, a majority of the government is behind the process. The first-hand slaughter and removal of the targeted group is carried out by paramilitary organizations, the Janjawid, that are unquestionably loyal to the cause and are organized, trained, and closely monitored by the Sudanese government and supported by the regular Army. The sole purpose of the Janjawid is to act as a catalyst for destruction of African groups in Darfur by burning villages, kidnapping and murdering important political and cultural leaders, and killing men or raping women in order to separate families so that reproduction is curtailed. For these reasons, the conflict in Darfur will be rightly referred to as genocide within this work.

There have been many global actors in the Darfur intervention effort, ranging from nations that have had a minimal impact on the process to those that have been primary actors in the implementation of policy or the financing and distribution of humanitarian aid. For the purpose of this study however, we will focus on nations and multinational organizations that are traditionally active in the geopolitical paradigm and have been overtly involved in events that have shaped the policies and decision-making processes that surround the crisis resolution effort.

As previously noted, I have identified four leading international entities that had a direct influence on the genocide in Darfur and its attempted resolution: the United States, the United Nations, the European Union, and the African Union. Other states, such as China and Russia, as

well as organizations like the Arab League had noteworthy influence in the Darfur intervention process and the effect of their exploits will be discussed within the chapter analyzing the United Nation, given their status as powerful member states of the organization. NATO, with many of its members already members of the European Union and with a similar Darfur strategy as that of the EU, will not require major discussion within this work.¹³ The roles of multinational organizations and non-governmental organizations will be discussed, but only within the context of their political and economic influence on the aforementioned key states.

Although a secondary concern during both Bush Administrations, the Darfur genocide presented many problems for US primary concerns such as American foreign policy and global economic hegemony, and therefore posed a challenge for its leaders. On one side, realists within the US Government, notably the US Department of State and the CIA amongst others, believed that Sudan and the Khartoum regime under Al-Bashir was too important strategically to upset or alienate; thus they felt that American intervention would prove detrimental to US geopolitical aims. On the other side, human rights groups, the Christian and Jewish communities, NGO's, and large elements within Congress judged US intervention in Darfur the only viable option in bringing an end to the human rights abuses suffered by its people.¹⁴ The Darfur Peace Agreement (DPA) of 2006 was another source of contention for the United States. Meant to bring about a lasting peace in the region, the DPA sparked fighting within the rebel movement as its largest faction and only faction supported by the US, the Sudan Liberation Movement, was the only

¹³ Prunier, 141.

¹⁴ Funk and Fake, 51.

rebel group present to sign the agreement.¹⁵ Factions that opposed the accord because their concerns were not addressed were marginalized by the US much like they had been marginalized by Khartoum.

In a critical examination of the United States interventionist response to the Darfur genocide, Steven Fake and Kevin Funk illustrate a United States that was well aware of Sudan's crucial position within Africa for US foreign policy. Sudan under the Bashir regime, according to the authors, had been a significant ally in intelligence-sharing and counter-terrorism in the War on Terror. It was also one of few African nations fully committed to neoliberal economic reform, in the mold of Western Nations. Most importantly, it was a producer and supplier of crucial natural resources, notably oil.¹⁶

Global competition for Sudanese oil, particularly from China, had forced the United States to reconsider its policy and interests in the region. Whereas in other African nations and weaker nations in general, the United States had successfully linked human rights and security to economics in an effort to strengthen its regional interests, Sudan was a main focus of China, a distinct rival to the United States and one that generally avoids linking human rights and other interests to economics, making them a more attractive trading partner to developing nations or regimes.

The discovery of oil reserves in Darfur during the conflict added yet another dimension to the already intricate dilemma faced by American foreign policy analysts. On one hand, oil exploration and discovery in the region had the potential to bring infrastructure investment, jobs,

¹⁵ Ibid., 6-7.

¹⁶ Ibid., 56-7.

and overall development to Darfur. On the other, it had the potential to escalate instability and damage relations between rebel factions and the government further as the possibility of oil revenue inevitably raised the stakes.¹⁷ US foreign policymakers were thus faced with the question of whether or not the pre-meditated destruction of African ethnic groups in Darfur conflicted with the overall national interests of the United States.

The difficulties faced by the United States in its stance towards intervention in the Darfur genocide undoubtedly affected the United Nations. In Darfur, the UN faced a conundrum unique in its complexity and depth, and hoped for a pragmatic and unified solution to emerge from its members' dialogue. Member nations of the international organization, including every member of the Security Council, were instead at odds on how to approach the delicate situation. Recognizing Darfur as one of the worst humanitarian crises in recent times, as well as one of the most violent, the UN under the leadership of Secretary General Kofi Annan, implored its members, particularly the Security Council, to aid the organization in its peacekeeping and humanitarian missions in the region. The United Nations, which traditionally relies almost totally on manpower and funding from its member states, was totally at the behest of them. Highlighting the atrocities of Rwanda, Kofi Annan and other UN officials attempted to raise a link between the international responsibility to protect and the countless human rights violations that were crippling Darfur.¹⁸

Although intentionally avoiding the use of the word "genocide" in their terminology, UN officials beseeched its members not to sit idly and allow the crisis to spread out of Darfur into the

¹⁷ Edmund Sanders, "A Search for Oil Raises Stakes in War-Torn Darfur," *Los Angeles Times*, March 3, 2007.

¹⁸ Hugo Slim, "Dithering over Darfur? A Preliminary Review of the International Response," *International Affairs* vol. 80, no. 5 (October 2004): 811.

rest of East and Central Africa; they did not. UN member states, led by the Security Council, demanded that the United Nations intervene in Darfur. They did this however, without supplying adequate manpower, funding, or sanctions. The fear some states had of agitating Sudan, with its political and economic importance, turned small and large UN members away from direct engagement. Even still, western nations like the United States were making it difficult for the UN to establish any ground in facilitating justice in Darfur out of fear that a global organization with the power to try and convict state leaders threatened their national sovereignty. China and Russia blocked economic sanctions and “no-fly zones” by threatening to use their veto power while simultaneously supplying weaponry to both sides. Over the span of the conflict, it became perfectly clear to the United Nations that its members were more interested in their respective national interests than in intervening in the genocide, stifling the organization tremendously.

Self-admittedly bearing some responsibility for the current state of affairs in much of Africa, European nations have aided in the continent’s recovery through the development of infrastructure projects and humanitarian programs. In Darfur, European states collectively voiced by the European Union, continued their policy of humanitarianism and funding. This, despite the glaringly obvious need for manpower which was evidenced by aid shipments being blocked from entering Sudan or disappearing within, and by the apathetic responses emanating from Khartoum regarding these occurrences.

Mobilization of funds had also been accompanied by numerous condemnations of Khartoum’s methods in Darfur, as well as action plans to end human rights violations there. From 2006 to 2008, the European Union and Common Foreign and Security Policy Chief Javier

Solana officially condemned Khartoum's handling of the situation in Darfur over fifteen times.¹⁹ The European Union also voiced the need for a peacekeeping force in the region. However, prior to 2008 they were unwilling to provide troops under the name of the European Union and instead supported the initiative of a hybrid United Nations/African Union force with funding and little else. In January 2008, the European Union took the decision to launch a peacekeeping mission in Central and Eastern Africa, primarily deployed to Chad, to stabilize and contain war zones and to aid refugees.²⁰ Before 2008, the European Union supported measures for "no-fly zones" and economic sanctions, but like others in the global community, when the Sudanese government promptly violated the measures, the EU did little or nothing to enforce them.²¹ Khartoum was also bullish in their insistence that no force comprised solely of Western troops would be allowed to intervene in Darfur, citing their belief that humanitarian intervention would lead to an invasion.²² Hampered by Khartoum's ability to keep Darfur out of the military reach of the international community and its own lack of direction and coordination, the European Union's actions during the first five years of the Darfur genocide were purely humanitarian.²³

The January 2008 policy change which saw 3700 European Force (EUFOR) troops deployed to Chad marked a significant shift in the European Union's Darfur strategy. The EU seemed to have recognized after five years that humanitarian intervention in the form of money would not be productive without a military operation to supplement its implementation, and thus

¹⁹ Delegation of the European Union to the United States of America, "European Union: Darfur," The European Union, http://eurunion.org/eu/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=63&Itemid=49 (accessed November 17, 2009).

²⁰ Opinion, "Chad Mission Crucial to Union's Peace Efforts in Africa." The Irish Times, January 29, 2008.

²¹ Prunier, 141.

²² Miranda Green, "Sudan Turns Down UN Darfur Force," Financial Times: World News, December 2, 2006.

²³ Prunier, 141.

shed its policy of disengagement. The force also represented the resolve and determination of the European Union to not allow the conflict in Darfur to spill out into surrounding East and Central Africa, destabilizing European-backed African governments and potentially causing a security meltdown in the region.

The recentness of this change in policy has occurred after notable Darfur scholars, such as Gerard Prunier, wrote their most current pieces on the subject. There is therefore a lack of historiographic analysis on the influence of the introduction of European troops to the region. However, Mahmood Mamdani in *Saviors and Survivors: Darfur, Politics, and the War on Terror* claims that the European Union, notably France, supported and provided the majority of troops to EUFOR with the intent of protecting their continental investment and to militarize the Chadian/Sudan border to provide cover to Darfuri rebels as they recruit from refugee camps in Chad.²⁴ He further questions the European Union's motives in Darfur, asking whether the force is meant to stabilize the region, or is it an introductory force meant to prepare for a cross-border military intervention into Darfur.

The last international organization examined within this work is the African Union. In Darfur, the African Union saw an opportunity to legitimize itself in the eyes of the global community as their actions in the region would be heavily scrutinized by the global community. This is a result of the fledgling organization's almost sole dependence on international donors to sponsor the African Union Mission in Sudan (AMIS).²⁵ More than happy to finance AMIS in order to keep their collective hands clean, the EU, US, and UN donated nearly \$250 million to

²⁴ Mahmood Mamdani, *Saviors and Survivors: Darfur, Politics, and the War on Terror*, (New York: Pantheon Books, 2009), 226.

²⁵ Prunier, 144.

the AU. However, the global effort to leave “African problems to African solutions” only worked well in theory, not in practice. In terms of personnel and materiel, the African Union was severely lacking. It took them several months to find, train, and equip the 3,500 troops that Khartoum agreed to allow into Darfur. Aircraft and ground vehicles, barracks, and funds to pay and train the soldiers which were promised in abundance by the international community, trickled in once AMIS ran into difficulties.²⁶ Tactically, the mission was at a precipice because its leaders did not know how to approach the delicate racial balance in Darfur; they feared their actions would lead to a potential split within the AU between Arabs and Black Africans.²⁷

Mamdani posits that the AU was deliberately politically undermined by Western nations. He states that Western donors did not uphold their agreement to provide necessary funds and equipment in an effort to discredit the AU in the region, clearing the way for a UN force to intervene in Darfur.²⁸ This United Nations force, states the author, would ironically be manned with African soldiers, effectively replacing African Union green hats with UN blue hats.²⁹ The view that the international community hobbled the AU in its actions in Darfur is somewhat shared by Prunier, though with more agency being placed on the African Union. He charges that the AU was a willing victim because though AMIS was in disarray, the international community legitimized the organization by allowing it to be the sole decision maker in Darfur.³⁰ He states that the African Union could claim no responsibility for the AMIS disaster as they could blame donors for not following through with promises.

²⁶ Mamdani, 40.

²⁷ Prunier, 145.

²⁸ Mamdani, 40.

²⁹ Ibid.

³⁰ Prunier, 145.

In all, the lack of urgency and intentional ambiguity displayed by these nations and organizations pertaining to the Darfur genocide was paramount in their inability to resolve it. From the analysis of their respective policies and actions in the region, I will show that the international community both as separate states and en masse, dithered over Darfur for multiple individualistic reasons, but most important, because they collectively feared that intervention in the region would significantly alter the global status quo, which was a risk that they were not willing to take; not even at the cost of over three million effected lives.

CHAPTER ONE: THE UNITED STATES- THE STRUGGLE BETWEEN RHETORIC AND ACTION

The progression of the American response and subsequent handling of the Darfur genocide by the United States under the Bush Administration can be characterized by stagnation. Between 2003 and 2008, the typically aggressive Bush Administration could not find a suitable answer to the Darfur question. Intense media attention and pressure from NGOs, Jewish and evangelical religious institutions, and powerful members of congress forced into the limelight a complex problem that the Washington, under President Bush, wanted to put on the backburner.¹ Totally engaged in the War on Terror and facing growing tensions with the People's Republic of China over global hegemony, policymakers within the Administration devoted little time and strategy to addressing the volatile conditions in Western Sudan.

On September 9, 2004, with the words of Secretary of State Colin Powell, speaking at a testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the United States position on the situation in Darfur significantly worsened:

And, Mr. Chairman, there is, finally, the continuing question of whether what is happening in Darfur should be called genocide.

Since the United States became aware of atrocities occurring in Sudan, we have been reviewing the Genocide Convention and the obligations it places on the Government of Sudan and on the international community and on the state parties to the genocide convention...

...When we reviewed the evidence compiled by our team, and then put it beside other information available to the State Department and widely known throughout the international community, widely reported upon by the media and by others, we concluded, I concluded, that genocide has been committed in Darfur and that the

¹ Funk and Fake, 51.

Government of Sudan and the Jingaweit bear responsibility – and that genocide may still be occurring...²

Secretary of State Powell's allegations that the Government of Sudan was committing genocide in Darfur in 2004, was swiftly followed by a caveat that the United States had "no vital interests" in the region, thus meaning the US would not be intervening militarily.³ There are several nuances within Secretary of State Powell's speech, notably his labeling of the situation in Darfur "genocide" and the subsequent assurance that military action would not be pursued, which must be addressed. Steven Fake and Kevin Funk assert that, "the US readily declares "genocide" when the violence is perpetrated by approved enemies or is otherwise found to be politically useful, while silence prevails if the mass murder is conducted by allies."⁴ The crux of this claim lies in the authors' beliefs that, deduced from Powell's testimony, the United States feared affecting the global status quo, particularly in Africa and the Middle East, where its geopolitical interests were at the time most focused.

The aforementioned War on Terror was a significant cause of inactivity in terms of American strategy for Darfur. David Morse highlights that the Bush Administration viewed the Government of Sudan as a prime ally in the war on terror and had been developing a relationship with the Khartoum regime based on the latter's sharing of anti-terrorism intelligence.⁵ Likewise, a burgeoning relationship with Khartoum was being pursued by the United States for oil. Energy security, noted by policymakers in the government, was to be a paramount topic of debate and

² Secretary of State Colin Powell, speaking on the crisis in Darfur, on September 9, 2004, to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, 2004/995.

³ David Morse, "Appeasement Driven by Oil," Information Clearing House, <http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article15172.htm> (accessed February 4, 2010).

⁴ Funk and Fake, 16.

⁵ See David Morse, "Appeasement Driven by Oil."

action over the next century with American, Russian, and Chinese eyes, amongst many others, affixed on the African continent.⁶ African energy, in the form of oil, became a main focus for US grand strategy in the early years of the millennium.

The importance of African oil for US foreign policy is dual. It allows the US to diversify its oil sources away from the Persian Gulf, Venezuela, and other states that are considered enemies to US goals, and once controlled allows the US to deter the much sought after African oil market away from competitors like China.⁷ The Bush Administration prior to 2005 focused its oil diversity programs in Africa on six countries: Nigeria, Angola, Gabon, Congo-Brazzaville, Chad, and Equatorial Guinea.⁸ After 2005 and a major oil discovery in Darfur that potentially doubled Sudan's already 400,000 barrel a day output, Washington's dormant oil interest in Sudan, which began before the new millennium, became active.⁹ With the introduction of Sudan as a potential oil partner, the War on Terror, and its main foreign policy aim of maintaining US dominance on the global scene, strongly pursuing the Darfur genocide was not a viable option for the Bush Administration; in this instance, national interests and sovereignty outweighed international humanitarianism. In essence, the Bush Administration in the most pivotal period of American policymaking towards the Darfur genocide, from mid-2004 to mid-2005, knowingly spread itself uselessly thin in an effort to appease constituents domestically (in an election year), as well as NGO's and the intelligence community which had disparate opinions on how the US should handle Darfur and Khartoum itself.

⁶ Padraig Carmody and Francis Y. Owusu, "Competing Hegemons?: Chinese Versus American Geo- Economic Strategies in Africa," *Political Geography* 26, no. 5 (2007): 5.

⁷ Daniel Volman, "The Bush Administration and African Oil: Security Implications of US Energy Policy," *Review of African Political Economy* 30, No. 98 (Dec., 2003): 575-577.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 574.

⁹ See David Morse, "Appeasement Driven by Oil."

As the dominant global political issue of our time, the War on Terror took precedence over all other international paradigms, including Darfur, for US policymakers. Constantly searching for allies and intelligence on how to contend with and neutralize an enemy that spans across the globe, the United States began a process of rapprochement with the Government of Sudan after September 11th.¹⁰ Sudan had been a renowned sponsor of terrorism and official enemy of the United States since the early 1990s; Sudan was put on the US State Department's list of states that sponsor terrorism in 1993 and has been sanctioned by the US since 1997.¹¹ The stark change in relations came as a result of Sudan being forced into mediation with the United States, which threatened military action if Sudan did not cooperate.

The consequences of this relationship were fruitful in terms of advancing American interests in East Africa and the Middle East. Counter-terrorism intelligence had been readily and ably supplied to the CIA and other American intelligence agencies by the Mukhabarat, Khartoum's intelligence service.¹² The two intelligence entities formed a strong partnership in the counter-insurgency effort in Iraq. Islamic militants utilized Sudan as a crossroads into Iraq where they integrated into Al Qaeda and other terrorist cells. Mukhabarat aided Washington by detaining terror suspects as they passed through Khartoum as well as sending informants to Iraq to infiltrate terrorist groups to provide intelligence on the insurgency.¹³

¹⁰ Alexandra Nichols, "Human Rights and Human Welfare: Sudan," *Human Rights and the War on Terror 2* (2007): <http://www.du.edu/korbel/hrhw/digest/terror/sudan.pdf> (accessed February 10, 2010), 194.

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² Alec Barker, "Between Conscience and Self Interest: The United States, Sudan and Darfur," *BC Journal of International Affairs 13* (Spring 2010), <http://bcjournal.org/2006/between-conscience-and-self-interest/> (accessed February 16, 2010).

¹³ Greg Miller and Josh Meyer, "Sudan Aids CIA's Spy Efforts in Iraq," *Los Angeles Times*, June 11, 2007.

Sudan seemed to have transitioned post 9/11, from pariah state to one of relative normalcy concerning the United States as a result of its efforts in counter-terrorism. For the Government of Sudan, this virtually guaranteed its safety from international intervention for its actions in Darfur. It appeared as if the realist camp of the government, in the form of the CIA, DIA and others, were winning the battle over those who wanted forced intervention against Sudan for its role in the Darfur genocide. Politicians continued to pay lip service to constituents, human rights groups, and NGOs who expected US action. The US Senate Committee on Foreign Relations held regular testimonies from 2002 to 2008 on Sudan and the prospects for resolution. They fully recognized however, that the existence of Janjawid militiamen being trained by the government to rape and murder, government sanctioned aerial bombings of Darfuri villages, and the forced displacement of millions of people would make peaceful resolution unlikely.¹⁴

Along with the nominal improvement regarding Sudanese-American political relations as a result of their clandestine intelligence alliance, Sudan also made significant efforts to modernize its economy with better tax collection efforts and more opportunity for investment from abroad, which pleased the International Monetary Fund, and to a much quieter degree the United States.¹⁵ Presidential campaigns in 2004, notably George W. Bush's reelection campaign, condemned Sudan and backed economic sanctions in an effort to appease constituents.¹⁶ Despite

¹⁴ Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, *The Current Situation in Darfur and the Prospect of Peace: Hearings on S. Hrg. 108-866*, 108th Cong., 2nd sess., 2004, 4-6.

¹⁵ Christopher Swan reports that the IMF praised Sudan for their tax collection efforts in, "IMF Praises Sudan for Fiscal Restraint, Better Tax Collection," Bloomberg, <http://www.bloomberg.com/apps/news?pid=20601116&sid=aG6VC03DQTdc&refer=africa> (accessed February 21, 2010). In *The Scramble for Africa: Darfur-Intervention and the USA*, 56, Steve Fake and Kevin funk show that the ability to invest in Sudanese oil as a result of rapprochement pleased the United States.

¹⁶ George W. Bush, *Continuation of the national emergency with respect to Sudan: communication from the President of the United States transmitting notification that the national emergency declared with respect to*

the condemnations, there was a noticeable disconnect between US sanctions against Sudan since 2004 and Sudanese and multinational corporations' adherence to it. Companies like Coca-Cola circumvented US sanctions and found loopholes to invest by utilizing third party producers and distributors within Sudan.¹⁷ Sudatel, a Sudanese telecommunications company, virtually completely ignored American sanctions in 2007, by expanding into West Africa and subsequently Nigeria. Sudatel, which is partially state-owned, was not directly doing business with any American firms; however, with Nigeria being a major trade ally of the United States, the Sudanese company undoubtedly benefited from American investment and funding in the country.

The sanctions which were a result of pressure from civil rights groups, a group that did not constitute a significant voting block for Bush, and the evangelical and Jewish communities, which did, did not fade away after the 2004 elections. Throughout 2005 and 2006, the United States employed its position on the UN Security Council to lead the United Nations to impose a travel ban and asset freeze on a number of top officials within the Sudanese government. Nonetheless, the bulk of the economic sanctions placed on Sudan had little impact because Khartoum did not have any direct trade lines with the United States since 1997. The sanctions also had minimal impact because the main source of the country's wealth, oil exports, was tied primarily to Chinese investment. Much like the political realists who attempted to persuade the Bush Administration not to aggravate Khartoum because of its importance as an ally in the War

Sudan, by Executive Order 13067, is to continue in effect beyond November 3, 2004, pursuant to 50 USC. 1622(d), Washington: US G.P.O. George W. Bush declares Sudan to national security and foreign policy threat to the United States and sanctions against Khartoum, which began in 1997, should continue.

¹⁷ Sudan Sanctions, "The Coca-Cola Company Responds to Questions about Business in Sudan," A Summary of Sudan Sanctions, <http://sudansanctions.wordpress.com/2007/04/10/the-coca-cola-company-responds-to-questions-about-business-in-sudan/> (accessed February 21, 2010).

on Terror, economic realists convinced the Administration of the importance of Sudan as a potential source of oil. With energy security destined to become one of the paramount geopolitical issues of the 21st Century, economic analysts feared that American alienation of Khartoum could push a potential source of non-OPEC oil away from the United States and firmly towards its closest economic rival, China. The shift away from punishing Khartoum's oil manufacturers is evident in that of the thirty-one Sudanese corporations affected by the new sanctions enacted by President Bush in September 2007, only three were oil companies. Conversely, eight were agriculture and farming corporations and nine were infrastructure developers.¹⁸

The primary goal of American policymakers in not putting too much practical pressure on the Sudanese oil industry (as opposed to previous mandates in 1997 and 2002), yet using powerful and threatening rhetoric, was to gain more influence over Sudan's oil industry.¹⁹ American policy officials had identified the African oil market as one of fundamental interest to American foreign policy and energy security and had been making significant inroads on the continent since the late 1990's. African oil however was also a major focus of China, whose interest in African oil predates that of the United States. Presently China imports about one-third of its oil from Africa, 9% of the continent's total exports in 2006.²⁰ China is most heavily invested in Sudan in particular. Thirteen of the fifteen most important foreign companies

¹⁸ Sudan Sanctions, "31 Companies," A Summary of Sudan Sanctions, <http://sudansanctions.wordpress.com/2007/05/29/31-companies/> (accessed February 21, 2010).

¹⁹ Funk and Fake, 56.

²⁰ Stephanie Hanson, "China, Africa, and Oil: Council on Foreign Relations," The Washington Post, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2008/06/09/AR2008060900714.html> (Accessed March 12, 2009).

operating in Sudan in 2004 were Chinese and Sudan supplied China with 7% of its oil imports in the same year; a number that continued to grow over the next four years.²¹

Chinese investment, as opposed to Western, also had a noticeable appeal to African leaders because it was marketed to them by PRC officials as free of political or human rights linkage and colonial aims, factors which were characteristics of Western investment and aid. As a result, Sudanese oil infrastructure and trade developed almost completely independent of American aspirations. These factors, coupled with the fact that sanctions against Sudan barred any American oil companies from operating in Sudan, meant that Sudan's oil market belonged almost exclusively to the PRC.

With this understanding in mind, Washington declared African oil a priority for US national security post 9/11. This was a pragmatic and cynical act because it legitimized the United States future actions in the region, which included the establishment of a coordinating base, AFRICOM, for American intelligence and military concerns on the continent.²² Prior to the establishment of AFRICOM, Washington increased its influence in Sudan by helping to facilitate the 2005 Comprehensive Peace Agreement between Khartoum and the Sudan Peoples' Liberation Movement (SPLM), the largest and most influential rebel movement in Southern Sudan.

The United States' focus on bringing an end to the North-South civil war, whose combatants had been warring for two decades with casualties over that time numbering in the

²¹ Padraig R. Carmody and Francis Y. Owusu, "Competing Hegemons: Chinese versus American Geo-Economic Strategies in Africa," *Political Geography* 26, no. 5 (jun 2007) p.17-8, www.public.iastate.edu/~fowusu/competing%20Hegemons.pdf, (Accessed March 3, 2009).

²² Funk and Fake, 57.

millions, may have been inspired by Washington's aims at gaining access to Sudan's oil markets which they posited would be easier in peaceful conditions. These physical movements were accompanied by rhetoric that manifested itself in the form of congressional hearings and testimonies in Washington. Senator Lamar Alexander, speaking at a 2004 hearing before the Committee on Foreign Relations, stated that the first major charge from Senate to pass the Sudan Peace Act came in 2002 from Senate Majority Leader Bill Frist, his legislation providing a framework for peace negotiations in Sudan. However, the first real steps towards peace between the SPLM and Khartoum came in May 2004 with the moderation of the United States and several other Western nations, according to Alexander.²³

The United States' strong influence in the peace process directly coincides with intelligence coming from the region that Sudan's oil potential was several times greater than first predicted by Washington and thus worth consideration. This is backed up by the fact that the United States had little interest in bringing an end to the relatively isolated, but bloody civil war prior to 2002 other than stopping its weapon sales to the country in 1987, brokering a wobbly ceasefire between factions within the SPLA and their leaders, and beginning to refer to it as a rogue state which were accompanied by sanctions in the late 1990s.²⁴

The main purpose of the 2004 Senate hearing, which is apparent in the title, was to determine the cost to Darfur, in terms of casualties and destruction, of bringing an end to the Sudanese civil war. Several senators, including Alexander and Feingold acknowledged that

²³ Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, *Sudan: Peace but at what Price?*, 108th Cong., 2nd sess., 2004, S. HRG. 108-666, 2.

²⁴ Ruth Iyob and Gilbert M. Khadiagala, *Sudan: The Elusive Quest for Peace* (Boulder CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2006), 96, 109.

some policymakers in Washington were concerned that confronting Khartoum too directly over its actions in Darfur could jeopardize any prospect for lasting peace in Southern Sudan.²⁵ While discussing the potential of tying the North-South agreement to the Darfur genocide, the hearing as well as history shows that Washington's efforts in halting the Sudanese civil war was much more organized and advanced at that time than were its efforts in resolving Darfur. This is characterized by the fact that the Comprehensive Peace Agreement between the SPLM and the Government of Sudan was signed seven months later in January 2005, yet there is still currently no similar long lasting peace agreement in place for Darfur, six years later.

It is logical to assert that the reason behind Washington's inability to broker a similar deal for Darfur to the one it helped facilitate for the North-South civil war is because of the complexity and timing of the crisis, with the North-South Agreement reaching its pinnacle and the global War on Terror in full swing. However, Steve Fake and Kevin Funk state that there is a much more cynical reason behind the stall in negotiations for Darfur. As previously stated, the discovery of oil in the Darfur region made finding a resolution to the Darfur genocide much more difficult for American analysts. Fake and Funk argue that Washington softened its rhetoric and hand wringing towards Khartoum on the humanitarian disaster because it had hoped to improve relations with the Government of Sudan in an effort to potentially increase its control of the African oil market, which was as previously noted, a priority for US national security post 9/11.²⁶

²⁵ Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, *Sudan: Peace but at what Price?*, 108th Cong., 2nd sess., 2004, S. HRG. 108-666, 3.

²⁶ Funk and Fake, 56.

It is misleading to portray that the United States made no effort in trying to facilitate a peace agreement in Darfur. In 2006, Congressman Christopher H. Smith of New Jersey stated that Washington under President Bush “deserves to be commended for its tenacious efforts to help broker this agreement and to ease the suffering of those most affected by the genocide in Darfur.”²⁷ The DPA, which was modeled after the Comprehensive Peace Agreement, was an effort that attracted the participation of the African Union- in the form of AMIS, the United Nations Security Council, a number of NGOs, and the main factions of the conflict- the Government of Sudan and the two main rebel groups in Darfur, the Sudan Peoples’ Liberation Movement/Army and the Justice and Equality Movement (JEM). The agreement, which was signed on May 5, 2006 by ranking government officials and by Minni Minawi of the largest faction of the SLM, addressed the marginalization of Darfuri ethnic groups in terms of government participation and wealth sharing.²⁸

The DPA however was a significant failure, as predicted by Jan Pronk, the UN Secretary-General’s Special Representative in Sudan. Most rebel factions acting in Darfur rejected the agreement as it did not resonate with the people in Darfur, forces from both sides including the Janjawid continued the fighting, and the international community did not follow up their mediations with implementation.²⁹ The US played a pervasive role in both the forming of the agreement and its failure. As previously mentioned, American policymakers and officials in Washington struggled with deciding which crisis, the North-South civil war or the Darfur

²⁷ Committee on International Relations, *Prospects for Peace in Darfur*, 109th Cong., 2nd sess., 2006, Serial No. 109–209, 1.

²⁸ Ibid.

²⁹ Laurie Nathan, “No Ownership, No Peace: the Darfur Peace Agreement,” (Working Paper 5, Crisis States Research Centre, 2006), 2.

genocide, was more crucial to American foreign policy and security interests in the region. The United States, which perceived the North-South civil war as the more vital of the two in the early years of the Darfur crisis, saw reasonable success in its implementation efforts of a peace accord between the two factions in that conflict. Washington was thus motivated to apply virtually the same tactics used in the North-South civil war to resolve the Darfur crisis, a conflict which was much different because it involved many more rebel factions and was less structured when compared with the former.

In its anxiousness to find peace in Darfur like it did to a degree in Southern Sudan, Washington amongst others in the international community coerced the main warring parties to the negotiation table, which excluded common Darfuris and many other diminutive groups whose concerns were not addressed.³⁰ This action led to a ceasefire that lasted no longer than a month, further division of Darfuri rebel groups into smaller and weaker factions which worked to the advantage of Janjawid militias that were able to attack villages almost unabated, and more death and destruction in the region.

At later congressional hearings US politicians recognized the rebel groups' division as a serious weakness that Khartoum was taking advantage of, yet took no responsibility for the further divisions it caused amongst the rebel groups with its sponsorship of the failed DPA. In an opening statement at an April 2007 Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearing, Senator Joseph Biden of Delaware speaking on the state of the rebel groups stated, "... I urged them to come up with a common program. I offered to host them in Congress if they did. I warned them

³⁰ Mehari Taddele Maru, "Lessons from the Failure of Darfur Peace Agreement," Sudan Tribune, <http://www.sudantribune.com/spip.php?article20975> (accessed March 15, 2010).

that if they did not, Khartoum would use their division as an excuse to do nothing. We need a major sustained diplomatic initiative to bring these rebels together.”³¹ The DPA backfired on the Bush Administration, which sought a quick and lasting peace in Darfur to match the peace in Southern Sudan. Peace in the region would have appeased constituents, NGOs, and other activists important to the Administration as well as helped the United States maintain its image as the world’s defender of human welfare and continue its process of normalization with Sudan uninterrupted.

Normalization vis-à-vis Sudan was important to American foreign policy interests. It would allow American oil corporations to make inroads into the Sudanese oil market, and build a better working relationship concerning the War on Terror. Though not obvious, the goal of normalization is nevertheless apparent in the language of some American politicians. Making a statement at a hearing in front of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Andrew S. Natsios, the President’s Special Envoy to Sudan, claimed that, “Our focus is on human rights and on humanitarian issues. We have no military or economic interest in Darfur.”³² However, American politicians make several comments that seem contrary to that of the Department of State official. Senator Feingold, speaking at a hearing before the Senate on Foreign Relations states, “There can be no normalization of relations between the United States and Sudan while this crisis continues. That government should expect no support, financial, political, or otherwise, from the US Government and the US taxpayers until meaningful action has been taken to stop the violence, to protect civilians, and to cooperate with relief efforts rather than bogging them down

³¹ United States, *Darfur: A "Plan B" to Stop Genocide? : Hearing Before the Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate, One Hundred Tenth Congress, First Session, April 11, 2007*, Washington: US G.P.O., 2008, 2.

³² *Ibid.*

with shakedowns and obstructions disguised as petty administrative requests.”³³ Likewise, Senator Biden acknowledged while speaking at an April 2008 hearing before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations that the Bush Administration and Khartoum had been in meetings in Rome regarding rapprochement between the United States and Sudan, although he follows up this acknowledgement with a statement of political posturing, that normalization should not occur until steps are taken by Khartoum to end hostilities with rebel groups, allow UN-AU peacekeeping troops into the region, and allow the humanitarian effort to reach the victims of the tragedy.³⁴

US support for the efforts of the United Nations in resolving the conflict is also a point of contention. Historically, the UN and US were on opposite sides of the geopolitical spectrum, most of all because of the United States perceived prerogative as an unrivaled superpower over the last two decades, to pursue its national interests without being bound by multi-lateral decision making entities such as the UN; Darfur was no different.³⁵ While rhetoric from Washington shows that the Bush Administration was in full support of the United Nations aims in Darfur, its actions showed otherwise.

During the Darfur genocide, the UN, whose role will be discussed in depth in the proceeding chapter, took a number of steps to bring peace to Darfur and to bring the perpetrators of the genocide to justice. Some of these steps however, were disparate from the goals and interests pursued by the United States for the region, and thus put the two entities at odds.

³³ United States, *Sudan: Peace but at What Price? : Hearing Before the Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate, One Hundred Eighth Congress, Second Session, June 15, 2004*. Washington: US G.P.O., 2004, 3.

³⁴ United States, *The Continuing Crisis in Darfur Hearing Before the Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate, One Hundred Tenth Congress, Second Session, April 23, 2008*, Washington: US G.P.O., 2009, 3.

³⁵ James Traub, *The Best Intentions: Kofi Annan and the UN in the Era of American World Power* (New York: Farrar, Strauss and Giroux, 2006), xi.

Utilizing its role on the Security Council, the United States threatened to vote against a UN resolution to refer the situation in Darfur to the International Criminal Court (ICC). This action was taken because Washington feared that the ICC in its investigation would have jurisdiction over all nationals operating in Sudan, including those of the United States.³⁶ Stating worry for national sovereignty as the motivating factor, American policymakers genuinely feared that the ICC's actions in Sudan, which is a sovereign nation, could set a precedent that empowers the International Criminal Court to perform investigations in places such as Iraq, where the actions of US troops would be heavily scrutinized and brought into question, threatening American foreign policy interests.

To counteract the ICC commission in Darfur, which could have brought American troops and officials under the Rome Statute - a series of international laws meant to punish perpetrators of serious international crimes, US officials in January 2005 proposed the use of a UN criminal tribunal modeled after a similar court used in Rwanda.³⁷ The proposal to create a criminal tribunal had many opponents. Americans who supported referring Sudan to the ICC as the 'single best mechanism' for justice in Darfur, as well as officials of member nations of the Security Council that supported the court argued that Washington's fears of a politically motivated and uncontrollable ICC could never occur because the court was essentially under the control of the Security Council, of which the United States is a member.³⁸ Human rights groups vehemently opposed the proposal because they saw the measure, which would have taken time to

³⁶ John R. Crook, "United States Abstains on Security Council Resolution Authorizing Referral of Darfur to International Criminal Court," *The American Journal of International Law* 99, no. 3 (Jul. 2005): 691-2.

³⁷ "US Proposes New Regional Court to Hear Charges Involving Darfur, Others Urge ICC," *The American Journal of International Law* 99, no.2 (Apr., 2005): 501-2.

³⁸ Ibid.

plan and establish, as stalling on providing aid and relief to the people of Darfur. The Bush Administration, as they perceived the situation, put its foreign interests and ideological opposition to the existence of such a court before the lives of millions of Darfuri nationals affected by genocide.³⁹ The ICC resolution did not stall as long as feared however, and was passed on March 31, 2005; the United States abstention and not rejection helped to pass the resolution.

For the Bush Administration, Darfur represented an enigma that was, in the eyes of some of its analysts, unsolvable. From the moment of Secretary of State Colin Powell's declaration of genocide the United States has been expected, as the protector of humanity, to muster the international community to intervene in Darfur, bringing those responsible in the Government of Sudan to justice and bringing an end to the suffering of the people of Darfur. In actuality, a number of influences played a role in the decision making of the Bush Administration which brought its intervention effort to a halt before ever it started. The War on Terror forced the United States to form a useful yet uneasy alliance with Sudan in providing intelligence on terrorist cells acting throughout East Africa and the Middle East. Domestic terrorism by the Government of Sudan against the people of Darfur was thus overlooked by American policymakers because Sudan was too important as an intelligence-sharing entity to be alienated by Washington. Likewise, energy security in the form of African oil was a primary factor of American foreign policy interests that seriously affected its efforts in Darfur. The Sudanese oil market, which had grown substantially over the last decade, was declared to be of key

³⁹ Human Rights Watch, "US Thwarts Justice for Darfur," *Review of African Political Economy* 32, no. 103 (Mar., 2005): 195-6.

importance to American security coincidentally when Darfur was in the throes of genocide. Policymakers began to push for a normalization of the economic relationship with Sudan so that American oil companies, who had not been allowed to operate in Sudan since the mid 90's, could begin competing with the likes of China for investment opportunities in the oil rich nation. Although rhetoric and media influenced propaganda from the Bush Administration got tougher against Khartoum for its actions in the crisis, American moves to hold the Government of Sudan responsible for its actions were marginal at best.

CHAPTER TWO: THE UNITED NATIONS- NO SHOULDERS TO BEAR THE BLAME

Ten years after the Rwandan genocide, the United Nations was asked to intervene, with a swifter and stronger response, to atrocities in Darfur. Under the leadership of Secretary General Kofi Annan, the United Nations conducted many fact finding missions and developed reports on the humanitarian crisis that was unfolding in Darfur in order to mobilize its member states to commit to providing economic, political, and humanitarian aid to the people of Darfur and to hold the Government of Sudan responsible for the overly brutal tactics it had utilized to quell the rebellion in Darfur, which left the region in devastating condition. What resulted was a disingenuous response from member states that had disparate views on how to approach the Darfur question and stagnation in regard to improvement of the situation from a diplomatic perspective because of Khartoum's skill in stalling and stifling, which were greater than the efforts of the United Nations. It also resulted in a humanitarian response that could not reach the intended victims due to the staunchly resistant Sudanese government as well as the poor conditions of roads and other infrastructure that should have led to the intended targets.

The United Nations' failure to negotiate an end to the crisis did not fall squarely on the shoulders of the organization and its leader Kofi Annan. The United States along with other member states, which had always been wary of the organization, pressured the United Nations to follow their recommendations pertaining to Darfur; in cases where it did not, the same countries provided little support. When failure was realized, they pointed out the UN as being the main catalyst for the breakdown, turning the organization into a scapegoat. The United Nations was

also being pressured by its members to deal with crises in sequence, meaning that at the beginning of the Darfur conflict when it would have been most pertinent to respond, the UN was fully involved in the North-South peace process.¹ In addition, the Sudanese government's efforts in obstructing UN progress towards unified action in Darfur proved effective. From a humanitarian standpoint, the United Nations was stretched paper thin in the region having been involved with the humanitarian relief effort in Southern Sudan from the outset. Annan also feared that strong action against Sudan by the United Nations could appear as neocolonialism by the West to Middle Eastern nations, as the existence of oil in the region could be seen as a motivating factor in a humanitarian invasion. Most importantly, the United Nations failed in Darfur because it had very little support en masse. The international community or the member states of the UN Security Council more specifically, did not want to commit excessive amounts of effort and manpower to bring an end to the catastrophe if such action had the potential to impair their national or foreign policy interests.

The United Nations' presence in Sudan was already strong at the time the crisis began in Darfur due to the Sudanese civil war. Although mostly isolated in Southern Sudan, where aid at the time was most needed, the UN was spending \$300 million a year in Sudan on employing manpower, humanitarian assistance, and the maintenance of a large fleet of aircraft and vehicles.² Throughout the early and middle months of 2003, reports continued to trickle onto the desks of UN officials residing in Khartoum from survivors of villages in Western Sudan that were being brutally attacked and destroyed, further stating that there was a pattern to the attacks.

¹ Slim, 814.

² Traub, 213.

By November 2003 UN officials in Khartoum, under the regional leadership of Dr. Mukesh Kapila, learned that the patterned occurrences being reported throughout the year were in actuality an organized campaign to rid Western Sudan of its African inhabitants by the Government of Sudan with the aid of Janjawid militiamen.³ The destruction of African ethnic groups in the region was ordered in retaliation to a string of defeats starting with the April 25, 2003 attack on a government air base in al Fasher Darfur by a combined group of rebels from the Sudan Liberation Army and the Justice and Equality Movement which resulted in the deaths of seventy five Sudanese soldiers, the capture of thirty two more, and the destruction of several warplanes and helicopters at the air field.⁴ Kapila responded by sending a memorandum to Annan and the UN headquarters in late November 2003 informing them of the pending humanitarian catastrophe that was developing as a result of the violence and destruction, stating that the international community must pressure the Government of Sudan into bringing a halt to Janjawid attacks and its own airstrikes in the region.⁵

The Sudanese government, recognizing the international community's potential for interference in its plans, began using obstruction tactics as early as September 2003, when it allowed humanitarian aid access to only 500,000 IDPs that were previously cut off to relief.⁶ In December 2003, United Nations Emergency Relief Coordinator Jan Egeland held a press conference to mobilize the international community and to bring attention to the conflict.

³ Traub, 214.

⁴ William F. Schulz, "Spread Wide the Word: Organizing the Grassroots to End Atrocity Crimes," in *Responsibility to Protect: The Global Moral Compact for the 21st Century* ed. Richard H. Cooper and Juliette Voinov Kohler (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2009), 150-1.

⁵ Traub, 214.

⁶ UN News Centre, "Sudan: government and rebel group agree to allow aid access to 500,000 – UN," UN News Service, <http://www.un.org/apps/news/storyAr.asp?NewsID=8284&Cr=sudan&Cr1=> (accessed March 20, 2010).

Regarding the disaster, Egeland gravely claimed, "The humanitarian situation in Darfur has quickly become one of the worst in the world. Access to people in need is blocked by the parties in conflict and now, as the need for aid grows, stocks of relief materials are dwindling."⁷ Egeland went further in the press conference to refer to both the Sudanese government and the rebel groups as "combatants" and blamed both sides for the lack of access to victims, citing international law as a reason to allow humanitarian workers safe access to the refugees.⁸ Kofi Annan and other UN officials did not know how to contend with the organization's inability to get relief to IDPs.

To counteract inaccessibility, the UN High Commissioner for Refugees began relocating IDPs away from the Darfur-Chad border, where the Sudanese troops and Janjawid were conducting most of their attacks, and deeper into Chad to UN built safe camps in early 2004. Refugees quickly overwhelmed these sites, pouring into these camps by the tens of thousands, which enflamed the humanitarian catastrophe further and increased political tension between Sudan and Chad. Janjawid militia were not relenting their attack and with support from the Sudanese government with bombers and fighter planes, the Janjawid led a devastating offensive, sacking and burning Darfuri villages as well as refugee camps on the Chadian border.⁹ By mid 2004, the situation in Darfur began to draw stark comparisons to the Rwandan genocide ten years earlier from many analysts and human rights groups.

⁷ UN News Centre, "Humanitarian and security situations in western Sudan reach new lows, UN agency says," UN News Service, <http://www.un.org/apps/news/storyAr.asp?NewsID=9094&Cr=sudan&Cr1=> (accessed March 20, 2010).

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ Prunier, 102.

Egeland and other officials already recognized the situation in Darfur as ethnic cleansing at the hands of the Government of Sudan based on briefs and reports of scorched-earth tactics and the targeting of black ethnic groups, particularly the Fur, Massalit, and Zaghawa.¹⁰ Their beliefs were confirmed when reports arrived that Darfur's IDP population had reached one million in May 2004 and that numerous UN calls to the Sudanese government to disarm the Janjawid, including several from Kofi Annan, had fallen on deaf ears. Despite nominal ceasefires and a slight increase in funding, the situation continued to deteriorate due to UN aid resources not having the ability to keep up with demands for food, water, and medicine. In situations where the UN provided adequate aid, some of the supplies never reached their targets because of theft and blockage by the Sudanese government and, to a lesser extent, the rebel groups. Pledges to stop the bombings and support for the Janjawid by the Sudanese had very little weight behind them with fighter planes and gunships often strafing rebel villages and cities only moments after meetings with UN officials had concluded.¹¹

Throughout 2004, the United Nations faced many stonewalls and intricacies on how to resolve the burgeoning crisis without making too many aggressive moves, upsetting the delicate balance in East Africa and potentially allowing the situation to spill out and cause exponentially greater damage. Its task got significantly harder when US Secretary of State Colin Powell, only two months after a fact finding trip to Sudan with Kofi Annan, declared on September 9, 2004 that what he perceived was taking place in Darfur was genocide. The overly pragmatic United Nations under Annan, whose multiple efforts at forging peace agreements with Omar al-Bashir

¹⁰ UN News Centre, "Sudan: Envoy warns of ethnic cleansing as Security Council calls for ceasefire," UN News Service, <http://www.un.org/apps/news/storyAr.asp?NewsID=10307&Cr=sudan&Cr1=> (accessed March 20, 2010).

¹¹ Traub, 224.

had been unsuccessful, was rocked by the declaration because it committed the United Nations to take action based on the 1948 Genocide Convention. Although Powell's statement was not backed with any American commitment to action, as a member of the Security Council and based on the Responsibility to Protect doctrine, it became the UN's duty to use appropriate means to ensure the safety of the population of Darfur from crimes against humanity.

The Responsibility to Protect (R2P) doctrine, which was not formally recognized by the United Nations General Assembly until September 16, 2005, was nevertheless a set of principles that had already enjoyed a position of influence within the realm of international law since its conceptualization in 2001.¹² The main principles of the doctrine are rooted in the four 1949 Geneva Conventions from which the main ideals of international humanitarian law were developed.¹³ The key aspects of R2P that are embraced by the UN General Assembly state that "Each individual State has the responsibility to protect its populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity. This responsibility entails the prevention of such crimes, including their incitement, through appropriate and necessary means..." and that "The international community, through the United Nations, also has the responsibility to use appropriate diplomatic, humanitarian and other peaceful means, in accordance with Chapters VI and VIII of the Charter, to help protect populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity..."¹⁴ Most importantly, the norm governs that the international

¹² Richard H. Cooper and Juliette Voinov Kohler, "The Responsibility to Protect, The Opportunity to Relegate Atrocity Crimes to the Past," in *Responsibility to Protect: The Global Moral Compact for the 21st Century* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), 3.

¹³ Ibid.

¹⁴ UN General Assembly, Sixtieth Session, *Integrated and coordinated implementation of and follow-up to the outcomes of the major United Nations conferences and summits in the economic, social and related fields*, A/60/L.1, 15 September 2005, 31.

community, through the approval of the Security Council, take collective action in situations that peaceful means have proven to be inadequate.¹⁵

The R2P doctrine was adopted by the UN for several reasons. First, in regard to safety, security and the protection of human rights, member states of the UN could rarely come to a consensus on what should be considered commonly shared humanitarian principles; the subjective nature of cultural and political differences between member states were difficult to overcome.¹⁶ The R2P resolution, as a set of norms, was meant to provide a structure through which to analyze a situation, regardless of cultural or political disparities, to determine if human rights abuses are taking place or can potentially take place, and the level of response which is warranted (mediation, economic sanctions, a peacekeeping force).

Second, it defines the role of the Security Council, as the de facto head of the international community, in responding to crimes against humanity. The Security Council is responsible for maintaining world peace and security, particularly its permanent five members. Before the adoption of the R2P resolution, the Security Council, who had the sole right to intervene militarily in the most extreme violations of human rights, could be stifled by the veto power of the permanent five.¹⁷ After the introduction of the resolution, state interests are in theory overpowered as the Security Council is now obligated to prevent or bring an end to the

¹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶ Cherif Bassiouni, "Advancing the Responsibility to Protect Through International Criminal Justice," in *Responsibility to Protect: The Global Moral Compact for the 21st Century* ed. Richard H. Cooper and Juliette Voinov Kohler (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2009), 32.

¹⁷ Ibid.

existence of genocides, crimes against humanity, war crimes, and ethnic cleansing wherever any of these factors exist.¹⁸

Third, in previous conflicts where those four factors existed, such as Yugoslavia and Rwanda, the Security Council was noticeably reactive to the humanitarian disasters that were ongoing. The R2P resolution influences the international community to take preventive measures to deter the potential perpetrating states from committing serious transgressions, which eliminates or, at a minimum, greatly curtails the loss of lives and maintains the international status quo.¹⁹

Despite its strong support amongst member states and adoption by the United Nations General Assembly, the R2P resolution was nonetheless criticized for its shortcomings. Alex J. Bellamy argues in his article, “Responsibility to Protect or Trojan Horse? The Crisis in Darfur and Humanitarian Intervention after Iraq,” that it has become harder for some member states of the permanent five, particularly the United States and Great Britain, to convince other nations to answer the call for humanitarian emergencies such as Darfur, when they are engaged in conflicts that are causing humanitarian issues themselves.²⁰ The author goes on to show that the merging of national interests and humanitarianism for the United States after September 11th, with its attempts at justifying the US-led invasions of Afghanistan and later Iraq as humanitarian intervention, has not only discredited the R2P doctrine in some ways, but also affected their ability to be carriers of the humanitarian banner.

¹⁸ “US Officials Endorse “Responsibility to Protect” Through Security Council Action,” *The American Journal of International Law* 100, no. 2 (Apr., 2006): 463.

¹⁹ Bassiouni, 33.

²⁰ Alex J. Bellamy, “Responsibility to Protect or Trojan Horse? The Crisis in Darfur and Humanitarian Intervention after Iraq,” *Ethics and International Affairs* 19, Iss. 2 (September 2005): 33.

On one hand, some members of the Security Council opposed the use of the International Criminal Court in Sudan because it threatened state sovereignty. However, as shown by the United States experiences in Afghanistan and Iraq, the significance of state sovereignty was greatly diminished because the United States invaded those sovereign states without Security Council approval. Bellamy makes the point that American officials cited state failure as their reason for invasion. In the case of Afghanistan and Iraq, state failure would have led to humanitarian disasters in the form of terrorist attacks, making intervention there a moral responsibility for the United States, a position that was readily exploited by Washington.²¹

Another major argument against the R2P doctrine concerns the selectivity of the Security Council. In other words, opponents fear an inherent bias for member states to use R2P when it is politically or economically beneficial for them, or an individual or state that is politically important to their interests.²² In this, they further fear the use of R2P by members of the Security Council who are often the most technologically advanced and most developed countries in the world, to rationalize their invasion and “rebuilding” of underdeveloped nations. Skeptical of their humanitarian aims, opponents claim that R2P allows ‘civilized’ nations to legally advance their national interests through the exploitation of underdeveloped yet sovereign states, which borders on neo-colonialism.²³

In Darfur, the R2P norm did have a profound effect in respect to immediate action by the Security Council. However, questions over implementation and concerns regarding the disparate

²¹ Ibid., 37.

²² S. Neil Macfarlane, Carolin J. Thielking and Thomas G. Weiss, “Review: The Responsibility to Protect: Is Anyone Interested in Humanitarian Intervention?,” *Third World Quarterly* Vol. 25, No. 5 (2004): 980.

²³ Ibid., 979.

opinions on how to approach the crisis by members of the Security Council yet still, hampered the United Nation's ability to utilize the R2P doctrine to persuade the international community into giving it the necessary funding and manpower to intervene in Darfur. The UN prior to the adoption of the resolution could not prevent the escalation of the conflict, which had resulted in approximately 180,000 deaths by the spring of 2005, most of which were civilian fatalities.²⁴ The use of weak sanctions, fact finding missions, ceasefires, proposals, and commitments from the Sudanese government to disarm the Janjawid and bring a halt to the use of heavy weaponry on Darfuri villages had paid no dividends in terms of lives.

From September 2004 to September 2005, the UN Security Council passed several resolutions which created the United Nations Mission in Sudan (Resolution 1590), attempted to stifle Khartoum's use of heavy weaponry in Darfur by requiring it seek approval before it moved any equipment into the Darfur region (Resolution 1591), and threatened the Sudanese government with referral to the International Criminal Court (Resolution 1593).²⁵ None of these initiatives had the influence intended. The most influential UN Security Council resolution came after the advent of R2P, and could not have been possible without its adoption. In July 2006, the Security Council passed Resolution 1706, which called for a 17,300 troop UN peacekeeping force to supplement the wavering African Union force that was already in Darfur, having been accepted by Khartoum in late 2004, but was failing to make a difference.²⁶ With the passing of Resolution 1706, the strongest step to UN intervention in Darfur had been made. However,

²⁴ John Hagan and Alberto, "Social Science: Death in Darfur." *Science* 313, no. 5793 (15 September 2006): 313. UN humanitarian coordinator estimated in early 2005 that in 18 months of conflict, 180,000 people had died.

²⁵ Mamdani, 44.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 45.

questions over how to staff and lead the force, the weakness of its mandate, and how to circumvent Khartoum and its efforts at blocking international aid had yet to be answered.

The first major road block for the UN indeed came in the form of Sudanese opposition to the peacekeeping force. Khartoum, which had successfully blocked attempts from the UN to send a team to investigate human rights abuses in Darfur, was fully intent on not allowing such a force into the region.²⁷ Realizing that the lack of success from African Union peacekeepers could potentially lead to them being replaced by United Nations peacekeepers that would be more capable of asserting their will in Darfur, Sudanese President al-Bashir began to incite issues between the AU and UN, stating that only African troops under African command would be acceptable.²⁸ Al-Bashir questioned the credibility of the African Union by insinuating that the UN could not be controlled by the AU, further stating that a colonial status would be installed in Sudan and soon the rest of Africa if the issues in Darfur did not remain strictly an African problem. By causing distractions such as these, al-Bashir effectively suppressed a consorted effort between the United Nations and African Union, allowing Khartoum to continue its military actions in the region.

Although al-Bashir made it clear that he would never allow Resolution 1706 to fulfill its goals in Sudan, politicians throughout the international community continued to heap pressure on him and the Sudanese government to allow the 17,000 troop peacekeeping force into Darfur. In September 2006, Secretary of State Condoleeza Rice, speaking at a meeting of several world

²⁷ Opheera McDoom, "Sudan Blocks UN Human Rights Mission over Envoy," *Reuters*, February 12, 2007.

²⁸ Mark Turner, "Sudan President Defies Calls for UN Peacekeeping Force in Darfur," *Financial Times*, September 20, 2006, <http://www.proquest.com.ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/> (accessed March 26, 2010).

leaders proclaimed, “As President Bush said on Tuesday, if the Sudanese government does not approve the peacekeeping force quickly, the United Nations must find a way to act.”²⁹ UN sanctioned no-fly zones and heavy weapons bans had proven ineffective thus far, as had economic sanctions. The veiled threat of open confrontation with the West conversely, seemed to have lightened Khartoum’s outright rejection of UN troops in the region. After diplomatic meetings with officials from the European Union, the Government of Sudan stated that it would be willing to accept United Nations peacekeeping troops into Darfur, although only to bolster the numbers of AU troops already there, and only under the leadership of African commanders.³⁰ After claiming that this was unacceptable, Security Council diplomats acquiesced to the demands of Khartoum, leading to the development of a joint AU/UN force, with United Nations troops taking the role of ‘technical assistants’ or advisors.³¹

With Khartoum now firmly dictating the shape of Resolution 1706, the Security Council was once again at a standstill. Kofi Annan and other UN officials fully understood that the weak and directionless African Union force in Darfur, even with the support of the UN, would not be able to sustain peace in the region. Resolution 1769 was thus passed by the Security Council giving the mandate to create a hybrid force, known as UNAMID (the United Nations-African Union Mission in Darfur), and detailing the means of transition from the African Union Mission in Sudan to UNAMID, including command structure.³² There was also language within the

²⁹ Zachary R. Dowdy, "Rice Urges Sudan to Work with UN," *Knight Ridder Tribune Business News*, September 24, 2006, <http://www.proquest.com.ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/> (accessed March 26, 2010).

³⁰ Mark Turner, "US Hits at Sudan Troop Challenge," *Financial Times*, October 6, 2006, <http://www.proquest.com.ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/> (accessed March 26, 2010).

³¹ Andrew England and Mark Turner, "Khartoum Curbs UN Role in Darfur Force," *Financial Times*, November 18, 2006, <http://www.proquest.com.ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/> (accessed March 26, 2010).

³² Mamdani, 45.

resolution for UNAMID to guarantee progression of the DPA, and to enforce a ceasefire between the Government of Sudan and rebel groups. Mamdani argues that there is an intrinsic discrepancy within the resolution. The author states that the resolution called for the promotion by UNAMID, of a political agreement and ceasefire between the Sudanese government and rebel groups through the application of the DPA, which was a program that had already failed because nothing had been agreed between belligerents.³³ He further claims that the West did not want a political agreement, showing that when the opportunity had arisen to put pressure on rebel groups who were unwilling to negotiate with the Sudanese government, where the government had already agreed to negotiations, Western states blamed the Government of Sudan and inflicted more sanctions.³⁴

Unsurprisingly, al-Bashir went back on his vow to allow a UN force into Darfur, stating that the UN could provide technical and financial support to the African Union, but no UN troops would be allowed in the region.³⁵ Naturally, the UN responded with a series of tough but ultimately limited sanctions against Darfur. In addition to the problems caused by Khartoum, UNAMID had a more innate issue in that it could barely field a force to account for, with only a few nations offering troops to man the mission. By the end of Kofi Annan's ten year tenure as Secretary General on January 1, 2007, the United Nations was no closer to bringing a halt to what was gradually being termed the "the next Rwanda," in Darfur. 2007 was wrought with inaction from the moneyless African Union, a lack of power projection from the Security

³³ Ibid., 46.

³⁴ Ibid.

³⁵ Miranda Green, "Sudan Turns Down UN Darfur Force," *Financial Times*, December 2, 2006, <http://www.proquest.com.ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/> (accessed March 26, 2010).

Council and disillusionment amongst its member states, and more rejections and objections from the Sudanese government. Multilateral intervention in Darfur, through UN action, required full commitment from powerful members of the international community. The UN General Assembly, with many developing countries that had a sympathetic perspective of the situation in Darfur, showed the necessary commitment. However, member nations of the Security Council each with separate geopolitical goals and interests, as well as interests in Sudan, did not respond with the intent required to bolster the United Nations hopes of peacefully resolving the conflict.

China, which had been earlier identified as a key business partner for Sudan, was heavily invested in Sudan's budding oil industry at the time of the crisis. Energy security to fuel its booming economy was China's primary concern in reference to Africa. To further this goal, the PRC marketed itself to Africa as the most ideal trading partner because it was not inclined to tie economics and trade to human rights, unlike the West. Due to these factors, China was at odds with Western states that recognized the PRC's economic partnership with Sudan as a means for Sudan to dodge UN sanctions. As one of the permanent five members of the Security Council, China used its position to protect Sudan from major UN action by abstaining from or objecting a number of resolutions, citing the national belief of noninterference in the internal affairs of foreign countries, a pillar of Chinese policy, as the reason.³⁶

Unlike most Western states, China did not see the utility in the Security Council focusing its energies on developing a large peacekeeping force that had the potential to lead to further death and destruction, with al-Bashir stating that any large force entering a sovereign UN member state without its permission could be taken as an act of aggression. Instead, China saw

³⁶ Mamdani, 51.

the crisis in Darfur as one requiring a political settlement; considering that it was in essence a civil war. In this, China did pressure Sudan to the negotiating table and appealed to Omar al-Bashir to allow a small UN peacekeeping force, in its truest form, to maintain peace in the region. For China, with its massive investments in the Sudanese oil industry, this was the most logical method of intervention.

As another member of the permanent five, Russia played a lesser known, but decisive role in the United Nations weak intervention effort in Darfur. Prior to the Darfur crisis, Russia was a primary supplier of heavy and mid-grade military weaponry to Sudan. Likewise, Russian aircraft and vehicles are prevalent in Sudanese airways and highways.³⁷ During the crisis, Russia identified Sudan as a potentially wealthy business opportunity where it had hoped to develop partnerships in the oil, pipeline, power generation, water resource, and railroad transportation industries.³⁸ Because of this, Russia looked to emulate China in not fostering UN resolutions that enabled strict sanctions on Sudan.

Although Russia recognized China as an economic rival in Sudan, Russian officials often voted lockstep with their Chinese counterparts. Both nations abstained from vote on Resolution 1706, claiming that a force of that magnitude could lead to a militant response from Sudan. Both were also lockstep when they denied a charge from Amnesty International that both countries breached a UN arms embargo, after an Amnesty International study found that Sudan imported

³⁷ "Russia's envoy comments on Sudan situation, prospects." *BBC Monitoring Former Soviet Union*, March 26, 2010, <http://www.proquest.com.ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/> (accessed March 26, 2010).

³⁸ *Ibid.*

\$45 million of materiel since 2005, when the embargo was instituted.³⁹ Russia's position as a supporter of the Bashir regime while simultaneously being a permanent five member of the Security Council, also hampered the Council's ability to utilize the Responsibility to Protect doctrine to bring perpetrating members of the Darfur genocide within the Khartoum regime to justice. Out of twenty UN resolutions that include a reference to Responsibility to Protect regarding Darfur, Russia abstained from seven.⁴⁰

From the outset, the Darfur crisis had been marginal to the interests of the Arab world. Much like its stance towards Sudan during the North-South civil war, the Arab League, representing the Arab world, backed the Sudanese government in Darfur. There are several potential reasons why the Arab League fully backed the Government of Sudan, despite evidence which showed the government had adopted a policy of ethnic cleansing against the African population of Darfur, almost all of whom were Muslim. It was likely that the Arab League backed Khartoum because of its suspicion of Western interest in the region. Many Arab scholars, journalists, and policymakers felt that the West was inciting African ethnic groups in Darfur to rebel against Khartoum, which would cause Khartoum to respond with force, prompting the West to intervene and take charge in Sudan, also taking charge of all the country's natural wealth.⁴¹

³⁹ "China, Russia Deny Weapons Breach," BBC News, 2007, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/africa/6632959.stm> (accessed March 26, 2010).

⁴⁰ Sheri Watson, "The Responsibility to Protect in Darfur: A Critical Analysis of the International Response," (Working Paper 6, Alice Salomon University of Applied Sciences, 2008), 28.

⁴¹ Hassan Tahsin, "Why is West Showing So Much Interest in Darfur?" *Arab News*, June 3, 2005, <http://www.jstor.org.ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/stable/162401?seq=1&Search=yes&term=breadbasket&term=sudan&term=economy&term=potential&list=hide&searchUri=%2Faction%2FdoBasicSearch%3FQuery%3Dthe%2Beconomy%2Bof%2Bsudan%2B%2Bpotential%2Bbreadbasket%26gw%3Djtx%26prq%3Dthe%2Beconomy%2Bof%2Bsudan%2B>

Another reason for the indifference in the Arab League was the racial makeup of Sudan. To the Arab world, Sudan was more African than Arab, as virtually all Sudanese- African or Arab, appeared black in skin color. Despite the Sudan's role as the breadbasket of the Arab world, it is still viewed by most Middle Eastern states as outside their cultural dynamic.⁴² Therefore to the Arab world, it was more important to focus on events in Iraq and Palestine that were taking place simultaneously, because they were distinctly Arab.⁴³ Yet another reason for the indifference shown by the Arab League is the propensity for Arab nations to either protect, or stay out of each other's way when one is accused of committing atrocities by the global community.⁴⁴ Due to these factors, and despite pressure from the West to act decisively regarding Sudan, the Arab world was relatively ineffective in supporting the multilateral intervention effort in Darfur.

Great Britain, the former colonial masters of Sudan, was plagued by its past position as colonizer as well as its relationship with the United States. Like its American counterparts, Great Britain was heavily involved in Iraq and as a result was losing its international identity as a flag bearer of human rights and humanitarianism. Also, as a result of their full participation in the War on Terror, British armed forces were stretched too thin to fully support armed intervention in Sudan. Consequently, threats from British politicians to the Sudanese

%2Bpotential%26hp%3D25%26wc%3Don&item=3&ttl=62&returnArticleService=showArticle&resultsServiceName=doBasicResultsFromArticle (accessed March 30, 2010).

⁴² Jack G. Kaikati, "The Economy of Sudan: A Potential Breadbasket of the Arab World?" *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, Vol. 11, No. 1 (Feb., 1980): 100.

⁴³ Irit Back, "Darfur: A View from the Arab World," *Tel Aviv Notes*, June 19, 2008, http://www.dayan.org/Irit%20Back_darfur.pdf (accessed March 30, 2010).

⁴⁴ Rami G. Khouri, "Darfur's Ugly Resonance in the Arab World," *Agence Global*, <http://www.agenceglobal.com/article.asp?id=201> (accessed March 30, 2010).

government, stating that the United Kingdom would act to protect the people of Darfur if Khartoum could not, were perceived as empty.

Falling in line with other members of the Security Council who did not have strategic interests in Darfur or did not have the power projection capabilities to act on their interests, Great Britain backed the use of economic sanctions and no-fly zones, both of which had limitations and had little impact on the Sudanese government. Great Britain's firm stance with the United States on Iraq and Darfur put it at odds with other member states of the European Union. EU member states such as France and Germany were opposed to the war in Iraq, which had a great effect on the EU's ability to coordinate a unified response to the Darfur question.⁴⁵ With ambiguity shown from Washington, as well as a lack of resolve from the European Union, Great Britain had no clear direction on how to approach Darfur, making them solely reliant on their humanitarian aid to have an impact in the region and rendering them virtually ineffectual as a UN Security Council member state.

The United Nations, despite the efforts of officials such as Kofi Annan, was doomed before it started in its efforts to resolve the genocide in Darfur. The global community, with memories of the Rwandan genocide still fresh, expected the United Nations to be well prepared ten years later to prevent a similar catastrophe from occurring again. In actuality, the UN was a weaker organization than ever before, now being fully reliant on member states that were first and foremost committed to their own national interests, to provide the necessary financial, diplomatic, and military means to act in Darfur. Without the full support of its member states,

⁴⁵ Prunier, 140.

particularly powerful members such as China and the United States, the United Nations could carry little more than the humanitarian burden in Darfur.

Contending with the Sudanese government, which was intent on blocking all of the United Nations efforts in gaining access to the region, proved difficult as well. The organization's focus on the Comprehensive Peace Agreement, at the behest of the international community who believed the North-South civil war to be a more important conflict, played to the advantage of Khartoum who continued its policy of ethnic cleansing in Darfur unabated. The implementation of useful instruments such as the Responsibility to Protect doctrine in 2005, appeared to pay dividends in the form of new and potent resolutions, yet continued rejections from Darfur and a divided Security Council hindered the full use of the Responsibility to Protect norm. In its attempts to maintain a delicate balance between upholding the global political status quo, to not violate the rights of a sovereign state, and to fully supporting the Comprehensive Peace Agreement, all of which were necessary to ensure its very survival as an influential geopolitical entity, the United Nations rendered itself incapable of finding an adequate and lasting answer to the Darfur question.

CHAPTER THREE: THE EUROPEAN UNION AND DARFUR- THE TRANSITION FROM APATHETIC BENEFACTION TO PERIPHERAL ENGAGEMENT

European involvement in Africa since the era of African independence has been paramount in the latter's political, economic, and infrastructural advancement. The bilateral relationship has benefited both parties concerning trade and diplomacy. However, in regard to regional security in Africa, the relationship has failed to develop over the last fifty years. Africa's security deficit was a primary concern for the European Union in the new millennium, which Europe bears some responsibility due to the 1884 Berlin Conference where existing African empires and chiefdoms were divided amongst European powers. In the ten years prior to the Darfur crisis, the Europe Community (EC), in partnership with the United Nations, had become increasingly involved in the resolution process for African conflicts. The European Union had been a driving force in decreasing violent conflict in Rwanda, Liberia, Sierra Leone, and the Great Lakes Region. As previously shown, the EU also played a profound role in developing resolutions to the Sudanese civil war.

The EC's shift over the ten years prior to the Darfur crisis pertaining to African security can be correlated to the evolution of the European Community's Africa policy. Due to the lack of success in adequately ending African conflicts, the EC adopted an approach that tied regional security to economic partnership. The bilateral relationship was thus based on the linkage

between human rights, fair governance and economic development.¹ Through this process, Europe was able to reaffirm its control, to an extent, over Africa as African states pushed for stability in order to reap the benefits of European economic investment. The latter stages of the Lome Agreement (1989's Lome IV) and the Cotonou Agreement of 2000 promoted the democratization of African states, as well as the recognition of inherent human rights. As a result of this approach, military intervention to prevent conflict and maintain security in Africa as a crisis management tool for the European Community was not prevalent.

In 2003, the escalating conflict in Darfur exposed the underlying frailties of linking economic investment to human rights and crisis prevention for the European Community. Sudan as a sovereign African state had not received any major forms of economic aid from Western nations since 1996, when it was placed under economic sanction by the United Nations for ignoring Resolutions 1044, 1054, and 1070, and by the United States for being a state sponsor of terrorism.² As a result Sudan turned to the Middle East, to whom it marketed itself as a potential breadbasket for the entire Muslim world, and to China, whose investment in Africa had been on a steady rise in the post-Mao era, and was set to increase exponentially as it recognized Sudan along with the entire African continent as a pertinent source of natural resources to fuel its booming economy. Consequently, the burgeoning and modernizing Sudanese economy of the waning years of the twentieth century and fledgling years of the twenty-first, developed almost completely independent of Western influence. Where the European Union had succeeded

¹ Niagale Bagoyoko and Marie V. Gilbert, "The European Union in Africa: The Linkage between Security, Governance, and Development from an Institutional Perspective," (Working Paper 284, Institute of Development Studies, May 2007): 9.

² "US State Department Patterns of Global Terrorism: 1997 Overview of State-Sponsored Terrorism," Hellenic Resources Network, <http://www.hri.org/docs/USSD-Terror/97/sponsored.html> (accessed April 20, 2010).

previously in resolving crises in Africa (Sierra Leone, Ethiopia, Angola, Cote d'Ivoire, etc.) with the promise of economic aid in the form of "humanitarian assistance" and the introduction of a nominal force of peacekeeping troops, it failed in the early stages of the Darfur crisis by relying on the same tactics.

The use of economics in the form of threatening economic sanctions and the denial of investment by corporations and nationals within the control of the European Union performed with marginal results during the beginning phases of the Darfur crisis. The Government of Sudan, who was being pressured by the European Community to work towards a lasting and effective ceasefire with Darfuri rebels, was virtually unconcerned with the prospect of a European embargo on Sudanese goods and resources due to its budding relationship with the People's Republic of China.³ In China, Sudan found a global trading partner who could rival and potentially outperform the West economically and was fundamentally opposed to linking economic investment to political ideology or human rights.⁴ China's existence as a viable source of aid and investment for Sudan undermined the efforts of the European Union to resolve the conflict through economic means.

Militarily, the EC was collectively unwilling to commit the necessary manpower and funding to bring about an end to the crisis in its initial stages through armed intervention. Although seventeen of the twenty-five EU member states provided military or civilian peacekeeping forces to the African continent at the beginning of the crisis, they were minimal in

³ Bates Gill and James Reilly, "The Tenuous Hold of China Inc. in Africa," *The Washington Quarterly* 30, no. 3 (Summer 2007): 40, http://www.twq.com/07summer/docs/07summer_gill_reilly.pdf (Accessed March 4, 2009).

⁴ Beijing Summit and Third Ministerial Conference of Forum on China-Africa Cooperation, "Strengthen Solidarity, Enhance Cooperation and Pursue Common Development—Speech by Zhu Rongji," 2000-10-12, http://english.focacsummit.org/2006-09/21/content_935.htm (accessed March 4, 2009).

size with most consisting of ten or less troops. Many of the participating EU countries shrewdly recognized the security deficit in Africa as an opportunity to showcase their modernized armed forces.⁵ Europe however, was unwilling to commit an effective level of military support to intervene in Darfur, with military misfortunes in the Yugoslav Wars as well as Liberia and Sierra Leone still fresh in the memories of EU policymakers. Unlike with France in Cote d'Ivoire, Italy in the Ethiopian and Eritrean War, and Belgium in the myriad of Great Lakes region crises, Darfur had no major European power with traditional interests in the area to influence greater participation from other European Union member states.⁶ With little clarity or coordination coming from the United Nations during the early phases of the Darfur conflict, the European Union remained militarily stagnant, making its contribution to the crisis strictly humanitarian, outside the occasional anti-Sudanese government summit.⁷

In 2007, the inactivity and disorganization that had defined the European Union's role in the Darfur conflict thus far came to an end. The European Community, which now recognized the failures of economic and legal prevention in halting of genocides, stepped up its financial and advisory support to the African Union. It also called for the entire international community to support unilateral sanctions and strict no-fly zones over Darfur to prevent Sudanese air force attacks. Most importantly, it developed plans to introduce thousands of European Troops to the Chad-Darfur border. These actions suggest a marked change in policy for the EU, which was

⁵ Charles C. Pentland, "The European Union and Civil Conflict in Africa," *International Journal* 60, no. 4 (Autumn, 2005): 927, <http://www.jstor.org.ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/stable/40204091?seq=9&Search=yes&term=Pentland&term=Charles&term=C.&list=hide&searchUri=%2Faction%2FdoBasicSearch%3FQuery%3DCharles%2BC.%2BPentland%26gw%3Djtx%26prq%3DCharles%2BC.%2BPentland%26hp%3D25%26wc%3Don&item> (accessed April 18, 2010).

⁶ Pentland, 926.

⁷ Prunier, 140-1.

fully aware of the failures of the DPA as well as the African Union's Mission in Sudan (AMIS) and understood that greater involvement from a diplomatic and military perspective from the European Union would be required to bring stability to the region.

The European Union's policy transformation from neutral status in 2004 when European nations summarily rejected the idea of military intervention, to 2007 when they became more involved in the intervention process with the promoting of no-fly zones and plans of a European peacekeeping force in the region, was not without reason. First, the EU realized that stabilizing the catastrophe was beyond the capabilities of the African Union alone, which did not have the funding nor the materiel or guidance necessary to efficiently intervene in Darfur.⁸ Likewise, even with proposed and promised funding from the international community led by the E.C., the European Union recognized that the humanitarian intervention and stabilization of the crisis was not the sole responsibility of African nations.

Second and more importantly, the European Union astutely shifted its policy towards Darfur in 2007 because it detected the potential for the region's security deficit to spill into the surrounding areas, affecting all of East Africa and making the conflict drastically more difficult to curtail. This would have the greatest impact on the E.C. due to its close proximity to Africa and, for certain powerful members of the Union who were heavily invested in the continent, such as Britain and France, it would have had significant economic ramifications. These factors show that Europe's increased involvement in the crisis management process in Darfur during 2007 was more correlated to the interests of the European Community in protecting its bilateral activities in Africa, along with the protection of the European homeland from refugee influx and increased

⁸ Mamdani, 40.

terrorist activity that would undoubtedly derive from volatility in East Africa, than it was the lives of the black African population of Darfur.

From the outset of the conflict, the European Union along with the international community en masse showed little political will for prevention. The Sudanese government did not accept the UN's demand to restrain Janjawid militia from terrorizing Darfur in 2004 because to that point, Sudan recognized no firm consequences from the international community if it continued to support the Janjawid.⁹ In August 2004, Secretary of State Colin Powell warned Sudan to accept UN Resolution 1556 to rein in the militia, yet there was no specified punitive action in the resolution if the Sudanese failed to do so.¹⁰

As previously shown, the Security Council and therefore the UN were at odds due to varying opinions on how to approach Sudan, and the United States was in no position to admonish Sudan or back up any punitive action due to its position in Iraq and Afghanistan. This left the European Union, which attempted to coerce the Sudanese government into stabilizing the situation in Darfur through economic means. Foreign ministers of the European Commission, which is the executive body of the EU and is responsible for the implementation of EU policy, began to pressure Sudan through the prospect of economic sanctions and the disruption of the Cotonou Agreement for violation. As a signatory of the Cotonou Agreement, Sudan was responsible for the respect of human rights and adherence to democratic principles and the rule

⁹ Kenneth A. Rodman, "Darfur and the Limits of Legal Deterrence," *Human Rights Quarterly* 30 (2008): 531.

¹⁰ Robin Wright, Powell Warns Sudan: Act on UN Demands, *Washington Post*, August 1, 2004.

of law.¹¹ This method of coercion proved to be of little consequence to the Sudanese government who continued in late 2004 to integrate Janjawid militia forces into its own military.

In August 2004, EU investigator Pieter Feith declared, “we are not in the situation of Genocide there,”¹² although he describes the situation in Darfur as grim, with widespread killing and the calculated destruction of specific villages rife. This declaration was soon contended by human rights groups who proclaimed that by finding no signs of genocide in Darfur, yet finding that specific targeting of a particular ethnic group and their cultural centers is a complete denial of the definition of genocide. The European Union’s response to this accusation was to allocate more funding, twenty million Euros, to the humanitarian aid process bringing the total provided by the European Commission by the end of 2004 to one hundred four million Euros. European humanitarian aid was having little impact on the catastrophe however, with the situation quickly worsening for aid workers who were contending with a progressively greater number of IDPs and an overall lack of safety as a result of harassment from both Janjawid and SPLM forces.

The strategy of deterring a humanitarian crisis through the use of economic or political means ultimately has little success on a state, like Sudan, that is already fully engaged in conflict and is not compelled by members of the international community to cease its actions. Thomas C. Schelling, in his work on conflict management through the use of economic, political, or military intervention posits that the perpetrator must be compelled to understand the other entity’s level of commitment and intention to resolving the crisis through action, if they are to understand the

¹¹ The European Parliament, *Human Rights in Sudan: European Parliament resolution of 24 May 2007 on human rights in Sudan*, Official Journal of the European Union, P6_TA(2007)0218, May 24, 2007.

¹² Europe Sees No Genocide in Sudan Region, *New York Times*, August 10, 2004.

consequences for not complying with demands.¹³ According to Schelling, to prevent loss of face in regard to a perpetrating state not ceasing aggressive action, expectations must be underlined and clearly stated so that fear of punitive measures can coerce the perpetrator from continuing their actions.¹⁴ From the beginning of its involvement, the European Union did not adequately illustrate to Sudan its level of commitment or the severity of measures if Sudan did not comply with EU and UN demands to rein in the Janjawid and cease air raids against Darfuri villages.

The cautionary and noticeably fearful response of financial support and vocal disdain for the Sudanese government's actions in Darfur continued for the European Union through 2004 and into 2005. EU foreign policy high representative Javier Solana, after a visit to the region in October 2004, announced that the EU would pledge one hundred million Euros in support of the African Union's peacekeeping force in Darfur. Despite further declarations that the EU would also provide enhanced logistical support to AMIS, EU military personnel participating in AMIS operations would remain negligible. After much planning and debate, on July 18, 2005, the European Commission established a civilian-military action to support the African Union's enhanced AMIS mission in Darfur.¹⁵ The mandate was to make European equipment and resources, materiel, and finances available to AMIS. It also intended to use EU military specialists to provide planning and technical assistance to AU commanders, strategic and tactical transportation, and training for African troops and observers.¹⁶

¹³ Thomas C. Schelling, *Arms and Influence* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1966), 48.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 55-6.

¹⁵ The Council of the European Union, *Council Joint Action 2005/557/CFSP of 18 July 2005 on the European Union civilian-military supporting action to the African Union mission in the Darfur region of Sudan*, Official Journal of the European Union, L 188/46, July 20, 2005.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*

Understanding that military intervention was not a viable option for the European Union, considering the United States' position in Iraq and the realization that intervention would be synonymous with invasion and colonialism to the world's developing countries, Solana supported the EU-AMIS joint action plan because it best utilized EU funding and crisis management capabilities.¹⁷ However, despite Solana and the EU's intention, support for AMIS tapered off only a year after the mandate's inception. In spring 2006, while the AU was in the crux of its operation in Darfur, soldiers and specialists stopped getting paid, the deliverance of EU materiel grounded to a halt, and less than half of the agreed upon twenty-five EU military officers intended to support AMIS operations in Darfur had actually been provided.¹⁸ The European Union, as one of high representative Solana's aides declared, was losing global credibility because of its inability to follow through on its promises to the African Union at a time when it was most needed.

By the summer of 2006, the European Community had mobilized approximately one billion Euros for the Darfur crisis, most of which was used to provide food, sheltering, and other forms of humanitarian assistance to the refugees of Darfur.¹⁹ Despite its admirable efforts in humanitarianism however, the EU to that point had not done enough to halt the cause of the

¹⁷ Ann Roosevelt, "Intervention Lesson: Better Civil-Military Coordination, Solana Says," *Defense Daily International* 6, no. 42 (October 28, 2005): 1,

<http://proquest.umi.com.ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/pqdweb?index=129&did=918600711&SrchMode=1&sid=3&Fmt=3&VInst=PROD&VType=PQD&RQT=309&VName=PQD&TS=1272294562&clientId=20176> (accessed April 17, 2010).

¹⁸ See Mamdani, 40, for accounts of and reasoning behind the EU suspending the provision of funds to AMIS in 2006. For an account of the EU not committing the tactical assistance and materiel to AMIS that it had previously agreed upon, see David Cronin, "Sudan/EU politics: 'Inability to deliver' puts EU's international reputation at risk," *The Economist Intelligence Unit ViewsWire*,

<http://ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/login?url=http://proquest.umi.com.ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/pqdweb?did=1016469791&sid=3&Fmt=3&clientId=20176&RQT=309&VName=PQD> (accessed April 17, 2010).

¹⁹ "Sudan: European Union response to the Darfur crisis," *Sudan Watch*, <http://sudanwatch.blogspot.com/2006/07/sudan-european-union-response-to.html> (accessed April 18, 2010).

humanitarian disaster and bring to justice, as part of the Responsibility to Protect doctrine, those responsible. The European Commission supported calls for the UN to create an international commission of inquiry to investigate human rights violations in Darfur, which was created on September 18, 2004 after the adoption of Security Council Resolution 1564. Unfortunately, it also supported the findings of the commission that the Government of Sudan had not pursued a policy of Genocide in Darfur.

In an effort to break the cycle of impunity, the EU went on to become a primary supporter of UN Security Council Resolution 1593 (2005), which allowed the International Criminal Court, for the first time since the inception of the Rome Statute in 2002, to investigate human rights abuses and crimes against humanity in a sovereign country.²⁰ On June 6, 2005, the Prosecutor of the ICC, Mr. Luis Moreno-Ocampo, officially opened the investigation. From June 2005 to June 2008, Moreno-Ocampo and his aides yielded seven reports confirming the existence of crimes against humanity and human rights abuses in Darfur, and calling for the arrest of several high ranking Janjawid militia leaders as well as several members of the Government of Sudan.²¹ The European Commission's firm support of the ICC investigation process in Sudan marked a precedent for the EU concerning its intervention effort in the Darfur crisis. For the first time since the acceptance of the Cotonou Agreement of 2000, the European Union utilized international law, as opposed to political or diplomatic methods, to put pressure on a bilateral trade partner in the interest of conflict management.

²⁰ "A Universal Court with Global Support: Res. 1593," *Coalition for the International Criminal Court*, <http://www.iccnw.org/?mod=res1593&idudctp=14&show=all#14> (accessed April 18, 2010).

²¹ *Ibid.*

In addition to its use of international law, the EU was an active supporter of the Abuja peace talks which led to the signing of the DPA.²² Although the DPA, in retrospect, has been perceived as a resounding failure for its inability to involve the common Darfuri citizen as well as its brokers' incapacity to uphold the ceasefire agreement more than a week after its approval, the European Union was an instrumental element in its mediation. The EU played a significant role in persuading dissident groups to the negotiation table for a better consensus and also helped to get monitors on the ground in Darfur through its European Security and Defense Policy (ESDP) program.²³ Financially, the EU continued with its well documented assistance for the humanitarian effort and the rebuilding process in Darfur. However, due to the rapid failure of the ceasefire which accompanied the DPA, even with the help of additional monitors, aid did not reach its intended targets. Notwithstanding its limited success, the European Union's comprehensive involvement in the DPA from the beginning of the Abuja peace talks in the summer of 2005 to the signing of the Agreement in May 2006 showed a significant increase in the amount of diplomatic attention that the European Union was placing on the successful mediation of the Darfur crisis.

Perhaps the most telling indication of the EU's shift in policy regarding the importance of the Darfur crisis was the authorization of the European Union Force Chad/CAR (EUFOR TCHAD/RCA) on October 15, 2007. A press release summarizing the results of the 2824th meeting of the Council of the European Union at which the mission was approved, read:

²² "Sudan: European Union response to the Darfur crisis," Sudan Watch, <http://sudanwatch.blogspot.com/2006/07/sudan-european-union-response-to.html> (accessed April 18, 2010).

²³ Oslo Forum, "Mediating Today's Conflicts for Tomorrow's Peace"—Speech by Javier Solana, June 27, 2006, http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/discours/90420.pdf (accessed April 18, 2010).

The Council decided that the EU will conduct a bridging military operation in Eastern Chad and North Eastern Central African Republic (EUFOR TCHAD/RCA) in the framework of the European security and defence policy. This follows the adoption of UN Security Council resolution 1778 (2007), which approves the deployment in Chad and the CAR of a multidimensional presence and authorises the EU to provide the military element. By addressing the regional dimension of the Darfur crisis, the deployment of EUFOR TCHAD/RCA and a UN police mission, in parallel to UNAMID in Sudan, is a crucial step to facilitate a long-lasting solution to the conflict in Darfur.²⁴

The decision to commit a military presence to the region evokes two messages concerning the EU's policy towards the crisis. First, approving operation EUFOR TCHAD/RCA confirms the political and economic importance of the region to the EU, particularly France and Belgium, with the language clearly stating that by placing Chad and the Central African Republic within the framework of the Darfur crisis, the EU would be able to better facilitate a peace process in Darfur and stabilize the entire region which had been further destabilized by the introduction of over three hundred thousand Darfuri refugees. In essence, the European Commission in Africa recognized that the spread of violent conflict in Western Sudan into the already erratic conditions of surrounding countries could create an unsolvable security disaster in the region. Second, it showed that the European Union accepted the limitations of linking good governance and human rights to favorable trade rights or economic and infrastructural development. The operation was also necessary to prevent highly probable war between Chad and Sudan due to the cross-border raids of Janjawid militia and Chad's noted support of Darfuri rebel groups according to Javier Solana, who was a main proponent of the ESDP mission.²⁵

²⁴ European Union, *Press Release- 2824th Council meeting General Affairs and External Relations, 13720/07* (Presse 227), Brussels: Council of the European Union, 2007.

²⁵ European Union, *Javier Solana, EU High Representative for the CFSP, comments on the situation in Chad and Operation EUFOR TCHAD/RCA, S046/08*, Brussels: Council of the European Union, 2008.

Operating within the framework of the European Security and Defense Policy, EUFOR TCHAD was intended to supplement UNAMID in its peacekeeping operations within Western Darfur by conducting missions aimed at stabilizing the border regions of Chad and the Central African Republic until the UN could firmly expand its operation to take over the peacekeeping process in the region in its entirety- The United Nations Mission in the Central African Republic and Chad (MINURCAT). As a result of efforts by the Sudanese government to stifle UN attempts at making a coherent and effective move to deploy a fully operational UNAMID force to Darfur throughout the planning and development phase of EUFOR TCHAD/RCA, the EU's task became much more difficult.²⁶ Chadian civil strife was also having a similar suffocating effect on EUFOR TCHAD/RCA as armed conflicts between rebel groups and forces loyal to Chad President Idriss Deby, particularly the rebel assault on the Chadian capital N'djamena, made it difficult for EUFOR TCHAD/RCA to focus on Darfur.²⁷ Nonetheless, the EU mission deployed as a bridging operation instead of supplementary, intending to hand over all peacekeeping operations in the region to the UN in twelve months under MINURCAT.

EUFOR TCHAD/RCA, which did not deploy until February 2008, was not without its critics. Amongst member states of the EU, Germany and Great Britain did not commit soldiers to the intended four thousand troop operation because of the overwhelming control of the process held by France, who they felt did not take adequate account of the opinions of other large EU members in the planning phase of the mission. The delayed start of the operation was also

²⁶ Mahmoud A. Suleiman, "Why does Sudan reject non-African troops in Darfur?" Sudan Tribune, http://www.sudantribune.com/spip.php?page=imprimable&id_article=25179 (accessed April 21 2010).

²⁷ Bjoern H. Seibert, "EUFOR TCHAD/RCA- A Cautionary Note," *European Security Review*, no. 37 (March 2008): 3, http://tamlyn-serpa.com/images/ISIS_euforchad_mar08.pdf (accessed April 21, 2010).

another cause for concern. Amid renewed and escalating violence in Darfur in February 2008, which saw the influx of thousands more refugees daily, calls to deploy EUFOR TCHAD/RCA with haste fell on deaf ears as the mission would not reach operational capability until mid March according to Javier Solana.²⁸ The non-deployment of UNAMID, coupled with the delayed deployment of EUFOR TCHAD/RCA proved to be a disastrous combination for Darfuri IDPs. Logistically, there were several major concerns for the viability of EUFOR TCHAD. A full year after its authorization, there were only thirty-three hundred troops in the field.²⁹ The expansive geographic area of Eastern Chad and the Republic of Central Africa, as well as the entirety of the border of Western Darfur, was too great for thirty-three hundred peacekeeping troops to sufficiently cover. The arid, desert-like environment of East Africa also placed a significant burden on EU troops and equipment. The need for airborne mobility was crucial because of the region's jagged terrain, yet EU member states were reluctant to incur the expense of donating helicopters to ease the obvious deficiency.³⁰

Despite the glaring flaws in EUFOR TCHAD/RCA, and the fact that its performance was marginal at best, its approval and deployment by the European Commission showed intent from the European Community to take necessary steps to contain and eventually resolve the conflict in Darfur. The problems faced by UNAMID in reference to political will and materiel significantly strained EUFOR TCHAD/RCA, yet they were able to persist by changing their

²⁸ European Union, *Javier SOLANA, EU High Representative for the CFSP, condemns the escalating violence in Darfur*, S057/08, Brussels: Council of the European Union, 2008.

²⁹ Hans-Georg Ehrhart, "Assessing EUFOR Chad/CAR," *European Security Review*, no. 42 (November 2008): 2, http://www.isis-europe.org/pdf/2008_artrel_231_esr42-euforchad.pdf (accessed April 21, 2010).

³⁰ Anonymous, "International: Getting boots off the ground; Military helicopters," *The Economist* 386, no. 8564 (Jan. 26, 2008): 70, <http://proquest.umi.com.ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/pqdweb?index=299&did=1419706961&SrchMode=1&sid=4&Fmt=3&VInst=PROD&VType=PQD&RQT=309&VName=PQD&TS=1272592946&clientId=20176> (accessed April 21, 2010).

mandate to become less an appendage of the faltering UN mission, and more the primary source of peacekeepers. A weakened and fractured Chad under the despotism of President Deby made security conditions more volatile in the region. Nonetheless EUFOR TCHAD/RCA found some success in reducing the danger to Darfuri refugees and providing them safe access to drinking water and food from humanitarian aid sources.³¹ Although they could not deal with the source of the conflict directly, the EU force put considerable pressure on Khartoum, who was forced to reflect on the probability and feasibility of a humanitarian invasion if it did not heed calls from the international community to find a lasting resolution for the embattled region.

The disorganized and strictly humanitarian response from the European Community concerning the Darfur conflict at its outset in early 2003 was disconcerting. With the exception of the major European powers that had colonial ties to the region, most European countries individually had little interest in the crisis, only hoping to keep its residual effects, specifically refugees, out of Europe. Collectively in the form of the European Union, the European Community threatened economic sanctions, condemned Khartoum for its role in the genocidal rampage, and gave half-hearted financial support to AMIS. Recognizing the financial and security ramifications for Europe of several failed states in East Africa, the EU began to transform its policy towards the Darfur crisis, taking a more active role in the facilitation of its peaceful resolution. This activity began with the European Commission's strong support of ICC investigations in Darfur, and culminated with the deployment of EUFOR TCHAD/RCA through

³¹ Andrea Rigoni and Rene Rouquet, *Recommendation 839 on European Union military operations - reply to the annual report of the Council, Report submitted on behalf of the Defence Committee*, Document A/2038, Brussels: European Security and Defence Assembly, 2009.

ESDP, which was at its operational peak in the summer of 2008. Partially motivated by self-interests, the European Union transformed its Darfur policy from apathetic observer in 2003 to diplomatically and militarily dynamic interventionist in 2008.

CHAPTER FOUR: THE AFRICAN UNION- AN IMPOSSIBLE TASK ON A SHOESTRING BUDGET

The inability of the United States, United Nations, and European Union to effectively resolve the crisis in Darfur had a direct effect on the African Union's actions in the region, as well as its recognition as a potent global entity. The pattern of intentional negligence, aggressive rhetoric, and desultory action that characterized the US, UN, and EU's relationship with the Darfur crisis was also an affliction of the African Union, although it had significantly less control over its activities when compared with the other three organizations. As a result of its youth, having only been in existence less than one year when SPLA and JEM forces attacked Sudanese forces in al-Fashir, the African Union was virtually completely reliant on foreign financial and materiel contributions. In theory, western states were eager to finance the African Union's peacekeeping operations in Darfur if it kept troops from those nations away from the conflict. Likewise, the African Union was keen to accept the funding as it was viewed as an opportunity to further its development and capabilities after its transformation from the Organization of African Unity (OAU). Darfur presented the African Union with an opportunity to greatly progress its operational capabilities while simultaneously asserting its global legitimacy.

In actuality, intervention in the Darfur crisis was a resounding failure for the African Union. Despite the numerous promises and grand plans presented by the African Union and the global community that supported them, the African Union's Mission in Sudan had very little effect on the ground due to a host of reasons, notably underfunding and a severe lack of logistics. A lack of political will was also a major hindrance. AU officials on a fact-finding mission to

Darfur in July 2004 determined in their conclusions, in the face of great slaughter caused by the government-backed Janjawid militia, that a policy of ethnic cleansing had not been adopted in Darfur.¹ The same officials, led by Commission chairman Alpha Konare, were overt in their efforts not to alienate a Khartoum that still had the backing of the AU's Arab states, which would have had a potentially detrimental impact on the organization. Although the African Union may have had the infrastructural and military potential necessary to successfully intervene in Darfur with financial assistance from the international community, political discord and a lack of general direction, an unfortunate regularity in its short history, beset the organization in its efforts in Darfur.

The inherent limitations of the AMIS mandate are also a focus for critics of the African Union's insufficient intervention effort. AMIS was meant to uphold the ceasefire which was established during the Humanitarian Ceasefire Agreement (HCFA), spearheaded by Konare in April 2004.² The Government of Sudan, JEM, and SPLM agreed to cease hostilities and allow for the facilitation of humanitarian assistance. The groups also agreed to allow a team of military observers and their accompanying protection forces to overlook the ceasefire, under which AMIS was born and hopes for a later comprehensive peace agreement were conceived.³ The AMIS mandate was thus formed under the pretense that a stable ceasefire would actually be upheld between the various groups involved, without any strong coercion from external actors or a firm understanding of what the HCFA entailed. What resulted was an immediate disintegration

¹ Prunier, 144.

² Arvid Ekengard, "The African Union Mission in Sudan (AMIS): Experiences and Lessons Learned," *FOI, Swedish Defence Research Agency* (August 2008): 14, <http://www.foi.se/upload/projects/Africa/foir2559.pdf> (accessed May 4, 2010).

³ *Ibid.*

of the ceasefire which put the civilian population back on knife's edge while AU military personnel could only observe. Critics of AMIS, who contend that the African Union's primary objectives in Darfur should have been to stabilize the security deficit to ensure it would not spread into neighboring countries and to protect the population from gross violations of human rights, claim that the mandate was too strict in its interpretation and completely reactive.⁴ The unsuccessful Abuja Peace Talks and subsequent DPA of which the African Union put significant time and resources, understandably failed as a result of the failures of HCFA and AMIS.

In addition to insufficient funding and support from the global community and a weak AMIS mandate, the African Union's intervention effort in Darfur was also debilitated by poor planning. At the beginning of the operation, AMIS consisted of a protection force of only 300 soldiers from Nigeria and Rwanda; AU officials quickly realized that a force of this size would not be enough to uphold HCFA agreements.⁵ Therefore an expansion operation, called AMIS II, was initiated. The AMIS II protection force of 1,695 African troops and 450 military observers that operated in Darfur in April 2005 was 1,800 less than what the AU had hoped for by that time and monitored an area approximately 250,000 square kilometers in size that was populated by over six million people.⁶ According to Catherine Guicherd of the International Peace Academy, AMIS and AMIS II staff, "whether military, police or civilian, were given minimal guidance;

⁴ Sally Chin and Jonathan Morgenstein, "No Power to Protect: The African Union Mission in Sudan," *Refugees International* (November 2005): 5, <http://www.refugeesinternational.org/sites/default/files/NoPowertoProtect.pdf> (accessed May 4, 2010).

⁵ Ekengard, 19.

⁶ David C. Gompert et al., "Learning from Darfur: Building a Net-Capable African Force to Stop Mass Killing," *Center for Technology and National Security Policy* (July 2005): 10-14, [http://www.carlisle.army.mil/DIME/documents/DTP%20Darfur\[1\].pdf](http://www.carlisle.army.mil/DIME/documents/DTP%20Darfur[1].pdf) (accessed May 4, 2010).

and strategic level goals were not clearly articulated.”⁷ Unorganized, misguided and poorly equipped, AMIS protection forces only worsened the humanitarian crisis in the region, as IDPs falsely believed AU troops would safeguard them from Janjawid militia attacks, who instead only watched in numerous occasions as Darfuri refugees were killed outside of IDP camps. After releasing a company of African Union troops that he captured in western Darfur in October 2005, the military leader of the JEM, Mohamed Salah told Reuters News Service, "The AU have become part of the conflict. We want the AU to leave and we have warned them not to travel to our areas. We went to Abuja and they (the AU) refused to talk to us, so now we will not talk to them."⁸

AMIS continued to expand its presence and operation in Sudan with little success throughout 2005 and 2006, its forces reaching seven thousand at its operational peak. The AU had hoped to increase the force by an additional three thousand but did not have the resources or capabilities to do so. Despite opposition from the Sudanese government, the AMIS mandate eventually dissolved and with the operation on the precipice of collapse, AMIS merged into UNAMID on December 31, 2007 after the July 2007 approval of United Nations Security Council Resolution 1769. The African Union had thus succeeded in showing the international community that it was capable of responding to African security crises garnering the young organization much needed global “credibility.”

⁷ Catherine Guicherd, “The AU in Sudan: Lessons Learned for the African Standby Force,” *International Peace Academy* (March 2007): 4, [http://www.reliefweb.int/rw/lib.nsf/db900sid/SKAI-7DPQKY/\\$file/IPA_AUinSudan_Mar07_English.pdf?openelement](http://www.reliefweb.int/rw/lib.nsf/db900sid/SKAI-7DPQKY/$file/IPA_AUinSudan_Mar07_English.pdf?openelement) (accessed May 4, 2010).

⁸ Opheera McDoom and Stephanie Nebehay, “Darfur Rebels Free Hostages,” *Reuters News Service*, October 10, 2005. http://www.redorbit.com/news/international/266416/darfur_rebels_free_hostages/index.html (accessed May 4, 2010).

In truth, African ownership of African problems was shown to be hyperbole. The African Union was heavily dependent on Western “partnership;” when promised resources and manpower from the West dried out as a result of political posturing and financial constraints, the poor training and tactics of the African Union were exposed. Equal support from AU member states was also severely lacking. Similar to the African Mission in Burundi (AMIB), where South Africa and Ethiopia provided seventy-five percent of the total security force in Burundi, Nigeria and Rwanda provided the majority of the mission’s troop support, while other member states contributions were minimal.⁹ Regardless of the presence of African troops or their quantity, their ineffective mandate made them mere spectators of the humanitarian catastrophe. In essence, the strategic and operational adversity experienced by the African Union in Darfur was offset by the fact that the organization could claim a victory internationally because it took responsibility for the continent’s security architecture.¹⁰ Plainly summed up by Gerard Prunier, “it (AU) was also satisfied: it had been allowed to play in the big boys’ league and would not have to pay for the privilege. “Africa” would be at the forefront of the Darfur crisis and any accusations of impotence or limitation of means could be beamed back at the donors.”¹¹

As previously noted, the African Union’s participation in the Darfur peace process was almost totally financed by the global community, with most of the perspective funding coming from Brussels and Washington. Verbal support for the African Union’s peacekeeping mission in

⁹ For aspects of South Africa’s contribution to AMIB, see Festus Aboagye, “The African Mission in Burundi: Lessons Learned from the First African Union Peacekeeping Operation,” *Conflict Trends*, Issue 2 (2004): 10-11; For AMIS troop contributions see Alexis Okeowo, “Eager to quell its own conflicts, African Union feels overstretched,” *The Christian Science Monitor*, <http://www.csmonitor.com/2007/0822/p04s01-woaf.html> (accessed May 5, 2010).

¹⁰ Tim Murithi, “The African Union’s Transition from Non-Intervention to Non-Indifference: An Ad Hoc Approach to the Responsibility to Protect,” *International Politics and Society* 1 (2009): 94, http://library.fes.de/pdf-files/ipg/ipg-2009-1/08_a_murithi_us.pdf (accessed May 5, 2010).

¹¹ Prunier, 145.

Darfur came from nearly every major international organization. Pledged money, materiel, and military experts from a number of world leaders gave AU officials confidence that the African Union would be able to adequately respond to the security crisis that was threatening to spill out of Darfur. Only two months after the inception of AMIS, in October 2004, US Congressman Gregory W. Meeks petitioned Congress for a \$150 million to help expand the operation.

Explaining the reasons behind such a lofty request, Meeks stated, "The most critical thing we can do is protect the Darfur refugees and put an adequate contingent of peacekeeping forces in place to prevent further acts of genocide by rebel and Sudanese government forces."¹²

On October 21, 2004, on the back of the African Union Peace and Security Council's formal agreement to send thirty-two hundred African peacekeepers to Darfur, President Bush ordered the Defense Department to send two C-130 military transport planes to Africa to transport African troops into Darfur along with the promise to be amongst many Western states that aimed to provide more than \$200 million in logistical support to AMIS.¹³ The US was not alone in its declarations of assistance to the mission, as both Javier Solana and Kofi Annan travelled to Africa in October 2004 to announce financial and tactical contributions to the African Union force.¹⁴

¹² J. Zamgba Browne, "Congressman seeks \$150 million for peacekeeping efforts in Sudan," *New York Amsterdam News* 95, no. 41 (Oct 7- Oct 13, 2004): 30, <http://ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/login?url=http://proquest.umi.com.ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/pqdweb?did=731106391&sid=1&Fmt=3&clientId=20176&RQT=309&VName=PQD> (accessed May 7, 2010).

¹³ Colum Lynch, "3,200 Peacekeepers Pledged on Mission to Darfur," *Washington Post*, October 21, 2004. <http://ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/login?url=http://proquest.umi.com.ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/pqdweb?did=718352541&sid=1&Fmt=3&clientId=20176&RQT=309&VName=PQD> (accessed May 7, 2010).

¹⁴ World Sources Online, "EU to finance African mission in Darfur, Sudan," Xinhua, <http://ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/login?url=http://proquest.umi.com.ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/pqdweb?did=719902431&sid=1&Fmt=3&clientId=20176&RQT=309&VName=PQD> (accessed May 7, 2010); World Sources Online, "UN chief introduces plan to expand African Union's role in Darfur, Sudan," Xinhua,

By early 2005, it became clear that funding and support from the international community for AMIS would not arrive with the same confidence and assurance that it was previously promised. The African Union guaranteed the manpower necessary to bring a halt to the crisis, yet Western powers that were initially eager to train, pay and equip African troops as it kept Western forces out of the region, did not follow through on their guarantees of financing. By March 2005, only \$25 million of the \$500 million pledged five months prior had been received.¹⁵ Some scholars point to political motives as the reasoning behind Western states deferring the providing of funds. According to Mahmood Mamdani, Western powers were eager to make the African Union a scapegoat for the lack of coordination between organizations and the subsequent stagnation on the ground; by doing so, it would justify the necessity for the UN to replace the AU in terms of both actual leadership and perceptibility to global media and NGOs. In *Saviors and Survivors*, Mamdani asserts, “It seems fair to conclude that a coordinated effort was under way to discredit the African Union’s presence so as to clear the way for “blue-hatting” African soldiers- literally replacing African Union hats with blue UN hats.”¹⁶ The author goes on to claim that the United Nations and other international organizations were hesitant in backing the African Union as they had once intended because the AU, unlike the rest of the world, did not believe as an organization that what was taking place in Darfur at the time was tantamount to state-sponsored genocide or crimes against humanity.¹⁷ In a period when most of the global

<http://ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/login?url=http://proquest.umi.com.ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/pqdweb?did=712726171&sid=1&Fmt=3&clientId=20176&RQT=309&VName=PQD> (accessed May 7, 2010)..

¹⁵ Warren Hoge, “Unpaid Aid Pledges Endanger Sudan Peace Pact, UN Says,” *New York Times*, March 7, 2005.

<http://ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/login?url=http://proquest.umi.com.ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/pqdweb?did=803902861&sid=1&Fmt=3&clientId=20176&RQT=309&VName=PQD> (accessed May 7, 2010).

¹⁶ Mamdani, 40-1.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 43-44.

community was pressuring the United Nations to sponsor external military intervention in the region, the AU's philosophy according to Mamdani, was not popular.

Mamdani's view, while not a primary argument of the book, subconsciously questions the role of race in the motives of Western states that severely handicapped AMIS by withholding pledged funding and materiel. Similarly, Michael L. Krenn's *The Color of Empire: Race and American Foreign Relations* alludes to the notion that the foreign policy of the United States and other predominately white countries towards non-white nations or entities like the African Union is embedded in racist ideology. Krenn argues that the historical domination of the world by whites during the age of exploration and the colonial period, as well as the self-perceived superiority of whites in leadership and governance begets de facto underlying racism in the current realm of international politics.¹⁸

Although external factors such as lessening financial support from the international community and political contradictions possibly based on racism were critical aspects that added to the deficiencies of AMIS, the African Union itself played a major role and was ultimately responsible for the mission's failure. One such failure was the inability of the African Union to hold its largest member state (by size), Sudan, responsible for its gross misconduct as a sovereign and modern nation, in the treat of its citizens. Responsibility to Protect doctrine notwithstanding, Sudan was expected to follow standards set by the governing mandate of the African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights which is backed by the African Court of Justice. The Government of Sudan did not respect the Commission's mandate, yet African

¹⁸ Michael L. Krenn, *The Color of Empire: Race and American Foreign Relations* (Washington D.C.: Potomac Books Inc., 2006), 106.

Union leaders were reluctant to hold Sudanese officials responsible. Initiatives such as Chadian President Idriss Deby's Abeche Agreement and the AU's Humanitarian Ceasefire Agreement were unsuccessful and somewhat self-serving; they also did not question the Sudanese government's role in perpetuating the crisis. In an effort to keep the Darfur crisis a domestic issue of an AU member state, thereby appeasing Khartoum and other Arab member states, AU officials such as Alpha Konare and AU Chairman Olusegun Obasanjo refused to confront Khartoum and pinpoint its leaders as the main perpetrators of the massacres.

The AMIS mandate is another point of contention when determining the African Union's level of liability. Discussing the importance of a mandate to the success of a peacekeeping operation, Arvid Ekengard states, "As the legal basis for military actions, the mandate is the natural benchmark to judge any peace operation against. Weak, unrealistic mandates have plagued peace operations since the birth of the concept."¹⁹ If the success of a mission lies within the strength and basis of its mandate, then it is easy to perceive why AMIS was unsuccessful. Based on the HCFA, the AMIS mandate in its original and modified form, set out to "monitor compliance with the HCFA, to assist in the process of confidence building, and to contribute to a secure environment for the delivery of humanitarian relief and the return of IDP's and refugees."²⁰ In the mandate's development, it is apparent that AU policymakers made several assumptions pertaining to the conditions in which AMIS would operate.

One such assumption was that the ceasefire agreement would be actively upheld by warring parties, that hostile acts would be avoided, and that the Sudanese government would

¹⁹ Ekengard, 25.

²⁰ Ibid., 26.

attempt to disarm the Janjawid and other government-controlled militia.²¹ Although Sudan had committed to upholding the ceasefire and disarming the militia groups, militia forces continued to operate without restraint in the region and in some cases, were still actively supported by the government.²²

Another assumption within the mandate relates to the operation's military capabilities. The amended AMIS task list called for officers and troops to "be prepared to protect both static and mobile humanitarian operations under imminent threat and in the immediate vicinity, within capabilities," and to "provide a visible military presence by patrolling and establishing temporary outposts in order to deter uncontrolled armed groups from committing hostile acts against the population."²³ As a result of severe underfunding, there was a major disparity between what the mandate demanded and what the military forces of AMIS were actually capable of. These factors, according to Ekengard caused some confusion over responsibility of the ineffectiveness of AMIS and the subsequent continuation of the humanitarian disaster.²⁴

During the latter half of 2005 and all of 2006 the African Union's precarious situation in Darfur continued to decline. HCFA failed, government attacks in Darfur worsened, and the African Union capacity to respond deteriorated even with the transformation of the mandate due to a lack of direction and monetary support. In October 2005, the AU accused the Sudanese government of painting their military vehicles in African Union colors and attacking villages in

²¹ Henri Boshoff, "The African Union Mission in Sudan: Technical and operational dimensions," *African Security Review* 14, no. 3 (2005): 58, <http://www.iss.co.za/pubs/ASR/14No3/AWBoshoff.htm> (accessed May 10, 2010).

²² William G. O'Niell, and Violette Cassis, *Protecting Two Million Displaced. The Successes and Shortcomings of the African Union in Darfur*. Brookings-Bern Project on Internal Displacement, November 2005, 19-20.

²³ Boshoff, 58.

²⁴ Ekengard, 26.

Darfur, killing nearly fifty and displacing thousands in a two week span.²⁵ Simultaneously, AU forces were being targeted and attacked by rebel forces in Darfur with more regularity for their perceived role as a fighting force in the conflict.²⁶ The situation was worsening for the African Union. As it became clear to the organization that the international community grew disenfranchised with the idea of funding AMIS without noticeable strides in the improvement of the crisis, the AU succumbed to pressure from Western states to hand ownership and responsibility of the intervention operation over to the United Nations.

Over the next year, the transition from AMIS to UNAMID was especially turbulent for the African Union. The adept shifting of Khartoum on their stance towards a non-African peacekeeping force in Sudan kept UNAMID from being established, which further stretched the already threadbare AU operation that had to maintain a presence in the region until it could be replaced by its UN counterpart.²⁷ In the winter months of 2006, the UN and AU agreed upon a three-phased transformation that would see responsibility for the peace operation transferred to the United Nations; Khartoum approved the plan.²⁸

The first phase saw the African Union receive a ‘Light Support Package’ from the UN made up of advisers and equipment to support the intelligence and observation capabilities of AMIS in preparation for the transformation. The second phase, called the ‘Heavy Support

²⁵ African Union Accuses Sudan in Darfur Attacks, *Los Angeles Times*, October 2, 2005. <http://ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/login?url=http://proquest.umi.com.ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/pqdweb?did=905340821&sid=1&Fmt=3&clientId=20176&RQT=309&VName=PQD> (accessed May 12, 2010).

²⁶ Darfur Rebels Abduct African Union Team, *Washington Post*, October 10, 2005. <http://ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/login?url=http://proquest.umi.com.ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/pqdweb?did=908838241&sid=1&Fmt=3&clientId=20176&RQT=309&VName=PQD> (accessed May 12, 2010).

²⁷ Tim Murithi, “The African Union's evolving role in peace operations; the African Union Mission in Burundi, the African Union Mission in Sudan, and the African Union Mission in Somalia,” *African Security Review* 17, no. 1 (01 Jan 2008): 77, <http://www.iss.co.za/uploads/17NO1MURITHI.PDF> (accessed May 12, 2010).

²⁸ Ekengard, 38.

Package,' was meant to heavily reinforce the military capacity of AMIS with the addition of nearly four thousand military personnel sponsored by the UN; the four thousand would gradually increase to twenty thousand. The third phase was intended to be the formal transformation from AMIS to UNAMID. Sudanese support for the plan diminished soon after the transformation process began to take its first steps. Citing fear that foreign (Western) forces under the United Nations intervening in Darfur would be more like a neo-imperialistic invasion, Khartoum objected to the inclusion of Western troops in the peacekeeping forces that would operate in Darfur.²⁹ The Sudanese government stood firm in this declaration because it enjoyed the backing of several of the Islamic world's militant factions, with al-Qaeda stating in 2007 that any UN troops entering the fully Islamic realm of Darfur would be repelled at all costs.³⁰

The hybrid AU-UN transformation effort was not only stifled and delayed by Khartoum, but also by influential circles within the African Union who feared their international credibility would be compromised if, like Mamdani states, AU helmets are replaced with UN helmets on African soldiers. Apprehension amongst African leaders, possibly influenced by Khartoum, that AU troops would do the dirty work while led by UN officials in a paternalistic relationship, may have also played a role in the delayed transition.³¹ With nations threatening to pull out forces as a result of deadly attacks on its troops, as well as an impending financial and structural collapse

²⁹ Prunier, 145.

³⁰ Murithi, "The African Union's evolving role in peace operations; the African Union Mission in Burundi, the African Union Mission in Sudan, and the African Union Mission in Somalia," 78.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 79.

of AMIS, the UN was able to circumvent Khartoum's obstruction policy to transfer authority of the operation from AMIS to UNAMID on December 31st, 2007.³²

Over the first half of 2008, the United Nations-led operation made some progress in Darfur, gaining access and securing previous "no-go" areas so that humanitarian assistance could reach IDPs still trapped in the area.³³ However, in terms of making a verifiable difference, UNAMID faced the same issues as AMIS over the two years prior; poor equipment, severe underfunding, a mandate that bent to the demands of Khartoum, and unrealistically high goals all plagued the operation.³⁴ In this, the African Union could claim some form of victory which could be used as a satisfactory excuse for its poor conflict management performance in Sudan. The United Nations was also failing to do what the international community proclaimed the African Union could not; stabilize the region and resolve the conflict allowing humanitarian aid to reach its intended targets.

Ultimately, despite the mandate transformation, from one that drew criticisms for its weakness to one that included the protection of IDPs and refugee camps, very few of the African Union's goals in the region were realized because it did not have the support it was promised.

³² Craig Timberg, "Senegal Threatens to Pull Out of AU Force: Rebel Attack on Darfur Base Reflects Troops' Vulnerability," *Washington Post*, October 2, 2007.
<http://ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/login?url=http://proquest.umi.com.ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/pqdweb?did=1349759671&sid=1&Fmt=3&clientId=20176&RQT=309&VName=PQD> (accessed May 17, 2010); "Peace Operations Fact Sheet Series: UNAMID," *The Henry L. Stimson Center* (2007): 2,
http://www.stimson.org/fopo/pdf/AU_UN_Hybrid_Fact_Sheet_Aug_07.pdf (accessed May 17, 2010).

³³ Rob Crilly, "UN force makes progress in Darfur," *The Christian Science Monitor*, April 28, 2008.
<http://ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/login?url=http://proquest.umi.com.ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/pqdweb?did=1485095831&sid=1&Fmt=2&clientId=20176&RQT=309&VName=PQD> (accessed May 20, 2010).

³⁴ Stephanie McCrummen, "Peacekeepers in Darfur Hobbled by Need; UN-African Union Force Short of Funds, Soldiers, Equipment," *Washington Post*, July 4, 2008.
<http://ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/login?url=http://proquest.umi.com.ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/pqdweb?did=1505180581&sid=1&Fmt=3&clientId=20176&RQT=309&VName=PQD> (accessed May 20, 2010).

Though not nearly as satisfying as to the organization as achieving the primary goal of successfully showcasing its conflict management capabilities, this victory pleased the African Union nonetheless because the international community was shown, through the similar plight of UNAMID, to collectively abandon the Darfur crisis at the time when action and implementation, as opposed to rhetoric, was required.

CONCLUSION

Collectively, the international community failed to adequately intervene in the Darfur genocide and the subsequent security deficit in the entire region, allowing the conflict to continue and worsen with no foreseeable end to date. A faster, more precise, and better coordinated effort from the international community during the formative months of the crisis in 2003 and early 2004 would have had a much greater effect on the intervention process than the respective policies pursued by the world's leading nations and organizations that followed. These policies, which should have been the physical emulation of strong rhetoric from global leaders that condemned the Government of Sudan and threatened action if the Sudanese government did not comply with demands to stop sponsoring attacks on the population of Darfur, instead reflected the global interests and national goals of each.

Global economic frailties which characterized the first decade of the twenty-first century, as well as many international conflicts such as the global War on Terror and the Iraq and Afghanistan Wars, which occurred concurrently with the Darfur crisis, certainly hindered the ability of some states to take an active role in the resolution process. However, the geopolitical interests of most nations involved and the economic and diplomatic importance of Sudan as the largest country in the Islamic world are factors that had an equal or greater impact. These factors, as shown, made a unified and concerted response to the Darfur question both difficult to achieve, as the individuality of states and organizations made disagreements such as those between the United States and the United Nations frequent, and dangerous to pursue as any action by Western states in Sudan could ignite a major international conflict with an Islamic world that

was already uneasy as a result of the aforementioned wars that targeted sovereign Islamic countries and extremist organizations.

Thus, the international community proceeded to further complicate the Darfur question. Beginning with Secretary of State Colin Powell's assertion of genocide on September 9, 2004, the global response to Darfur, with the aid of the media and human rights groups, turned the distant African crisis into a major political question in which the UN, the US, and other global leaders were required to provide an answer. At a period when many Western countries had hoped to keep the Darfur conflict out of national consciousness, it was thrust upon them by the international media. The introduction of the fledgling African Union into the realm of global political leadership, which was originally seen by Western states as a benefit, complicated the issue greater because of its lack of organization, political will, and finance. Not only did the international community's aim of providing "African solutions to African problems" fail within the first two years of the crisis because it did not supply the support it promised, but it was also contradictory to the collective international "never again" pledge to be proactive in halting crimes against humanity after the events in Rwanda.¹

Throughout the transformation process of the international community's response to the Darfur crisis, it has become clear that despite the introduction of preventative measures such as United Nations Genocide Resolution 260 and the United Nations General Assembly recognized Responsibility to Protect doctrine, the international community has yet to develop a conflict

¹ Prunier, 124; Don Cheadle and John Pendergrast, "Never again! - again," *USA Today*, March 1, 2005. http://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:p-i2G6ZhN4EJ:www.usatoday.com/news/opinion/editorials/2005-03-01-darfur-edit_x.htm+never+again+Rwanda&cd=5&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=us (accessed May 25, 2010).

management system to comprehensibly respond to and neutralize genocides or crimes against humanity. In classically accepted cases of genocide since the advent of Resolution 260, Bosnia and Rwanda, the international community was also reactive.

In Bosnia, similar to Darfur, debates over the proclamation of the term genocide slowed the international response as critics of its use argued that proponents were declaring genocide as part of a political process intended to evoke images related to the archetypal genocide, the Jewish Holocaust. Its proponents hoped the use of imagery related to the Jewish Holocaust would incite the international community to mobilize against the conflict's perpetrators, the Serbs, effectively ending the conflict.² The international community's presence, regardless of the lack of evidence in advance, was long overdue in Bosnia. According to Resolution 260, the goal of the international community is to prevent potential genocides from occurring. Through the media and other sources of information, it was clear to the international community that the Muslim population of Bosnia was being targeted by the State, yet no international force intervened in Srebrenica until 1993 with the inception of failed peacekeeping mission UNPROFOR, a death-filled year after the conflict began. Much like in Darfur, this international response was undermanned and directed by an insufficient mandate. Only the signing of the Dayton Accord in 1995, which established an outline for peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina, brought an end to the crisis- with the help of sixty thousand NATO ground troops.³

² Robert M. Hayden, "Mass Killings and Images of Genocide in Bosnia, 1941-5 and 1992-5," in *The Historiography of Genocide*, ed. Dan Stone (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008), 508.

³ Richard Caplan, "Assessing the Dayton Accord: The Structural Weaknesses of the General Framework Agreement for Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina," *Diplomacy & Statecraft* 11, no. 2 (July 2000): 213, *Military & Government Collection*, EBSCOhost (accessed May 25, 2010).

The Rwandan genocide proved to be a major and lasting blemish to the advocates of international interventionism. Similar to Darfur, despite the early signs of potential genocide such as a series of small-scale massacres that took place before the events of April 1994, the international community was reluctant to brand the brutality in Rwanda a genocide, which would have required them to take action.⁴ According to Scott Straus, the hasty US declaration of genocide in Darfur may have been a consequence of the international community's failure to do so in Rwanda ten years earlier, although the outcome of both crises were much the same.⁵ Most disturbing is that unlike Darfur, the UN had a peacekeeping force in place when the genocide began, yet the force did not have the capabilities to compel peace. Scholars of the Rwandan genocide typically argue that despite being hampered by poor intelligence, logistics, and several other discrepancies, the peacekeeping force could have been reinforced with the necessary upgrades to curtail the low-tech violence that caused most of the killings.⁶ Instead of a delayed reaction or weak mandates, which were the primary errors in the global response to genocide in Bosnia and Darfur, the Rwandan failure is defined by an international community that was dismayed by the idea of losing anymore lives in a remote African conflict.

As noted, the global response to Darfur was untimely, with the first United Nations observer teams reporting the possibility of mass murder in spring 2004 although the conflict had been ongoing since early 2003. The international response then progressed from negligence in 2003 and 2004, to observance in 2004 and 2005, to the use of international law as a deterrent in

⁴ Scott Straus, "The Historiography of the Rwandan Genocide," in *The Historiography of Genocide*, ed. Dan Stone (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008), 532-534.

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ Ibid.

2006, to which some nations objected. It progressed further in 2006 with the incoherent use of military peacekeeping operations in the region that were ill-equipped and undermanned. Most importantly, the operations were directed by mandates that were dictated by a Sudanese regime that should have been held responsible by the international community. The global response has consequently stagnated and the Darfur crisis continues to this day. Having fallen outside the scope of the media and subsequently the grasp of Western public opinion, the Darfur question remains unanswered and its perpetrators, who remain at-large as leaders of Sudan, have not answered for their crimes. And thus Darfur has become, to the satisfaction of some, “another African crisis” that we will look at in retrospect and somberly proclaim “never again.”

APPENDIX: MAP OF DARFUR, SUDAN

c



1

¹ Airline World, "Map of Darfur Region," map, 2008, http://airlineworld.files.wordpress.com/2008/08/darfur_map.png?w=330&h=355 (Accessed July 14, 2010).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Periodicals

New York Times

Washington Post

Sudan Tribune

Christian Science Monitor

People's Daily

Irish Times

Financial Times

Los Angeles Times

Knight Ridder Tribune

Publications of International Bodies

Delegation of the European Union to the United States. *EU Pledges 300 Million Euros for Development of Sudan*. No. 43/08. Washington: Delegation of the European Commission.

European Union. 2008. *EU Military Operation in Eastern Chad and North Eastern Central African Republic Fact Sheet*. Brussels: Council Secretariat.

European Union. 2008. *EU Presidency Statement on the Republic of Chad*. 5624/08 (Presse 19). Brussels: Council of the European Union.

European Union. 2008. *General Affairs and External Relations: Sudan/Chad/Central African Republic- Council conclusions*. Brussels: Council of the European Union.

European Union. 2008. *Summary of Remarks by Lt. General Patrick Nash, Operation Commander EUFOR Tchad/RCA*. Brussels: Council of the European Union.

European Union and the International Criminal Court. *Declaration by the Presidency on behalf of the European Union on the Anniversary of the referral of the situation in Darfur/Sudan to the ICC*. P042/08. Brussels: Council of the European Union.

European Union Foreign Policy Chief. 2008. *Javier Solana, EU High Representative for the CFSP, Condemns the Escalating Violence in Darfur*. S057/08. Brussels: Council of the European Union.

European Union Foreign Policy Chief. 2008. *Solana on Khartoum Attack and Darfur Situation*. S160/08. Brussels: Council of the European Union.

International Criminal Court. "Pre-Trial Chamber I requests additional materials in relation to the request for a warrant of arrest for Sudanese President Omar Hassan Al Bashir." 2008-10-16. Available from [http://www.icc-cpi.int/menus/icc/press%20and%20media/press%20releases/press%20releases%20\(2008\)/pre_trial%20chamber%20i%20requests%20additional%20materials%20in%20relation%20to%20the%20request%20for%20a%20warrant%20of%20arrest](http://www.icc-cpi.int/menus/icc/press%20and%20media/press%20releases/press%20releases%20(2008)/pre_trial%20chamber%20i%20requests%20additional%20materials%20in%20relation%20to%20the%20request%20for%20a%20warrant%20of%20arrest). (accessed 27 August, 2009).

NGO Documents

China National Petroleum Corporation. "CNPC donates US\$1.9 million to Sudan." 2007-02-02. Available from [http://www.cnpc.com/en/eng/press/newsreleases/CNPCdonatesUS\\$1.9milliontoSudan.htm](http://www.cnpc.com/en/eng/press/newsreleases/CNPCdonatesUS$1.9milliontoSudan.htm). (accessed 4 March, 2009).

China National Petroleum Corporation. "CNPC employees kidnapped and three killed in Sudan." 2008-10-29. Available from http://www.cnpc.com/en/eng/press/newsreleases/CNPC_EmployeesKidnappedand3KilledinSudan.htm. (accessed 4 March, 2009).

China National Petroleum Corporation. "Jiang Jiemin meets with Sudan's Minister of Energy and Mining Al-Zubeir Ahmed Al-Hassan." 2008-11-01. Available from <http://www.cnpc.com/en/eng/press/newsreleases/JiangJieminmeetswithSudansMinisterofEnergy&MiningAl-ZubeirAhmedAl-Hassan.htm>. (accessed 4 March, 2009).

US Government Documents

United States, and George W. Bush. 2004. *Continuation of the national emergency with respect to Sudan: communication from the President of the United States transmitting notification that the national emergency declared with respect to Sudan, by Executive Order 13067, is to continue in effect beyond November 3, 2004, pursuant to 50 USC. 1622(d)*. Washington: US G.P.O.

United States. *Comprehensive Peace in Sudan Act of 2004*. Washington, D.C.: US G.P.O., 2004.

United States. *Darfur Crisis Death Estimates Demonstrate Severity of Crisis, but Their Accuracy and Credibility Could Be Enhanced : Report to Congressional Requesters*. [Washington, D.C.]: US Government Accountability Office, 2006.
<<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS77420>>.

United States. *Darfur Crisis Progress in Aid and Peace Monitoring Threatened by Ongoing Violence and Operational Challenges : Report to Congressional Requesters*. [Washington, D.C.]: US Government Accountability Office, 2006.
<<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS77449>>.

United States. *Sudan: Peace but at What Price?: Hearing Before the Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate, One Hundred Eighth Congress, Second Session, June 15, 2004*. Washington: US G.P.O., 2004.

US Congress House Committee on Financial Services Subcommittee on Domestic and International Monetary Policy, Trade, and Technology. *H.R. 180, the Darfur Accountability and Divestment Act of 2007*. 110th Cong., 1st sess., 2007.

US Congress House Committee on International Relations. *The crisis in Darfur: a new front in Sudan's bloody war; and condemning the government of the Republic of the Sudan for its attacks against innocent civilians in the impoverished Darfur Region of Western Sudan*. 105th Cong., 2nd sess., 2004. H. Con. Res. 403.

_____. *Prospects for Peace in Darfur*. 109th Cong., 2nd sess., 2006.

US Congress House Committee on International Relations Subcommittee on Africa. *Condemning the government of the Republic of the Sudan for its attacks against innocent civilians in the impoverished Darfur region of western Sudan*. 108th Cong., 2nd sess., 2004. H. Con. Res. 403.

US Congress House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform Subcommittee on National Security and Foreign Affairs. *Darfur and the Olympics : a call for international action*. 110th Cong., 2st sess., 2008.

US Congress Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. *Darfur Revisited: the International Response*. 109th Cong., 1st sess., 2008. S. Hrg. 109-868.

_____. *Darfur: a "Plan B" to stop genocide?* 110th Cong., 1st sess., 2008. S. Hrg. 110-229.

_____. *The Continuing Crisis in Darfur*. 110th Cong., 2nd sess., 2009. S. Hrg. 110-748.

US Congress Senate Committee on Foreign Relations Subcommittee on African Affairs. *Chad and the Central African Republic: the regional impact of the Darfur crisis*. 110th Cong., 1st sess., 2008.

US Congress Senate Committee on the Judiciary Subcommittee on Human Rights and the Law. *From Nuremberg to Darfur : accountability for crimes against humanity*. 110th Cong., 2nd sess., 2009.

Secondary Sources

Books

Ahmed, Abdel Ghaffar M., and Leif Manger eds. *Understanding the Crisis in Darfur: Listening to Sudanese Voices*. Bergen, Norway: UNIFOB Global, 2006.

Coghlan, Nicholas. *Far in the Waste Sudan: On Assignment in Africa*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2005.

Cooper, Richard H., and Juliette Voinov Kohler, eds. *Responsibility to Protect: The Global Moral Compact for the 21st Century*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.

Daly, M.W. *Darfur's Sorrow: A History of Destruction and Genocide*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

de Waal, Alex. *Famine that Kills: Darfur, Sudan*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989.

_____, ed. *War in Darfur and the Search for Peace*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2007.

Faris, Stephan. *Forecast: The Consequences of Climate Change, from the Amazon to the Arctic, from Darfur to Napa Valley*. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 2009.

Flint, Julie, and Alex de Waal. *Darfur: A Short History of a Long War*. London: Zed Books, 2005.

Francis, David J. *Civil Militia: Africa's Intractable Security Menace?* Aldershot, Hants, England: Ashgate, 2005.

Funk, Kevin, and Steven Fake. *Scramble for Africa: Darfur-Intervention and the USA*. Montreal: Black Rose Books, 2009.

Hagan, John, and Wenona Rymond-Richmond. *Darfur and the Crime of Genocide*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

- Ibrahim, Fouad, et al. *Explaining Darfur: Four Lectures on the Ongoing Genocide*. Amsterdam: Vossiuspers UvA, 2006.
- Idris, Amir H. *Conflict and Politics of Identity in Sudan*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2005.
- Iyob, Ruth, and Gilbert M. Khadiagala. *Sudan: The Elusive Quest for Peace*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers, Inc., 2006.
- Johnson, Douglas H. *The Root Causes of Sudan's Civil Wars*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2003.
- Krenn, L. Michael. *The Color of Empire: Race and American Foreign Relations*. Washington D.C.: Potomac Books, Inc., 2006.
- Larkin, Bruce D. *China and Africa 1949-1970: The Foreign Policy of the People's Republic of China*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1971.
- Mamdani, Mahmood. *Saviors and Survivors: Darfur, Politics, and the War on Terror*. New York: Pantheon Books, 2009.
- Piiparinen, Touko. *The Transformation of UN Conflict Management: Producing Images of Genocide from Rwanda to Darfur and Beyond*. London: Routledge, 2010.
- Prunier, Gerard. *Darfur: A 21st Century Genocide*. 3rd ed. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2008.
- Schelling, Thomas C. *Arms and Influence*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1966.
- Sidahmed, Abdel Salam, Walter C. Soderlund, and E. Donald Briggs. *The Responsibility to Protect in Darfur: The Role of Mass Media*. Lanham, Md: Lexington Books, 2010.
- Steidle, Brian, and Gretchen Steidle Wallace. *The Devil Came on Horseback: Bearing Witness to the Genocide in Darfur*. New York: PublicAffairs, 2007.
- Stone, Dan, ed. *The Historiography of Genocide*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.
- Taylor, Ian. *China and Africa: Engagement and Compromise*. New York: Routledge, 2006.
- Totten, Samuel, and Eric Markusen, eds. *Genocide in Darfur: Investigating the Atrocities in the Sudan*. New York: Routledge, 2006.
- Traub, James. *The Best Intentions: Kofi Annan and the UN in the Era of American World Power*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2006.

Wai, Dunstan M. *The African-Arab Conflict in the Sudan*. New York: Africana Publishing Company, 1981.

Unpublished Theses and Dissertations

Melvin, David J. "Ending Impunity: Establishing the Legitimacy of the International Criminal Court." B.S. Thesis, University of Central Florida, 2008.

Journal Articles, Papers, and Chapters from Edited Books

"State Department Legal Adviser Describes US Views on International Law, Suggests Possible Cooperation with International Criminal Court on Darfur." *The American Journal of International Law* 101, no. 3 (Jul. 2007): 636-639.

"US Officials Endorse "Responsibility to Protect" Through Security Council Action." *The American Journal of International Law* 100, no. 2 (Apr., 2006): 463-464.

"US Proposes New Regional Court to Hear Charges Involving Darfur, Others Urge ICC." *The American Journal of International Law* 99, no.2 (Apr., 2005): 501-502.

Bagoyoko, Niagale and Marie V. Gilbert. "The European Union in Africa: The Linkage between Security, Governance, and Development from an Institutional Perspective." IDS Working Paper 284 (May 2007): 3-34.

Barker, Alec. "Between Conscience and Self Interest: The United States, Sudan and Darfur." *BC Journal of International Affairs* 13 (Spring 2010). <http://bcjournal.org/2006/between-conscience-and-self-interest/> (accessed February 16, 2010).

Bellamy, Alex J. "Responsibility to Protect or Trojan Horse? The Crisis in Darfur and the Humanitarian Intervention after Iraq." *Ethics and International Affairs* 19, Iss. 2 (September 2005): 31-54.

Boshoff, Henri. "The African Union Mission in Sudan: Technical and operational dimensions." *African Security Review* 14, no. 3 (2005): 57-60.
<http://www.iss.co.za/pubs/ASR/14No3/AWBoshoff.htm> (accessed May 10, 2010).

Caplan, Richard. "Assessing the Dayton Accord: The Structural Weaknesses of the General Framework Agreement for Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina." *Diplomacy & Statecraft* 11, no. 2 (July 2000): 213-232. *Military & Government Collection*, EBSCOhost (accessed May 25, 2010).

Cook, Robin. "US Hostility to the International Criminal Court Knows no Bounds." *Review of African Political Economy* 32, no. 104/105 (Jun.-Sep. 2005): 465-466.

- Crook, John R. "United States Abstains on Security Council Resolution Authorizing Referral of Darfur to International Criminal Court." *The American Journal of International Law* 99, no. 3 (Jul. 2005): 691-693.
- Ehrhart, Hans-Georg. "Assessing EUFOR Chad/CAR." *European Security Review* 41, no. 42 (November 2008): 1-4. http://www.isis-europe.org/pdf/2008_artrel_231_esr42-euforchad.pdf (accessed April 21, 2010).
- Ekengard, Arvid. "The African Union Mission in Sudan (AMIS): Experiences and Lessons Learned." *FOI, Swedish Defence Research Agency* (August 2008): 3-59. <http://www.foi.se/upload/projects/Africa/foir2559.pdf> (accessed May 4, 2010).
- Gareth, Evans. "The Responsibility to Protect: From an Idea to an International Norm." In *Responsibility to Protect: The Global Moral Compact for the 21st Century*. Edited by Richard H. Cooper and Juliette Voinov Kohler. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.
- "Getting a Toe in Darfur; Sudan and the United Nations." *The Economist International* 381, Iss. 8505 (Nov., 2006): 70.
- Gilpin, Robert. "The Challenge of Global Capitalism: The World Economy in the 21st Century." In *Globalization and the Poor: Exploitation or Equalizer?* Edited by William Driscoll and Julie Clark. New York: The International Debate Education Association, 2003.
- Gompert, David C, Courtney Richardson, Richard R. Kugler, and Clifford H. Bernath. "Learning from Darfur: Building a Net-Capable African Force to Stop Mass Killing." *Center for Technology and National Security Policy* (July 2005): 1-51. [http://www.carlisle.army.mil/DIME/documents/DTP%20Darfur\[1\].pdf](http://www.carlisle.army.mil/DIME/documents/DTP%20Darfur[1].pdf) (accessed May 4, 2010).
- Guicherd, Catherine. "The AU in Sudan: Lessons Learned for the African Standby Force." *International Peace Academy* (March 2007): 1-28. [http://www.reliefweb.int/rw/lib.nsf/db900sid/SKAI-7DPQKY/\\$file/IPA_AUinSudan_Mar07_English.pdf?openelement](http://www.reliefweb.int/rw/lib.nsf/db900sid/SKAI-7DPQKY/$file/IPA_AUinSudan_Mar07_English.pdf?openelement) (accessed May 4, 2010).
- Hagan, John and Albert Palloni. "Social Science: Death in Darfur." *Science* 313, no. 5793 (15 September 2006): 1578-1579.
- Hayden, Robert M. "Mass Killings and Images of Genocide in Bosnia, 1941-5 and 1992-5." In *The Historiography of Genocide*. Edited by Dan Stone. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.
- Hilsum, Lindsey. "Re-Enter the Dragon: China's New Mission in Africa." *Review of African Political Economy* 32, no. 104/105 (Jun.-Sep., 2005): 419-425.

- Human Rights Watch. "US Thwarts Justice for Darfur." *Review of African Political Economy* 32, no. 103 (Mar., 2005): 195-196.
- Keller, Edmond J. "Africa and the United States: Meeting the Challenges of Globalization." In *Africa-US Relations: Strategic Encounters*. Edited by Donald Rothchild and Edmond J. Keller. Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2006.
- Meron, Theodore. "Reflections on the Prosecutions of War Crimes by International Tribunals." *The American Journal of International Law* 100, no. 3 (Jul., 2006): 551-579.
- Murithi, Tim. "The African Union's evolving role in peace operations; the African Union Mission in Burundi, the African Union Mission in Sudan, and the African Union Mission in Somalia." *African Security Review* 17, no. 1 (01 Jan 2008): 70-82. <http://www.iss.co.za/uploads/17NO1MURITHI.PDF> (accessed May 12, 2010).
- _____. "The African Union's Transition from Non-Intervention to Non-Indifference: An Ad Hoc Approach to the Responsibility to Protect." *International Politics and Society* 1 (2009): 90-108. http://library.fes.de/pdf-files/ipg/ipg-2009-1/08_a_murithi_us.pdf (accessed May 5, 2010).
- Nichols, Alexandra. "Human Rights and Human Welfare: Sudan." *Human Rights and the War on Terror* 2 (2007): 194-202. <http://www.du.edu/korbel/hrhw/digest/terror/sudan.pdf> (accessed February 10, 2010).
- O'Neill, William G. and Cassis, Violette, *Protecting Two Million Displaced. The Successes and Shortcomings of the African Union in Darfur*. Brookings-Bern Project on Internal Displacement, November 2005.
- Padraig, Carmody, and Francis Y. Owusu. "Competing Hegemons?: Chinese Versus American Geo- Economic Strategies in Africa." *Political Geography* 26, no. 5 (jun, 2007).
- Pentland, Charles C. "The European Union and Civil Conflict in Africa." *International Journal* 60, no. 4 (Autumn, 2005): 927. <http://www.jstor.org.ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/stable/40204091?seq=9&Search=yes&term=Pentland&term=Charles&term=C.&list=hide&searchUri=%2Faction%2FdoBasicSearch%3FQuery%3DCharles%2BC.%2BPentland%26gw%3Djtx%26prq%3DCharles%2BC.%2BPentland%26hp%3D25%26wc%3Don&item> (accessed April 18, 2010).
- "President and Secretary of State Characterize Events in Darfur as Genocide." *The American Journal of International Law* 99, no. 1 (Jan. 2005): 266-267.
- Rodman, Kenneth A. "Darfur and the Limits of Legal Deterrence." *Human Rights Quarterly* 30 (2008): 529-60.

- Roosevelt, Ann. "Intervention Lesson: Better Civil-Military Coordination, Solana Says." *Defense Daily International* 6, no. 42 (October 28, 2005): 1.
<http://proquest.umi.com.ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/pqdweb?index=129&did=918600711&SrchMode=1&sid=3&Fmt=3&VInst=PROD&VType=PQD&RQT=309&VName=PQD&TS=1272294562&clientId=20176> (accessed April 17, 2010).
- Slim, Hugo. "Dithering in Darfur? A Preliminary Review of the International Response." *International Affairs* 80, Iss. 5 (28 Oct 2004): 811-828.
- Straus, Scott. "The Historiography of the Rwandan Genocide." In *The Historiography of Genocide*. Edited by Dan Stone. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.
- Tull, Denis M. "China's Engagement in Africa: Scope, Significance, and Consequences." *The Journal of Modern African Studies* 44, no. 3 (Sep. 1, 2006): 459-479.
- Volman, Daniel. "The Bush Administration and African Oil: Security Implications of US Energy Policy." *Review of African Political Economy* 30, No. 98 (Dec., 2003): 573-584.

Published Electronic Sources

- "A Universal Court with Global Support: Res. 1593." Coalition for the International Criminal Court. <http://www.iccnw.org/?mod=res1593&idudctp=14&show=all#14> (accessed April 18, 2010).
- "China, Russia Deny Weapons Breach." BBC News. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/africa/6632959.stm> (accessed March 26, 2010).
- "International: Getting boots off the ground; Military helicopters." *The Economist* 386, no. 8564 (Jan. 26, 2008): 70.
<http://proquest.umi.com.ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/pqdweb?index=299&did=1419706961&SrcMode=1&sid=4&Fmt=3&VInst=PROD&VType=PQD&RQT=309&VName=PQD&TS=1272592946&clientId=20176> (accessed April 21, 2010).
- Chin, Sally, and Jonathan Morgenstein. "No Power to Protect: The African Union Mission in Sudan." *Refugees International* (November 2005): 1-24.
<http://www.refugeesinternational.org/sites/default/files/NoPowertoProtect.pdf> (accessed May 4, 2010).
- Crilly, Rob. "UN force makes progress in Darfur," *The Christian Science Monitor*, April 28, 2008.
<http://ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/login?url=http://proquest.umi.com.ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/pqdweb?did=1485095831&sid=1&Fmt=2&clientId=20176&RQT=309&VName=PQD> (accessed May 20, 2010).

- Cronin, David. "Sudan/EU politics: 'Inability to deliver' puts EU's international reputation at risk." The Economist Intelligence Unit ViewsWire.
<http://ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/login?url=http://proquest.umi.com.ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/pqdweb?did=1016469791&sid=3&Fmt=3&clientId=20176&RQT=309&VName=PQD>
(accessed April 17, 2010).
- Heavens, Andrew. "Sudan Army Rejects UK Peacekeeper." uk.reuters.com.
<http://uk.reuters.com/article/idUKL1484703820080214> (accessed December 9, 2009).
- Morse, David. "Appeasement Driven by Oil." informationclearinghouse.info. 10/01/06.
(accessed February 4, 2010).
- Okeowo, Alexis. "Eager to quell its own conflicts, African Union feels overstretched." The Christian Science Monitor. <http://www.csmonitor.com/2007/0822/p04s01-woaf.html>
(accessed May 5, 2010).
- "Sudan: European Union response to the Darfur crisis." Sudan Watch.
<http://sudanwatch.blogspot.com/2006/07/sudan-european-union-response-to.html>
(accessed April 18, 2010).
- Suleiman, Mahmoud A. "Why does Sudan reject non-African troops in Darfur?" Sudan Tribune.
http://www.sudantribune.com/spip.php?page=imprimable&id_article=25179 (accessed April 21 2010).
- "US State Department Patterns of Global Terrorism: 1997 Overview of State-Sponsored Terrorism." Hellenic Resources Network. <http://www.hri.org/docs/USSD-Terror/97/sponsored.html> (accessed April 20, 2010).
- World Sources Online. "EU to finance African mission in Darfur, Sudan." Xinhua.
<http://ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/login?url=http://proquest.umi.com.ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/pqdweb?did=719902431&sid=1&Fmt=3&clientId=20176&RQT=309&VName=PQD> (accessed May 7, 2010).
- World Sources Online. "UN chief introduces plan to expand African Union's role in Darfur, Sudan." Xinhua.
<http://ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/login?url=http://proquest.umi.com.ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/pqdweb?did=712726171&sid=1&Fmt=3&clientId=20176&RQT=309&VName=PQD> (accessed May 7, 2010).