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POLITICAL MAP OF SUDAN

Source: University of Texas-Austin, Perry Casteñada Library Map Collection
## Selective List of Sudanese Ethnic Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Religion¹</th>
<th>Region²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African</td>
<td>Dinka</td>
<td>Christian/Animist</td>
<td>South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nuer</td>
<td>Christian/Animist</td>
<td>South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nuba (southern)</td>
<td>Christian/Animist</td>
<td>South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nuba (northern)</td>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fur</td>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zaghawa</td>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Masalit</td>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tunjur</td>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meidob</td>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Berti</td>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Birgid</td>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab</td>
<td>Baggara</td>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>West &amp; South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Missiriya</td>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Southern Rezeigat</td>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>West &amp; South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abbala</td>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>West &amp; North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Northern Rezeigat (Mahamid)</td>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>West &amp; North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>North &amp; Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beja</td>
<td>Beja</td>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>East</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


² Since 2005, Sudan has been divided into 25 states (*wilayat*) in 5 historical Regions: NORTHERN – River Nile, Northern; EASTERN – Al Qadarif, Kassala, Red Sea; CENTRAL – Al Jazirah, Blue Nile/Central, White Nile, Sennar, Khartoum; SOUTHERN – Upper Nile, Jonglei, Unity, North Bahr al Ghazal, West Bahr al Ghazal, Lakes, Warrap, Western Equatoria, Central Equatoria, Eastern Equatoria; WESTERN – North Kordofan, South Kordofan, North Darfur, South Darfur, West Darfur.
**LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AMIS</td>
<td>African Union Mission in Sudan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU</td>
<td>African Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNPC</td>
<td>China National Petroleum Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>Comprehensive Peace Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPA</td>
<td>Darfur Peace Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPAA</td>
<td>Darfur Peace and Accountability Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUP</td>
<td>Democratic Unionist Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESF</td>
<td>Economic Support Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNU</td>
<td>Government of National Unity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOSS</td>
<td>Government of South Sudan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICC</td>
<td>International Criminal Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICID</td>
<td>International Commission of Inquiry on Darfur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEM</td>
<td>Justice and Equality Movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCP</td>
<td>National Congress Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDA</td>
<td>National Democratic Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIF</td>
<td>National Islamic Front</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFAC</td>
<td>Office of Foreign Assets Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ONGC</td>
<td>Oil and National Gas Company (India)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCP</td>
<td>People’s Congress Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDF</td>
<td>Popular Defense Forces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SADA</td>
<td>Sudan Accountability and Divestment Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAF</td>
<td>Sudanese Armed Forces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDN</td>
<td>Specially Designated Nationals and Blocked Persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLM/A</td>
<td>Sudan Liberation Movement/Army</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPLM/A</td>
<td>Sudan People’s Liberation Movement/Army</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDRA</td>
<td>Transitional Darfur Regional Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNAMID</td>
<td>United Nations African Mission in Darfur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNSC</td>
<td>United Nations Security Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTRODUCTION

Adopted by the United Nations General Assembly in 1948, the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide defines genocide as:

…any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group, as such:

( a ) Killing members of the group;
( b ) Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group;
( c ) Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part;
( d ) Imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group;
( e ) Forcibly transferring children of the group to another group.3

In 2002, Samantha Power published her Pulitzer Prize-winning book, A Problem from Hell: America and the Age of Genocide. Among other things, the work provides a damning account of how the United States and the rest of the international community not only repeatedly failed to stop genocide in the 20th century, but even denied its occurrence because of concerns for strict geopolitical interests. Indeed, Power notes that the international community was slow and reluctant to stop genocides in Cambodia (1975-1979), Iraqi Kurdistan (1987-1988), Bosnia (1992-1995), Rwanda (1994), Kosovo (1998-1999), and elsewhere, despite the inherent moral imperatives and the legally enshrined promise to intervene created by 1948 UN Convention. Following straight from the title, Article I of the Convention clearly states that contracting parties must “undertake to prevent and punish” the crime of genocide.

Considering this record of inaction and reluctance, the U.S. response to genocide in Sudan has been unusually strong. Even before the well-published atrocities in Darfur in 2003-2004, the United States had labeled Khartoum’s other war against the southern part of the country as genocide. In fact, Sudan is one of the only cases where the United States called evil by its name while the crime was actually taking place, rather than after. The U.S. response has not been strictly rhetorical either – the United States has implemented a full-court press of economic sanctions and public condemnations targeting the ruling regime, while pressuring other key international players to do the same. The United States has also been

the world leader in pushing for the deployment of international peacekeepers with strong mandates to
Sudanese conflict zones.

Because of the United States’ uncommon reaction to genocide in southern Sudan and Darfur, U.S.
policy towards Sudan provides a rare and interesting case study for something that is not common in the
foreign policy literature – assessing the impact of external diplomatic and economic pressure on a state’s
decision to pursue genocide. A great deal of literature exists for a host of related issues – the international
community’s reluctance to respond to genocide, the usefulness of peacekeeping forces, predicting the onset
of genocide, tools for preventing genocide, creating lasting peace in post-conflict scenarios – but little work
has been done assessing the actual effectiveness of diplomatic and economic efforts at preventing or
limiting genocide, specifically.

Studying the effectiveness of diplomatic and economic efforts is also useful for improving
contemporary strategies for dealing with Sudan in particular. While violence today is much lower than it
was five years ago, conflict persists, and the possibility of more catastrophes still looms. Currently there is
no consensus among experts on how to influence the behavior of the Sudanese state regarding the use of
violence against civilians, as evidenced by the differing views of the two most prominent U.S. officials
involved in America’s Sudan policy. Susan E. Rice is the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations (UN),
and she advocates a hard-line approach that continues to squeeze the regime in Khartoum, while retired
Major General Jonathan S. Gration, the U.S. Special Envoy to Sudan, favors a softer approach with more
engagement. A critical assessment of U.S. policy to date would benefit the development of policy towards
Sudan.

Given the rare and useful nature of studying U.S. policy toward Sudan, I have created a case study
to serve two purposes: 1) to enhance our knowledge of foreign policy’s ability to stop/limit genocide, and
2) to provide lessons for U.S. policy towards Sudan, based on a critical assessment of past practice. To
achieve these ends, I ask the question: How effective have U.S. diplomatic and economic efforts been at
affecting the behavior of the Sudanese state regarding its use of genocide and mass killing of civilians?
The question is narrow, and for good reasons. First, it asks for an assessment. The current literature
contains numerous works proposing a range of policy options for preventing genocide, without offering conclusive evidence of their effectiveness. Second, it focuses strictly on diplomatic and economic efforts short of violent force to prevent or limit genocide. Historically, it has been very difficult for the United States to gain support – domestic or international – for military interventions (especially since its military forces are tied down in Iraq and Afghanistan). The simple reality is that diplomatic and economic efforts will be the most likely response to genocide (if any) in the future. Furthermore, even if an escalation to military intervention were on the table, determining the independent usefulness of diplomatic and economic tools gives us a better understanding of whether or not violent force might be necessary. Third, because military intervention to force a regime change is unlikely to occur, and because the nature of a new regime is uncertain, the focus of the study is on influencing the behavior of the current regime – not recreating the Sudanese government.

The structure of this case study is divided into five parts. Part I builds the necessary groundwork. It presents a background for conflict in Sudan and U.S.-Sudanese relations. Part II presents some of the important arguments in the literature on persuasion and deterrence, as this project is fundamentally a study of influence. Part III explains the power structures in Sudan, as well as the interests of those in power. It then reveals why the Sudanese government has at times viewed genocide as a way of furthering those interests. Part IV is the actual assessment. It presents the different diplomatic and economic efforts the United States has used in the past to influence the current Sudanese regime regarding genocide and provides an assessment of their effectiveness. Part V explains how this case study 1) adds to the literature on foreign policy’s ability to prevent genocide, and 2) provides guidance for the shaping of U.S. policy towards Sudan.

---

Former Secretaries of State and Defense Madeleine K. Albright and William S. Cohen worked with the Genocide Prevention Task Force to produce such a paper, publishing a report in 2008 entitled, “Preventing Genocide: A Blueprint for U.S. Policymakers.”
PART I
LAYING THE GROUNDWORK

Not all of the following historical context deals specifically with genocide in Sudan. However, the following background material is all relevant to understanding why U.S. policy has unfolded the way it has, and why the Sudanese government has reacted the way that is has to U.S. diplomatic and economic efforts.

Historical Background

Sudan is the largest country in Africa in terms of area, and the eighth most populous with 40.2 million people. It borders nine other African countries. While Sudan has hundreds of different ethnic groups, the great majority can be distinguished as black African (52%), Arab (39%), or Beja (6%).

Sudan was granted independence from Great Britain on January 1, 1956, but even before then the country was already embroiled in conflict. A civil war erupted in 1955 between the Muslim Arab North and Christian/Animist African South – a conflict that lasted 17 years until the Addis Ababa Agreement in 1972. The civil war resumed a decade later in 1983 after then-President Jaafar Nimieri unilaterally abrogated the terms of the peace agreement by abolishing Southern autonomy, declaring Arabic the official language in the South, and transferring control of the Southern armed forces to the central government. This time the rebellion consisted of a group of southern Sudanese army officers under the leadership of Colonel John Garang calling themselves the Sudan People’s Liberation Movement/Army (SPLM/A). The SPLA is comprised mostly of Dinka, Nuer, and Nuba.

In 1985 a bloodless military coup overthrew Nimieri and set up democratic elections in Sudan. In 1986, Sadiq al-Mahdi was elected Prime Minister and formed a coalition government comprising his Umma Party, the National Islamic Front (NIF) (led by Hassan al-Turabi), the Democratic Unionist Party (DUP) (led by al-Sayyid Muhammad Othman al-Mirghani), and other smaller parties. However, instability, administrative mismanagement, and fears that Mahdi would give concessions to the South

---

6 Sudanese Arabs are only Arab in linguistic, cultural, and ethnic association. Racially, Sudanese Arabs are in fact black Africans, and are much more closely related to Sudanese African tribes than they are to Arabs from the Arabian Peninsula.
7 “Sudan,” CIA World Factbook.
8 U.S. Department of State, “Background Note: Sudan.”
prompted another military coup on June 30, 1989—this time led by army Colonel Omar Hasan Ahmad al-Bashir. Bashir formed and headed the new governing body, the Revolutionary Command Council for National Salvation, which he disbanded in 1993 after having consolidated power and declaring himself president. Bashir's coup was also backed by Turabi and the NIF; they ruled Sudan, outlawing all other political parties. Together, they tried imposing Sharia law over all of Sudan and creating a totalitarian state. Turabi even envisioned Sudan as the base for an Islamic revolution across all of Africa. Though outlawed, the opposition parties joined together under an umbrella group, the National Democratic Alliance (NDA). In 1998, the NIF changed its named to the National Congress Party (NCP), which remains the ruling political party to this day. However, in 1999, Turabi severely miscalculated by introducing a bill to limit the president’s powers.9 Bashir reacted by dissolving parliament, declaring a state of emergency, and imprisoning Turabi along with many of his supporters. Turabi promptly formed his own splinter party, the People’s Congress Party (PCP), but has been on the outside looking in at Bashir’s government ever since.

On January 9, 2005, the NCP and SPLM finally signed the Naivasha Agreement (better known as the Comprehensive Peace Agreement, or CPA) ending their civil war. Twenty-two years of conflict between the North and South had resulted in the deaths of over 2 million people, internally displaced 4 million more, and forced an estimated 600,000 people to seek refuge in other countries.10 On June 18, 2005, the NCP also signed a peace deal with the NDA, bringing other opposition parties into the interim Government of National Unity (GNU). The CPA established an autonomous Government of South Sudan (GOSS), and calls for nation-wide elections set to take place in April 2010. Additionally, in 2011, South Sudan will hold a referendum for independence, which is highly expected to pass. A 2011 referendum will also be held for three disputed areas – Blue Nile, Nuba Mountains, and Abyei – giving them an opportunity to join South Sudan.11 The peace is tentative, and many challenges to full CPA implementation still exist.

10 U.S. Department of State, “Background Note: Sudan.”
11 South Sudan currently consists of the 10 states of the Southern Region (see footnote #5). Blue Nile consists of the current Blue Nile state. Nuba Mountains and Abyei consist of the eastern half and southwest corner of South Kordofan state, respectively.
Before the North-South war could come to an end, rebellion erupted in the western Darfur states in 2002. In 2003, two new rebel groups in Darfur declared their existence: the Sudan Liberation Movement/Army (SLM/A) (led by Abdul Wahid al Nur, a Fur; and Minni Minawi, a Zaghawa) and the Justice and Equality Movement (JEM) (led by Khalil Ibrahim). The SLA is primarily composed of Fur, Zaghawa Tuer, and Masalit, while JEM is primarily Zaghawa Kobe. The brutal war that ensued reached its peak between February 2003 and December 2004, during which 96% of the total fatalities caused by the Darfur conflict occurred. Minni Minawi’s SLA faction and the NCP signed the Darfur Peace Agreement (DPA) on May 5, 2006, making him Senior Assistant to the President and head of the Transitional Darfur Regional Authority (TDRA). Abdul Wahid and Ibrahim abstained. The rebel movement has since devolved into numerous bickering groups that continue a low-intensity conflict against the Sudanese government and each other. Death tolls for the conflict are widely disputed – Bashir claims 10,000 while some Darfur advocates argue it is over 400,000 – but the UN puts the total number of dead at over 300,000, with another 2.7 million internally displaced and 250,000 others forced to seek refuge in other countries, mostly in eastern Chad.

U.S. Policy and Interests

During the Cold War, Sudan originally benefited from Soviet arms sales. However, Soviet-Sudanese relations diminished in the 1970s. The United States began to see Sudan as a nation threatened by neighboring Libya and Ethiopia, which at the time received heavy military assistance from the Soviets, so the Americans began offering military assistance the late 1970s. During the 1980s, the United States made Sudan its largest recipient of development and military assistance in Sub-Saharan Africa. However,
the United States suspended all development and military aid to Sudan following the 1989 coup.\textsuperscript{17} Relations soured even further as Turabi pursued a number of provocative activities: verbally supporting Saddam Hussein’s invasion of Kuwait, aiding destabilizing rebel movements in neighboring countries, and promoting international terrorism.\textsuperscript{18} These activities led to Sudan’s designation as a state sponsor of terrorism in 1993, the cutting off of diplomatic relations in 1996, and comprehensive economic sanctions in 1997. Since being stripped of his power in 1999, Turabi has no longer been able to use the Sudanese state as his personal terrorist incubator, and the two countries even began cooperating on counterterrorism.

Right before 9/11, President George W. Bush started shifting U.S. focus in Sudan to ending the genocide in the South. On September 6, 2001, Bush appointed Senator John Danforth U.S. Special Envoy to Sudan with the goal of pressuring the two parties to reach a peace agreement. Since then, the United States has utilized a number of diplomatic and economic tools to influence the Sudanese regime’s genocidal behavior. These efforts will be explored and evaluated more extensively in Part IV.

It is curious that the United States became so involved opposing genocide in Sudan considering it had resisted action in other genocidal conflicts. There are a number of factors that might explain the active U.S. stance in Sudan. First, the North-South civil war has been depicted as a conflict where Muslim aggressors persecute a minority Christian population – an unsettling idea for a Judeo-Christian nation like the America.\textsuperscript{19} Second, the United States was already pressuring Sudan over an issue that was a direct threat to national security: international terrorism. With Turabi expelled from the NCP, and the Sudanese government cooperating with the CIA on counterterrorism, other Sudanese issues had a chance to receive greater attention. Third, Clinton’s comprehensive sanctions eliminated most of the economic ties between

\textsuperscript{17} Section 508 of the Foreign Assistance Act prohibits the extension of military and development aid to regimes that have come to power by overthrowing a democratically-elected government. However, Congress can choose to waive those sanctions on a case-by-case basis, as it did with Pakistan under President Pervez Musharraf.

\textsuperscript{18} By 1994, he was aiding destabilizing rebel movements in no less than five of Sudan’s nine neighboring countries. Also, Turabi courted some of the world’s most infamous terrorists, including Carlos the Jackal, Osama bin Laden, and Abu Nidal, and his Popular Arab and Islamic Conference, created in 1991, brought together representatives from the likes of Palestinian Liberation Organization, Hamas, Egyptian Islamic Jihad, Algerian Islamic Jihad, and Hezbollah. In June 1995, Sudanese-backed terrorists attempted to assassinate Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak.

the United States and Sudan, so by the time Bush decided to pursue genocide prevention, there were very few American special interest groups to oppose an escalation of pressure. The Sudanese government and business interests simply did not have any friends in U.S. politics that could put pressure on Bush or Congress to ease off. Fourth, instability in South Sudan limited oil production and exporting. Fifth, media attention for Darfur was significant, with about 1,300 English-language newspaper articles in August 2004 alone. The release of Hotel Rwanda, a movie which depicts the horrors of genocide in 1994 Rwanda, just two days after then-Secretary of State Colin Powell testified that the conflict in Darfur was genocide further focused public attention on Darfur. By 2005, Darfur was the spotlight of “the largest American civic activist movement on Africa since the anti-Apartheid campaign.” Lastly, since 2005, the United States has spent more than $5 billion on humanitarian, development, peacekeeping, and reconstruction assistance to Sudan and eastern Chad, with $1.7 spent in FY2007 alone. Genocide may not cost the United States much directly, but it does incur substantial indirect costs. Each of these factors contributed to U.S. involvement with genocide prevention in Sudan since 2000.

PART II

THEORY OF INFLUENCE: PERSUASION AND DETERRENCE

What are Persuasion and Deterrence?

To perform an assessment of U.S. efforts to influence Khartoum’s behavior, it is necessary to provide a discussion here on the literature of persuasion and deterrence. For the purposes of this study, persuasion involves efforts to alter a state’s behavior by changing the decision-makers’ cost-benefit analysis with political, economic, and other foreign policy instruments. Persuasion applies pressure on the target until it behaves in such a way that is desired by the sender. Deterrence, on the other hand,

21 Ibid, 184.
22 Ibid, 184.
23 U.S. Department of State, “Background Note: Sudan.”
25 To begin behaving in a way that is desired can also be thought of as to stop behaving in a way that is undesired. While essentially two sides of the same coin, the different language can have slightly different connotations. To persuade a target to begin behaving in a desired way could be thought to mean getting the
involves changing the decision-makers’ cost-benefit analysis by threatening action if it behaves in such a way that is undesired by the sender.\textsuperscript{26} In other words, persuasion is dynamic, while deterrence is static.\textsuperscript{27} Both are relevant to this study of genocide in Sudan – persuasion because this study seeks to assess past U.S. efforts to stop Khartoum’s genocidal campaign, and deterrence because the goal of current U.S. policy is to prevent the Sudanese government from pursuing genocide again in the future.

There are two sides of persuasion: the promise or use of negative sanctions (coercion) and positive sanctions (engagement), which are also commonly referred to as sticks and carrots, respectively.\textsuperscript{28} Negative sanctions can be either the imposition of harm (air strikes) or the withdrawal of a good (cancelling development aid). Either way, coercion works to the extent that the sender can credibly impose costs on the target that are greater than the value the target places upon its current behavior.\textsuperscript{29} Similarly, positive sanctions can be either a reward (support in multilateral institutions) or the removal of harm (restore diplomatic relations). Either way, engagement works to the extent that the sender can credibly guarantee benefits that are greater than the value the target places upon its current behavior. In sum, persuasion is essentially a bargaining process in which the sender tries to convince the target that compliance with its demands is better than all other alternatives.\textsuperscript{30}

Deterrence works in a similar fashion to coercion. Deterrence works to the extent that the sender can credibly impose costs or remove benefits that are greater than the value the target places upon its desired behavior. For example, a sender could threaten both sanctions (imposed cost) and the cancellation of development aid (removed benefit). Whereas persuasion is proactive and involves both positive and negative inducements, with deterrence the sender action is reactive and strictly negative.

\textsuperscript{26} Schelling, 70.
\textsuperscript{27} Ibid, 71.
\textsuperscript{29} Schelling, 4.
**Crafting Influence Strategies**

Persuasion and deterrence strategies require a number of important considerations. First, the sender needs to pick the right target. To be effective, efforts to influence state behavior must concentrate on those people actually responsible for state behavior, i.e. the decision-makers.\(^{31}\) Efforts that influence the population are only effective to the extent that the populace can apply pressure on the decision-makers in government.\(^{32}\)

Second, exerting influence requires an understanding of the target’s cost-benefit calculations. For instance, bargaining does not just happen between the sender and target states, but also between the target state and its domestic constituencies.\(^{33}\) Therefore, a target’s cost-benefit calculation includes domestic gains and losses as well. Additionally, the relationship between the target and sender is very important. Adversaries are less likely than allies to yield to persuasion because adversaries tend to have an expectation of future conflict with the sender, meaning that they will not want to weaken their position vis-à-vis the sender.\(^{34}\) Generally speaking, persuasion and deterrence must take into account the target’s particular wants and fears—those factors that constrain its decision-making.\(^{35}\)

Third, the sender must clearly communicate to the target what changes in behavior will be rewarded or punished, and to what extent, so that it can accurately weigh its options. Because persuasion seeks a *change* in behavior, a timeframe must also be attached to the demand, lest the target delay compliance indefinitely.\(^{36}\) Deterrence, on the other hand, requires no change and therefore no deadline; and a degree of ambiguity can actually be useful if the target overestimates the sender’s potential reaction.\(^{37}\)

Finally, the perception of the sender’s credibility is extremely important. Targets do not react to threats or promises, but rather to what they perceive the sender’s reaction will be to their action (or

\(^{31}\) Ibid, 8.  
\(^{32}\) Schelling, 29.  
\(^{35}\) Schelling, 3.  
\(^{36}\) Ibid, 72.  
\(^{37}\) Ibid, 37.  
inaction). 38 Therefore, how well the sender has followed up on its threats and promises in the past, as well as its perceived capability and willingness to carry them out, will affect the target’s calculation regarding those threats and promise.

**Comparing Expectations**

Deterrence strategies have a number of inherent advantages over persuasion. First, yielding to persuasion carries higher political costs for the target than remaining deterred, since the former is a conspicuous submission to an outsider’s demands while the latter can be casually rationalized as business-as-usual. 39 Therefore, the costs associated with compliance are higher for persuasion than for deterrence. Second, as Robert Jervis notes, “people and states become committed to policies not only by staking their bargaining reputations on them, but by coming to believe that their policies are morally justified and politically necessary.” 40 In other words, people tend to think in terms of sunk costs rather than marginal ones, so a target is less likely to abandon a policy for which it has already dedicated time, effort, and resources. Therefore, persuasion efforts focused on pressuring a target to *stop* its actions – as opposed to *start* acting in a specified way – are at an inherent disadvantage. Third, because successful persuasion involves relatively high political costs for the target, the first success makes a second one less likely, as no decision-maker wants to develop a reputation for perpetual servitude.

Within persuasion, coercion and engagement have their own pros and cons. Coercion can sometimes have unintended effects. First, sometimes leaders can shift the costs of coercive efforts away from key supporters, which usually involves passing the costs off to the population. 41 When they do, the target’s population faces increased hardship on top of the suffering that coercive policies already directly impose on them (this is especially true with economic sanctions). 42 Second, placing external pressure on a target can provide an opportunity to blame the sender for domestic problems, creating a “rally around the

---

38 Ibid, 36.
39 Ibid, 82.
flag” effect among the population. Third, coercion can produce what David A. Baldwin calls the “spill-over effect” and “scar effect.” The hostility created by coercion can make the target unwilling to cooperate on other issues (spill-over) and less likely to cooperate on any issue (scar) in the future. Fourth, there is a limit on the extent to which a target can be deprived, and when that point is reached, coercion efforts cannot be made more effective. Lastly, some scholars contend that coercive policies – especially economic ones – are almost always ineffective.

Engagement has several advantages and disadvantages compared to coercion. The first advantage is that engagement tends to produce positive “spill-over” and “scar” effects, making the target more likely to cooperate on other issues and on any issue in the future generally. Second, it is normally easier to legitimate demands based on positive inducements than those based on threats. Third, unlike coercion, there is almost no limit on how much a sender can reward a target. Engagement also has its drawbacks, though. Targets that are unwilling to change their behavior can decline engagement, but they cannot decline coercion without complying. Also, engagement could very well constitute appeasement, thereby encouraging the target to engage in more undesirable behavior in the future. For example, this argument frequently surfaces in the debate on how to convince North Korea and Iran to abandon their nuclear programs. Lastly, engagement can be interpreted as weakness, which would undermine the coercive value of a sender’s threats.

Regardless of the pros and cons of influence’s different elements, the studies of Richard N. Haass and Meghan L. O’Sullivan offer a number of lessons for what makes a good influence strategy. First, the best possible candidates for influence strategies are often in countries where decision-making is highly
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concentrated. In these cases, only a limited number of individuals need to be targeted. Second, countries with acute economic and strategic vulnerabilities are easier to hurt or reward. They make especially good engagement partners because they can achieve significant gains through engagement, giving them an incentive to comply with policy demands. Third, influence strategies, and particularly engagement, should be seen mostly as a means of achieving modest goals. Demands that threaten the survival of the governing regime will meet strong resistance. Fourth, when seeking persuasion, incentives offered should be accompanied by credible penalties in order to increase the margin of the decision-makers’ cost-benefit calculus. Lastly, coordination with allies is important because unilateral efforts can easily be undone when other countries are willing to engage the target at little or no cost.

PART III
GETTING TO KNOW THE TARGET

The Target: Decision-makers in Sudan

As noted in Part II, the first step in crafting an influence strategy is to identify those responsible for the behavior of the state. In the context of this case study, it is therefore necessary to identify the decision-makers in Sudanese government responsible for the undesired behavior, which in this case is genocide and mass killing.

Several northern parties have been an important part of the traditional power base in Sudan, the two most prominent being former prime minister Mahdi’s Umma Party (the largest party in Sudan) and the Mirghani family’s DUP (the oldest party in Sudan). The power of both groups is tied to the Islamic sects of their leaders, which takes advantage of the fact that Sudan is 70% Sunni Muslim. Mahdi is the Imam of the Ansar sect of Sufi Islam. In the 1880s, Mohamed Ahmed ‘al Mahdi’ launched a messianic revolution in western Sudan that defeated the Turko-Egyptian regime ruling Sudan at the time. He established the
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Mahdist state in 1885, which lasted until defeat at the hands of the British in 1899. To this day, support for
the Ansar sect is very strong among Muslims in Darfur and Kordofan, especially among the Fur and
Masalit tribes. Mirghani is a descendant of the Prophet Muhammad, and his antecedent established the
Khatmiya sect of Sufi Islam, the largest Sufi order in Sudan, Eritrea, and Ethiopia. DUP’s support largely
comes from Muslims in the North and East. Because the leader of the party is always the head of the sect,
and leader of the sect must be a descendant of the sect’s founding father, both the Mahdis and Mirghanis
have monopolized the power in their political parties. 56 Both sides joined forces with other political parties
by forming the NDA after the 1989 coup. Turabi and his PCP also maintain a significant amount of
support, especially among the Zaghawa in his traditional areas of support – Darfur and Kordofan. 57

While smaller and less popular than the traditional parties, the NCP has managed to keep its
political opponents weak by employing repression and sowing internal dissent. The power of the Umma
Party, DUP, and PCP to directly influence government behavior has been insignificant, as the NCP
successfully kept all opposition parties out of the government until the 2005 CPA. Even then, the power-
sharing structure established by the CPA guarantees that 52% of the seats in the National Assembly go to
the NCP and 28% to the SPLM, leaving the remaining 20% for NDA groups like the Umma Party and
DUP. Turabi’s PCP does not belong to the NDA, and so cannot participate in the government at all.
Clearly then, while the traditional parties may hold influence within Sudanese society, control of the
government belongs exclusively to the NCP. So who, then, controls power in the NCP?

Lieutenant General Bashir has now been the dictator of Sudan for two decades, and considering
his nomination by the NCP for the 2010 presidential elections, it is fair to assume he has no plans for
stepping down. He is not just president, but also prime minister, head of state, head of government, and
commander in chief of the armed forces. 58 From the outside looking in, it would seem that decision-
making authority rests solely in his hands. However, that is not the case. As Andrew S. Natsios, a former
U.S. Special Envoy to Sudan, notes, Bashir is actually part of an oligarchy; he floats atop a governing
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council composed of 40-60 of the NCP’s most powerful members.\textsuperscript{59} Authors and humanitarians Alex de Waal and Julie Flint, both of whom have decades of experience in Sudanese humanitarian and human rights issues, call this governing council the “security cabal.”\textsuperscript{60} After the 1989 coup that brought him to power, Bashir and the ruling party (first the NIF, then NCP) established a division of power where the president kept the government together while the civilians ran the executive.\textsuperscript{61} Decisions are made by the governing council collectively, with Bashir siding with one faction or the other depending upon his political calculus at the moment. The NCP is very disciplined – once the governing council makes a decision, all members say the same thing, presenting a unified front.\textsuperscript{62} Occasionally Bashir will reshuffle his cabinet, handing out promotions or demotions, but the overall nature and composition of the governing council remains constant.

However, the governing council is united on the surface only; within the council there are a number of factions. Nafie Ali Nafie heads the hard-line militant faction. In the 1990s, Nafie was chief of external intelligence. He is now an Assistant of the President,\textsuperscript{63} and in September 2007 was made chief negotiator for the Darfur conflict.\textsuperscript{64} Nafie is joined by others, including Major General Salah Abdallah ‘Gosh,’ the director of Sudan’s National Security and Intelligence Service, and former Minister of the Interior/current Defense Minister Major General Abdel Rahim Mohammed Hussein, both who were among 17 individuals listed in a confidential annex to a 2006 UN Security Council resolution naming those most responsible for the atrocities committed in Darfur.\textsuperscript{65} Leading the ‘moderate’ faction is Ali Osman Mohammed Taha. Ali Osman was Turabi’s protégé and right-hand man until the latter’s fall from grace. He has been Foreign Minister, First Vice-President, and is now Second Vice-President of Sudan.\textsuperscript{66} He is top political rival of both Bashir and Nafie, and is widely regarded as the second-most powerful member of
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the NCP. Despite his role in the Darfur genocide, Ali Osman is considered Sudan’s leading peacemaker, having brokered the 2005 CPA between the NCP and SPLM.⁶⁷

Virtually without exception, all members of the governing council come from three Arab tribes from the Arab Triangle⁶⁸ along the Nile River in northern Sudan: The Ja’aliyiin of Bashir, the Shaygiyya of Ali Osman, and the Danagla of Defense Minister Bakri Hassan Saleh.⁶⁹ Sudan has never had a president or prime minister who was not from the North,⁷⁰ and in the period 1989-2002, 52% of all national ministerial positions were filled by people from the Northern Region, with another 17% from the Central/Khartoum Region.⁷¹ Furthermore, throughout Sudan’s history, Northerners exported electoral candidates to stand for election in other parts of the country, ensuring that Northern interests were represented in all regions.⁷²

Despite the fact that the entire Northern Region contains only 5.6% of the total population,⁷³ since independence those three powerful riverine Arab tribes have dominated the senior ranks of the civil service, military officer corps, cabinet positions, business sector, and university system, regardless of which regime was ruling the country.⁷⁴ As this information suggests, rather than being a unique political figure, Bashir is just one in a long line of riverine Arab leaders representing a narrow slice of Sudanese society.⁷⁵ From this section, it is clear that the decision-making power lies in the hands of the small ruling riverine Arab elite of the NCP that constitutes the governing council, a group that Bashir heads but over which he does not have complete control.
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**Target's Wants and Fears: Interests of the Decision-makers**

Having identified the decision-making locus in the Sudanese state, the next step in evaluating influence is to identify that power center’s interests.

Sudan is an oligarchic autocracy ruled by a small group that uses power to increase its wealth and influence. Evidence strongly suggests that the NCP has used its power to disproportionately increase the wealth and development of the Northern Region and Khartoum at the expense of the country’s periphery.\(^{76}\)

Indeed, when Bashir created a national committee in 1999 to formulate the division of wealth between Federal and State governments, 76% of the committee’s members were from the Northern Region.\(^{77}\) Over time, Sudan’s Gini coefficient\(^ {78}\) for wage laborers has grown from 0.41 in 1968, to 0.50 in 1980, to 0.61 in 1990, to 0.74 in 1996.\(^ {79}\) In comparison, Brazil, which is one of the worst in the world in terms of wealth inequality, is a 0.57. Clearly the governing council is seeks to concentrate wealth and development in the North.

The different faction leaders within the NCP also compete with each other for prestige and power within the party. Nafie and Ali Osman both see themselves as Bashir’s eventual successor and often try to achieve political feats (or defeat each other’s political feats) that increase their influence within the NCP.\(^ {80}\)

However, enrichment and prestige are relatively minor goals of the NCP governing council compared to its overwhelming top priority: regime survival.\(^ {81}\) Indeed, “survival” is the key word; loss of power not only means decreased control over wealth, but some in the NCP fear that they and their tribes will actually be massacred if they ever lose power.\(^ {82}\) History suggests that these fears are legitimate. As of January 2009, there were still 4.8 million internally displaced persons (IDPs) in Sudan, 1.2 million of
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which live near Khartoum. Most of those IDPs living around Khartoum are Southerners displaced by the 22-year civil war and the continued, sporadic violence since 2005. Six months after signing the CPA, SPLM leader John Garang died in a helicopter crash. While a U.S. government investigation found that there was no foul play, the Southerners around Khartoum were incensed. Thousands rioted for three days straight, destroying Northerners’ businesses and burning Arabs alive. The prospect of massacre is therefore a very real fear for the NCP.

Besides possible death, some NCP leaders face imprisonment if they are ever ousted. Indeed, two decades of repression could have some opposition leaders looking for revenge. Mahdi himself was imprisoned following the 1989 coup until he managed to escape. Also, on March 4, 2009, chief prosecutor for the International Criminal Court (ICC) Luis Moreno-Ocampo issued an arrest warrant for Bashir, citing war crimes and crimes against humanity; it was the first time the ICC ever issued an arrest warrant for an acting head of state. Therefore, Bashir and others are looking at jail time in The Hague if they ever lose power.

A dictatorial regime like the NCP governing council can lose power three ways: by coup, foreign intervention, or popular uprising. Because the regime’s top priority is survival, it will behave in such a way to minimize the threat of overthrow. Gary M. Shiffman’s work sheds light on how dictators accomplish this task. Dictators do not enjoy popular support, and so must rule by other means. They rule with security forces and armies; however, they cannot rule those institutions with the same power, so they must buy them off or convince them that a coup will not succeed. The dictator must appear strong and prevent groups/coalitions that will undermine him, so he prevents communication between conspirators and keeps others from achieving positions of power. One can therefore conclude that dictatorships like Bashir and the NCP governing council seek to prevent overthrow by buying the loyalty of key elites, while using the
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security apparatus to repress dissent from the rest of the population. They must also control the distribution of wealth in society in order fund their security apparatus and to prevent the diffusion of power to individuals or groups outside their control.\footnote{Ibid, 32.} Because they are not accountable to the people, dictators spend on development to the extent to that it benefits them and their power base. As Shiffman explains: “The rational and self-interested autocrat…[spends] on public goods, but only to the point at which the marginal expenditure generates an increase in national income that returns a tax revenue equal to or greater than his expenditure.”\footnote{Ibid, 25.}

Certainly, Shiffman’s analysis matches up well with the behavior of the NCP. It has often expressed fear of coup, foreign intervention, and popular uprising. Ali Osman is a potential candidate to lead a coup, and the only reason he has not been expelled from the NCP yet is because of his political connections and the fact that he is the only Northerner that the SPLM and Western countries trust as a negotiator.\footnote{Natsios, Interview.} Turabi is another; when he left the NCP in 1999, he commanded his Islamist followers to remain inside as secret cells.\footnote{Flint and de Waal, 68.} The hard-line reaction to the Darfur rebellion can in large part be seen as evidence that the regime feared Turabi was organizing an Islamist uprising against the central government.\footnote{Ibid, 101.} Indeed, the JEM’s leader Khalil Ibrahim had been one of Turabi’s main supporters.\footnote{Natsios, Interview.}

The assertion that dictatorships maintain power by bribing elites and repressing dissent also closely matches Khartoum’s behavior. A senior official in the Sudanese government has repeatedly said in private that the only reason the NCP keeps power is because it has guns and oil revenue, which they use to bribe other groups in the North.\footnote{Ibid, 68.} One can conclude that the NCP governing council’s primary interests then are its military and revenues.

No resource is more important to government revenues than oil. Chevron first discovered oil in southern Sudan in the 1970s. However, it took years to build the infrastructure to exploit this resource. Until then, Sudan’s economy had been largely agricultural, relying on cotton, gum arabic, and livestock for
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export revenues. Sudan finally began exporting oil in 1999, and by 2008 output had increased so dramatically that oil accounted for 95% of the country’s $13.62 billion (2008 est.) in export revenues, as well as 65% of Khartoum’s government revenues. Sudan’s rising oil wealth looks to only continue growing in the future. For years, insecurity in the South limited oil exploration and production. Thanks to the modicum of stability since the 2005 CPA signing, exploration efforts have increased Sudan’s proved oil reserves from 563 million barrels in 2006 to 5 billion barrels as of January 2009 – a nearly 800% increase over three years. Additionally, new natural gas discoveries have been announced in 2009, and there is speculation that oil explorations in Darfur will reveal even more reserves.

The vast majority of the oil reserves and production are in the Muglad and Melut basins in southern Sudan. The Muglad basin is situated in the states of Unity and South Kordofan, mostly in the disputed Abyei area. Oil extracted the Muglad basin is a heavy sweet, high-quality crude called Nile Blend. Two of largest oil fields in the basin are the Heglig and Unity oil fields, which contribute to the area’s 210,000 barrels per day (bpd) production (2008 est.). That oil is transported to Khartoum and Port Sudan via the 994-mile Greater Nile Oil Pipeline. The Melut basin is located primarily in the southern states of Upper Nile and Jonglei. Oil extracted from its fields is a heavy sweet, acidic crude called Dar Blend, which will reach production levels of 300,000 bpd by the end of 2009. The Dar Blend is transported to Port Sudan by the PetroDar Pipeline, where it ships mostly to China. Dar Blend is of a low quality, and sells at a discounted price. Even though extraction is mostly in the South, the refining is limited to Khartoum and Port Sudan; and because Port Sudan is the only major port in the whole country,
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all oil is exported there (see Appendix A for a map of Sudan’s oil infrastructure). This fact allows the NCP to control all oil revenues.

Despite the fast-growing importance of oil in Sudan, agriculture stills accounts for 31% of GDP, with value split roughly even between crops and livestock.\textsuperscript{104} With a 2008 GDP of \$88.08 billion, agriculture production amounts to over \$27 billion – a significant source of taxable wealth.\textsuperscript{105} Industrial development on the other hand is slow and not significant outside of oil extraction and refining and agricultural processing.\textsuperscript{106} What little industry there is in Sudan focuses mostly on auto and truck assembly, and the production of some military equipment.\textsuperscript{107}

Consistent with Shiffman’s model, Sudanese government revenues mostly go towards military outlays and payments to Northern elites.\textsuperscript{108} In 2001, more than 60% of Sudanese oil revenues went towards military spending,\textsuperscript{109} and according to Sudan’s own Ministry of Finance statistics for 2000, total expenditures were divided among: wages (34%), operation and maintenance (38%), debt service (9%), social services (2%), and development (17%).\textsuperscript{110} As Shiffman’s analysis predicts, the great majority (72%) of government expenditures goes to paying for people and operations on the NCP payroll, while very little is spent on development – other than in the oil industry, of course. It is also worth noting that, according to the International Energy Agency (IEA), combustible renewables (i.e. wood, grass) and waste accounted for 78% of Sudan’s total energy consumption in 2006 because most people in rural areas do not have access to the electricity grid, forcing them to burn biomass for cooking and heating needs.\textsuperscript{111} Rather than waste its oil providing for the needs of the Sudanese people, the NCP exports it for revenue. Clearly, the NCP governing council’s primary interest is to accumulate wealth to fund its security apparatus and pay off Northern elites, keeping it in power.
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The Behavior: Genocide and Mass Killing

The stage is almost set to evaluate U.S. efforts to prevent genocide in Sudan. The target and its general interests have been identified. To understand the target’s cost-benefit analysis, though, it is necessary to look at the value the target places on the behavior in question – in this case, genocide.

While ethnic- and religious-related violence is often thought to be the result of age-old hatreds between groups, many scholars assert that it is in fact the result of the manipulation of ethnic and religious identities by political actors.\footnote{Benjamin A. Valentino, Final Solutions: Mass Killing and Genocide in the 20th Century (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2004), 2; John Mueller, “The Banality of Ethnic War,” International Security, Vol. 25, No. 1 (Summer 2000), 43; Barry R. Posen, “The security dilemma and ethnic conflict,” Survival, Vol. 35, No. 1 (Spring 1993), 27.} They point to evidence that atrocities committed during communal violence are usually carried out by a small group unleashed by political elites who have secured the compliance or passivity of the rest of society.\footnote{Valentino, 2-3.} If that is the case, then genocide and other mass killings are in fact policies of a group of decision-makers. Benjamin A. Valentino claims:

…mass killing is most accurately viewed as an instrumental policy—a brutal strategy designed to accomplish leaders’ most important ideological or political objectives and counter what they see as their most dangerous threats… its purpose is to force victims to submit to radically new ways of life, to give up their homes and possessions, or to cease their support for political or military opposition groups.\footnote{Ibid, 3.}

As this statement suggests, leaders rarely view genocide as an end in itself,\footnote{Adolf Hitler is a notable exception.} but as a means to accomplish objectives that are of importance to them.

Genocide can help a group counter political or military threats in a number of ways. If a particular ethnic or religious group represents a threat than cannot be removed any other way, genocide can be used to permanently destroy their ability to organize politically or militarily.\footnote{Ibid, 5.} Genocide has often been used as a counterinsurgency strategy as well. Insurgents draw their support from the civilian population and have
most often proven very difficult and costly to defeat.\textsuperscript{117} This reality creates strong incentives for the central authorities to target the insurgents’ defenseless civilian base of support, especially when the government does not rule by popular support.\textsuperscript{118} The insurgency loses momentum if its civilian supporters are all dead. Furthermore, a scorched-earth strategy that also destroys crops, livestock, and homes offers three particular advantages when fighting an insurgency: 1) it deprives insurgents and their supporters of food and shelter, increasing the likelihood that they will die of starvation or disease; 2) it forces people to abandon their homes and move to government-controlled areas; and 3) it can be used to selectively punish or deter civilians who support the insurgents.\textsuperscript{119}

In both the wars in the South and Darfur, the NCP regime clearly thought of genocide as a strategic instrument to counter threats and accomplish its political objectives. However, the interests at stake in each case were different. It is worth noting that the war in the South began in 1983, and that the resulting genocide was set in motion in 1985, before the current regime came to power. The SPLA in the South threatened to form a breakaway state, taking the nation’s oil reserves and agricultural/mineral resources with it. In the early stages, suppression of the rebellion proved difficult and costly, so in 1985 the Sudanese government made a fateful decision – to decimate the guerrillas’ civilian support base by conducting genocide through proxy. After overthrowing Nimeiri in July 1985, the transitional president, General Abdel Rahman Suwar al Dahab, decided to mobilize Arab militias in Darfur and Kordofan against the SPLA. Defense Minister General Fadlalla Burma Nasir manipulated the ethnic grievances of the nomadic Baggara Arabs (cattle herders) – especially the Missiriya and Southern Rizeigat tribes – by providing them with arms, tactical leadership, and military logistics and support from the Sudanese Armed Forces (SAF), while promising them free land, cattle, and other possessions if they attacked the Dinka, Nuer, Nuba, and other African tribes who were suspected of supporting the SPLA.\textsuperscript{120}

Alex de Waal calls it “counter-insurgency on the cheap” because the leaders in the central government conserved their resources by pursuing a divide-and-rule strategy. Both Arabs and Africans in
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the South had reasons to oppose the central government since both lived in a region that was neglected and exploited by Khartoum. By opportunistically using the Baggara Arabs to fight a war against the Africans on their behalf, leaders in Khartoum tried eliminating two threats at the same time. Arab militias also cost much less then the SAF because they did not have to be paid except with weapons and impunity; their reward was whatever they could take.\textsuperscript{121} This strategy allowed the ruling elite to conserve their resources and increase their chances of staying in power.\textsuperscript{122}

The North pursued a scorched-earth campaign in the South, which continued unabated after the 1989 coup. Military intelligence would identify rebel targets, and then the Sudanese air force would bombard the village. After the bombing ceased, the predominantly-Baggara Arab militias – referred to as \textit{Murahaliin} (nomads) or \textit{Fursan} (horsemen) – would move in and commit their atrocities. Massacre, pillage, and rape were all common. The militias would burn crops, slaughter livestock, and throw dead bodies into town wells to poison them. At the same time, the Northern government would inhibit international humanitarian efforts to help the resulting waves of IDPs. These tactics were used in the Bahr al Ghazal region in 1986-1988, the Nuba Mountains in 1992-1995, Upper Nile in 2001-2003, and elsewhere on a lesser scale.\textsuperscript{123}

The interests at stake in Darfur were different, but the tactics were the same. The NCP was not so concerned about losing resources to a separatist movement as it was about weakening its northern political rivals and defeating a military threat to the regime’s survival. Bashir’s regime first started arming the Arab’s in southern Darfur in 1991 when an SPLA commander named Daud Bolad moved his forces there.\textsuperscript{124} More importantly, though, the NIF/NCP wanted to break the support base of Madhi’s Umma Party, especially its stronghold among the Masalit in western Darfur.\textsuperscript{125} To that effect, in 1994 the NIF divided Darfur into its current three states. The purpose was to divide the largest Darfurian African tribe, the Fur, into three states in which they would be minorities. Not coincidentally, the triborder meeting point
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of the three states falls on Jebel Marra, the traditional center of power for the Fur, splitting it three ways. This move also gave Arab Darfurians greater influence in each new state.

All the while, the NIF/NCP quietly kept arming the Abbala Arabs (camel herders) who were the only group in Darfur that did not possess tribal land rights, and who were increasingly coming into conflict with African farmers over migration routes and water resources. Particular attention was given to the Mahamid subsection of the Northern Rezeigat tribe, a group of Abbala Arabs who had fallen upon particularly hard times in the 1990s, and who deeply resented the land-possessing African Tunjur tribe. When fighting broke out between the Masalit and the Abbala Arabs in 1995, the Sudanese armed forces ignored Arab attacks. Many Masalit and Zaghawa, on the other hand – who dominated the Popular Defense Forces (PDF) of Darfur – were sent to fight against the South. By 1999, the primarily Abbala Arab militias were being called “Janjawiid” – a word originally meaning criminal. The NCP exploited continued unrest between the Abbala Arabs and Africans to make their policies even more discriminatory; the SAF would go around disarming the African tribes supposedly to restore order, and then standby as the Janjawiid attacked.

In 1999, the NCP interests in Darfur became about much more than weakening the Umma Party. Having been expelled from the NCP, Turabi was now a prime candidate to lead an overthrow of the government. A coup was possible; during his time in government, Turabi had hand-picked over half of the SAF’s senior officers. Many members of the security services and former-NIF came from Turabi’s main support base – the Darfurians, and particularly the Zaghawa of western Darfur, who presented a special challenge in their own right. Not only were the Zaghawa supportive of Turabi, but their kinsman, Idriss Deby, was (and still is) the president of Chad and a habitual supporter of instability in Sudan. Furthermore, despite being a small tribe (at most 8% of Darfur’s population), the Zaghawa were well-known for their...
fighting ability, intelligence, and aggressiveness. The NCP elite feared that Turabi would use Darfur to launch an Islamist revolt against them in Khartoum – just as he had attempted to do against Nimeiri in the 1980s. The expulsion of Turabi lost the African Darfurians for the NCP; their loyalty was suspect. The arming of the Abbala Arabs took on a new sense of urgency in Khartoum.

The year 1999 changed matters for the soon-to-be Darfurian rebels too, as they starting becoming fully aware that the central government was assisting the Janjaweed. By 2002, the Fur and Zaghawa formed an alliance and launched a rebellion. These events alarmed the NCP and became even more serious when the SLA and JEM announced their existence in February and March 2003, respectively. The NCP knew and feared JEM’s leader, Khalil Ibrahim – an intelligent leader and superb organizer who they suspected was planning to seize power with Turabi, who Ibrahim sees as his spiritual and political godfather. The new rebellion presented an additional predicament for the central government: Even if NCP rulers could afford to move troops away from the fight against the South (which they could not), the Sudanese army was 60% Darfurian in 2003, mostly in the enlisted ranks. African Darfurian soldiers simply refused to fight their own people.

Because of the threat and special challenges of the Darfur rebellion, the proxy war between the government-supported Janjaweed and SLA/JEM began in earnest in early 2003. After the Darfur rebels successfully attacked and destroyed Sudanese air force planes at the al-Fasher air base on April 25, 2003, the alarm in Khartoum over a possible overthrow attempt reached new heights. This event solidified the view that the Darfur rebels were “a front-rank military threat to Khartoum.” Just as they had in the South, the Sudanese armed forces pursued a scorched-earth counterinsurgency strategy where the military intelligence, air force, and Arab militia worked in concert to commit genocide against the guerrillas’ civilian support base (see Appendix B for a map of destroyed villages). The Janjaweed allowed the central government to conserve its resources by fighting the war on the government’s behalf; they were rewarded
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with land, livestock, and other possessions that they took from the African tribes. Thousands were slaughtered, and thousands more died of starvation and disease as Khartoum tried to block access for humanitarian aid.

As this discussion demonstrates, the NPC governing council clearly saw genocide as an instrument for achieving its domestic political and military objectives. Having identified the target, the target’s interests, and the value the target places on the behavior in question, this study is now ready to assess external efforts to influence the target’s behavior.

PART IV
ASSESSMENT OF U.S. FOREIGN POLICY TOWARD SUDAN

This part of the case study will provide an assessment of U.S. diplomatic and economic efforts to influence the Sudanese government’s behavior regarding genocide and mass killing. It must first be noted that during the Clinton administration, U.S. policy toward Sudan focused mostly on Khartoum’s support for international terrorism.\textsuperscript{141} By the time the Bush administration turned its focus to stopping the genocide in the South, a number of U.S. influence efforts were already in place. First of all, the United States had already suspended all development and military aid after the 1989 coup. Second, the United States had already designated Sudan a state sponsor of terror on August 12, 1993. Third, President Clinton suspended diplomatic relations in 1996. Fourth, Clinton issued Executive Order 13067 on November 3, 1997, which imposed comprehensive trade, economic, and financial sanctions against Sudan. E.O. 13067 severely limited (but did not prohibit) bilateral trade and blocked all property of the government of Sudan within the United States or in control of U.S. persons. So this record makes perfectly clear, when U.S. focus took on the additional task of genocide prevention, the ability of the United States to unilaterally impose further costs on Sudan was significantly limited.

\textsuperscript{141} I reach this conclusion because most U.S. efforts during the Clinton administration were reactions to terrorist incidents, even if the President also listed the civil war with the South and human rights abuses as U.S. concerns. See U.S. Department of the Treasury, “Effectiveness of U.S. Sanctions with Respect to Sudan,” Report to Congress, January 2009, \url{http://www.treas.gov/offices/enforcement/ofac/programs/sudan/sudan_report_030509.pdf}, 2.
However, because America tied the *continuation* of these imposed costs to genocide, these efforts are still very much relevant to this analysis of genocide prevention. Furthermore, there was still room to impose more costs. From here, this study will look at the major economic and diplomatic tools utilized to influence the Sudanese state’s cost-benefit calculus regarding genocide. To assess the effectiveness of these instruments, three questions will be answered regarding U.S. policy in different time periods. First, strictly from the point of view of the U.S.-Sudanese bilateral relationship, what were the costs or benefits of U.S. policy to the NCP governing council’s ability to repress dissent and buy support? The answer to this question provides us with a measure of the costs and benefits to the decision-makers. Second, how did the regime’s behavior regarding genocide change subsequent to U.S. efforts? The answer here tells us the extent to which behavior could be a result of U.S. influence efforts. Third, does the impact of U.S. policy explain the regime’s behavior, or did other factors affect the target’s cost-benefit calculus? This answer corrects for the influence of other external and internal developments. Based on those answers, this study will then answer the most important question: Why did U.S. policy have the impact that it did? This answer is the final explanation this assessment seeks to achieve.

**Early Bush Administration: January 2001 – October 2002**

As previously mentioned, the Bush administration made a push towards stopping genocide in South Sudan in 2001 by trying to help broker a peace agreement. On September 6, 2001, Bush appointed Senator John Danforth as the U.S. Special Envoy to Sudan with the goal of pressuring the two parties to reach a peace agreement. In the following months, Danforth would call for a stronger U.S. diplomatic presence in the peace talks, and on May 31, 2002, the United States posted its first resident diplomat in Khartoum since 1996.\(^{142}\) Bush even signaled to the NCP that the United States would begin normalizing relations once peace had been achieved.\(^{143}\) Until then, Sudan’s forced isolation and economic deprivation would remain in place. The growing violence in Darfur did not receive much attention from the Bush administration at this time, as the genocide there was still developing.

---


\(^{143}\) Flint and de Waal, 31, 169; Natsios, Interview.
Costs and Benefits. The first step in assessing costs and benefits during this time period is to determine the cumulative impact of policies still in place from earlier administrations. This information shows the costs of the continuation of U.S. sanctions to the NCP ruling council and the potential benefits of their removal. The first policy is the cancelation of development and military assistance following the 1989 coup. America started providing military aid to Sudan in 1977, and was sitting at $101.2 million in FY1982. U.S. military assistance declined following the resumption of the North-South civil war in 1983, and dipped even further following the 1985 coup that overthrew Nimeiri. Still, between 1983 and 1988, Sudan obtained an estimated $350 million in military arms and equipment; the United States was the largest supplier at $161.2 million, with China ($30 million), France ($30 million), Great Britain ($10 million), Egypt (unknown), and Libya (unknown) being other major suppliers. Since February 28, 1990, when then-President George H.W. Bush invoked the Foreign Assistance Act, Sudan has not seen a dime in military assistance from the United States.

Development assistance and Economic Support Funds (ESF) experienced a similar trend, dipping even before 1989 and then dropping off dramatically following the coup. These types of assistance programs went from $189.6 million in FY1985, to $17.1 million in FY1988, to only $17.4 million over the next five years combined. After its designation as a state sponsor of terrorism in 1993, the only assistance Sudan could receive from the United States was food aid – most of which went to the South. Clearly, Sudanese leaders are familiar with the extent to which America can assist them, as well as the loss that came with their broken relationship.

The 1997 comprehensive sanctions banned most U.S. investment in Sudan, cut off bilateral trade between the two countries, and froze all Sudanese assets in U.S. control. The main exception at the time was one of Sudan’s main exports – gum arabic. Evidence suggests that to this day, U.S. sanctions have
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hurt Sudan economically. Business managers in the agricultural sector have complained that their inability
to access U.S. consultants or purchase U.S. equipment inhibits their efficiency.\footnote{U.S. Department of the Treasury, “Effectiveness of U.S. Sanctions with Respect to Sudan,” 10.} However, sanction
implementation has been spotty, as the Office of Foreign Assets Control (OFAC) for the U.S. Treasury is
able to issue licenses for specific companies to conduct business with Sudan.\footnote{Waleed Ahmed, “USA Sanctions Have Little Effect on Sudan,” \textit{Sudan.net}, August 11, 2008, \url{http://www.sudan.net/news/posted/16178.html}.} It was not until February
2000 that Sudan’s state-owned oil enterprise, Sudapet Ltd., and the Greater Nile Petroleum Operating
Company Ltd., a joint venture, were added to OFAC’s “List of Specially Designated Nationals and
Blocked Persons” (SDN List), which specifies the individuals and entities targeted by U.S. sanctions.\footnote{U.S. Department of the Treasury, “Treasury Applies Sudan Sanctions to Joint Oil Venture,” February
16, 2000, \url{http://www.treas.gov/press/releases/ls393.htm}.}

Those sanctions deny access to U.S. equipment, technology, and expertise, which places limits on the
efficiency, capacity, and profitability of Sudan’s oil industry.\footnote{U.S. Department of the Treasury, “Effectiveness of U.S. Sanctions with Respect to Sudan,” 11.} This is especially true for the Dar Blend
crude because few countries besides the United States have the expertise to refine it properly; otherwise,
Dar Blend has to sell at a discount. Overall, U.S. sanctions to this point surely did cause harm to the ruling
elite’s interests, even if the actual dollar amount is impossible to determine.

The continuation of these costs into the Bush administration kept the pressure on the NCP
governing council. However, the offer to normalize relations and potentially provide aid should North-
South peace be reached showed that there were other benefits for government compliance besides the
removal of harmful sanctions. Indeed, Bush restarted development assistance in FY2001 with $4.5 million;
that number grew to $81 million in FY2005, along with another $20 million for ESF.\footnote{This aid was mostly for the neglected and war-torn South and Darfur regions; see Rennack, 8.} The NCP
experienced tangible economic losses for its noncompliance, and had much to gain from better relations
with the United States.

\textit{Behavior.} The NCP’s behavior regarding genocide could only be described as mixed during this
period. Despite efforts by Danforth to mediate the North-South conflict, the government launched a major
offensive starting in 2001 to defeat SPLA rebels in the Upper Nile state. The NCP was engaged in a
deliberate campaign to force civilians away from oil fields and pipelines in order to decrease security risks to its precious new industry. On February 22, 2002, Danforth even suspended his efforts after the Sudanese military fired machine guns and rockets into a crowd of 4,000 Southerners waiting at a food distribution site.\textsuperscript{154} Such attacks were frequent, and the NCP refused to accept restrictions on its ability to attack civilians who were hiding rebels. The SAF also tried denying civilians access to humanitarian aid, and frequently broke promises to allow aid agencies to operate.\textsuperscript{155} Some successes were achieved, though. On June 19, 2002 the NCP and SPLM sat down together in Machakos, Kenya for peace talks, and then on July 21, 2002, the two sides signed the Machakos Protocol, in which the NCP accepted the South’s right to seek self-determination. This was a historic concession. However, the agreement did not include a ceasefire.\textsuperscript{156} The NCP’s genocidal practices in Upper Nile aimed at forcing civilians away from oil installations would continue, as the NCP repeatedly abandoned the Machakos Protocol to launch attacks on civilians up through the end of this period.\textsuperscript{157} By June 2002, anywhere from 150,000-300,000 people in Upper Nile were affected by the recent conflict.\textsuperscript{158}

It is also worth noting that during this whole period, the NCP was ramping up for the coming war in Darfur. Government officials were disarming Africans and arming Arabs. In fact, the atrocities were already underway. In October 2002, government-supported Arab militias from South Darfur launched a major offensive against the Fur stronghold, Jebel Marra – the largest attack since the Fur-Arab war in the 1980s. Janjawiid supported by Sudanese airplanes burned, bombed, and ravaged scores of villages, killing at least 160 civilians by the end of the year.\textsuperscript{159} Clearly, if U.S. pressure was working for the North-South conflict – and that is a big \textit{if} – it was not working for Darfur.
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Explanation. A number of factors worked against hopes that the United States could influence the NCP’s behavior regarding genocide and mass killing. First, any progress in resolving the North-South civil war can be attributed to internal security developments. The NCP split with Turabi in 1999 weakened the ruling elite and put fear in their hearts that an Islamist invasion from the Western Region would topple the government in Khartoum. Furthermore, the SPLM at this time was getting stronger by reducing tensions with other southern rebel movements and handing Khartoum repeated setbacks. These developments gave the NCP governing council a significant incentive to sue for peace with the South.

Second, Sudan finally began exporting oil in 1999. While the United States was willing to target Sudan’s oil industry, other countries embraced it. Heavy investment by China, India, and Malaysia, among others, significantly deflected the costs of U.S. sanctions. Additionally, the consequent boom in oil revenues made U.S. sanctions against the agricultural sector less significant as the NCP gained more and more of its funds from exporting oil. Oil sales already comprised 42% of NCP funds in 2001, and cash military expenditures (not including spending on domestic security services) rose 45% between 1999 and 2001. With regards to Sudanese agriculture, most of it is subsistence farming in the peripheral regions. The irrigated, mechanized farming that occurs mostly in the Northern and Central Regions employs laborers from non-privileged tribes, especially Southerners living around Khartoum. U.S. sanctions against Sudanese agriculture to a great extent were passed off to these poor laborers. Therefore, it is safe to conclude that U.S. sanctions against Sudan’s agricultural and oil industries were not very effective in limiting the NCP’s access to funds for strengthening its military or paying off Northern elites.

Third, the bipolar strategy against the SPLA in Upper Nile (talks of peace, acts of genocide) can be seen partially as internal disagreement within the NCP governing council itself. Ali Osman at the time was making a big push for peace with the South because increased oil production as a result of security would give the NCP an absolute gain in oil revenue even when concessions to the South were taken into
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account. Nafie and the militant hard-liners, on the other hand, did not want to share wealth with the South and pushed for genocide as a way to remove civilians and rebels from areas near important oil infrastructure.

Fourth, the loss of U.S. military support after 1989 was being replaced by military arms and equipment sold from Russia and China starting in the mid-1990s. This development helped offset worries the NCP might have otherwise had about its military capabilities.

Overall, U.S. policy during this time period does not seem to have had an appreciable impact on the NCP governing council’s decision to pursue genocide.

**Genocide Erupts in Darfur: October 2002 – December 2004**

On October 21, 2002, Bush signed the Sudan Peace Act. While the bill did not contain any new unilateral sanctions, it used the politically-loaded word “genocide” to describe the SAF’s actions in the South. It also announced that the United States would lobby for multilateral sanctions at the UN Security Council if NCP behavior did not improve. As the genocide in Darfur started becoming evident over the course of 2003, a U.S. reaction started gaining momentum. A U.S.-led international relief operation began in August 2003. In 2004, Bush and Danforth started pushing for a UN Security Council Resolution against the Sudanese government. In March 2004, the UN Coordinator for humanitarian assistance in Darfur, Dr. Mukesh Kapila, called the conflict “genocide.” Colin Powell and then-UN Secretary General Kofi Annan made a high-profile visit to the region in June 2004 in order to draw international attention to the crisis. What they got was UNSC Resolution 1556 on June 30, 2004, which blamed the violence in Darfur on – among others – the Sudanese government. Just weeks later, the U.S. Congress passed a resolution calling the atrocities in Darfur “genocide” – the first time any part of the U.S. government did so.

Danforth, promoted to U.S. Ambassador to the UN, followed up on July 30, 2004 by publicly stating that
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the Sudanese regime was now “on notice” and that “serious measures – international sanctions – are looming,” but skirted the “genocide” declaration.\(^{167}\)

Then, on September 9, 2004, Bush released a press statement stating that genocide was in fact occurring in Darfur, and Powell stated as much later in the day with testimony to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.\(^{168}\) This recognition would eventually lead to the Comprehensive Peace in Sudan Act on December 24, 2004. The bill labeled both the wars in the South and Darfur “genocide;” called for UN member states to cease importing Sudanese oil, freeze assets held by individuals and businesses linked to genocide in Sudan, and place travel bans on individual Sudanese leaders; and suggested that Bush impose new targeted sanctions, including asset freezing and travel bans, and that he not normalize relations with Sudan until a peace agreement in Darfur had been signed and implemented. The whole while pressure built up over Darfur, the Bush administration kept up the demands for a solution to the North-South civil war as well.

\textit{Costs and Benefits.} Besides the continuation of negative sanctions from the pre-October 2002 period, the concrete costs imposed on the NCP governing council during this phase of relations are rather limited. Only a few businesses were added to OCAC’s SDN List. The diplomacy here was mostly rhetorical and threatening. The use of the term “genocide” implied that “serious measures” would be taken by the international community if the NCP did not comply with demands to stop targeting civilians. The UNSC Resolution blaming the NCP for the violence would suggest that the UN was preparing to impose serious sanctions if behavior did not change. However, these were all threats, and the potential costs and benefits of those threats were subject to the NCP’s interpretation of them. The ruling elite did incur one concrete cost though: Bush had to rescind his promise that normalization would occur if peace with the South was achieved. Therefore, U.S. sanctions would remain in place, and U.S. aid to Sudan would remain very limited, even if peace with the South was achieved.

Behavior. On October 15, 2002, the NCP and SPLM signed a memorandum of understanding to help end their long and bitter conflict. Despite numerous violations on both sides – including the deployment of additional Northern troops to the southern capital, Juba\textsuperscript{169} – by December 2004, the two sides were on the brink of a historic peace agreement. The CPA would be signed on January 9, 2005, officially ending the civil war. However, as further sections will show, intransigence on both sides continued well after the signing of the CPA.

While the war was winding down in the South, the war in Darfur turned into a conflagration from hell. Between February 2003 and December 2004, literally hundreds of instances have been documented where SAF troops and planes assisted Janjaweed in destroying villages and massacring their inhabitants.\textsuperscript{170} Of the estimated 300,000 people who have died during the Darfur conflict (UN estimate), as much as 96\% of them died during this time period (see Appendix C for a breakdown of death tolls by month).\textsuperscript{171} Additionally, the NCP fought the whole time to block humanitarian access to Darfur.\textsuperscript{172} The reasons for these limitations are clear; only about 25\% of the deaths in Darfur were the result of actual violent action.\textsuperscript{173} The rest died of malnutrition, starvation, and disease as a result of their displacement and impoverishment.

Even among this chaos there were a few bright spots. A month after relief operations began in August 2003, the NCP held ceasefire talks with the SLA in Abeche, Chad. However, three months later the NCP and Janjaweed began their second major offensive in Darfur. In February 2004, Bashir partially lifted the blockade on humanitarian aid.\textsuperscript{174} After Dr. Kapila stated that the government was committing genocide, the NCP and Darfur rebels met in N’Djamena, Chad, and agreed on a ceasefire and African Union (AU) monitoring mission in April 2004. Those AU monitors, called the African Union Mission in Sudan (AMIS), began arriving the next month. After UNSC Resolution 1556, both sides met in Abuja,
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Nigeria for the first round of peace talks.\textsuperscript{175} Over the course of this period, civilian deaths in refugee camps as a result of conflict went from a couple hundred in March 2003, to about 9,000-16,000 in January 2004, back down to about 3,000-3,500 in December 2004.\textsuperscript{176}

\textit{Explanation.} The additional imposed unilateral costs during this period were insignificant, and while the United States and relief workers in Sudan were able to bring international attention to the conflict in Darfur, the international community’s reaction was minimal. The weak wording of UNSC Resolution 1556 can be seen both as a lack of international interest in stopping genocide in Sudan and as a result of Chinese, and to a lesser extent Russian, influence in the UN Security Council – both of whom are permanent, veto-holding members. As the Genocide Intervention Network notes, the state-owned China National Petroleum Corporation (CNPC) considered Sudan “its most valuable asset, comprising more than half of the company’s overseas output portfolio in 2003 and, according to Deutsche Bank, 52\% of CNPC’s overseas crude reserves.”\textsuperscript{177} Also, as noted earlier, both China and Russia had become major suppliers of military arms and equipment to Sudan. Despite a lot of rhetoric in multilateral institutions about taking tough action against the NCP over genocide, the governing council likely knew that China and Russia would never allow any serious measures to pass at the UN.

Oil revenues allowed the Sudanese military to greatly increase its armament during this time period – increasingly from China. Khartoum bought about 12\% of its total small arms imports from China in 2003, a number that increased to over 90\% in 2004.\textsuperscript{178} In 2003, China also sold Sudan 20 A-5C Fantan fighter-bombers. Clearly, U.S. efforts could not significantly limit the Sudanese military’s ability to acquire arms.

To the extent that the NCP did adjust its behavior regarding genocide (peace talks, ceasefires, etc.), these changes are once again largely the result of domestic developments – not external pressure. The war in Darfur grew much larger than the NCP expected and made peace with the South all the more urgent.

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{175} Ibid, 278-279.  
\textsuperscript{177} Genocide Intervention Network, “PetroChina, CNPC, and Sudan: Perpetuating Genocide,” 4.  
Indeed, the politicking within the NCP governing council demonstrates this decision-making calculus. As the leading peacemaker, Ali Osman sympathized with General Ibrahim Suleiman, the governor of North Darfur in from late 2002 to early 2003, who favored bringing more police and development money to the Darfur states as a strategy for restoring peace. However, Ali Osman’s priority was on peace with the South. He needed political capital to bring Nafie, Salah Gosh, and the rest of militant faction on board, so he had to look tough on the rebels in Darfur. Suleiman was sacked as governor on May 9, 2003, and the conflict exploded soon after.

Those in the militant faction were so displeased when they found out about Ali Osman’s concessions to John Garang that they told Bashir not to let him be the negotiator with the Darfur rebels. However, this move was about more than just peace agreements and oil. Nafie also did not want Ali Osman to gain any more prestige by becoming the NCP’s man in Darfur. The hard-liners wanted one of their own to represent the NCP in Darfur so as to increase their power within the party. They succeeded, and one of Ali Osman’s arch-rivals, a hard-liner named Majzoub al Khalifa Ahmed, was chosen for Darfur in 2004.

Clearly, the United States did not have an appreciable impact on the NCP’s decision to pursue genocide during this time period either.

**Relative Peace: January 2005 – Present**

With the signing of the 2005 CPA, U.S. efforts in the North-South conflict took on the additional task of ensuring implementation of the peace agreement. Preventing further genocide through influence is still a point of interest, but the United States has also been seeking to help Sudan implement the structural and political changes required by the CPA in hopes that conflict resolution and stability will decrease the central government’s interest in genocide as a strategic instrument.

The majority of the U.S. economic tools during this period focused on increasing costs to those responsible for genocide in Darfur. On March 25, 2005, the United States helped ensure the passage of UNSC Resolution 1591, which placed travel bans on and froze the assets of certain individuals tied to the
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genocide in Darfur. On April 26, 2006, Bush issued E.O. 13400, which blocked the personal assets of more individuals connected to the genocide in Darfur. Months later, on October 13, 2006, Bush signed the Darfur Peace and Accountability Act (DPAA) and issued E.O. 13412, which prohibited all transactions by U.S. persons relating to Sudan’s oil industries – a sanction that had not been fully enforced previously. To step up pressure even more, on May 29, 2007, Bush issued further sanctions seeking to block the Sudanese government’s access to revenues by freezing Sudanese companies out of U.S. financial institutions.

Because all oil transactions are denominated in U.S. dollars (if done electronically), the main goal with this policy was to block the Sudanese government from receiving its oil revenues. On December 24, 2007, Bush signed the Sudan Accountability and Divestment Act (SADA), which encouraged state governments and domestic institutions to withdraw their investments in certain Sudanese business. That policy was already partially underway thanks to private organizations in the United States like the Genocide Intervention Network, which began a massive divestment campaign to hurt businesses seen as helping the central government perpetrate its crimes. That effort has been underway for at least five years now.

The United States also pushed to replace AMIS with a more effective UN force. The policy began in December 2005, was agreed to by the AU in March 2006, and then fully supported by the UN in August 2006. The result was a hybrid UN-AU force. However, the new peacekeeping mission, the UN African Mission in Darfur (UNAMID), did not receive an official mandate until UNSC Resolution 1769 on July 31, 2007, and did not take over for AMIS until January 2008. Also, thanks to pressure from the U.S. and other Western countries, Bashir’s bid to head the AU, which had previously been a lock, was rejected.

One other special political tool came into play during this time period: ICC involvement. The Security Council established the International Commission of Inquiry on Darfur (ICID), which delivered its report on January 25, 2005. The ICID report did not find that genocide was taking place in Darfur, but recommended investigation into war crimes for 51 individuals, 10 of whom were high-ranking members of
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the NCP. On March 31, 2005, UNSC Resolution 1593 referred Darfur to the ICC. The first arrest warrants were issued on May 2, 2007, for Ahmed Haroun (Minister of State for the interior, April 2003 to September 2005) and Ali Kushayb (militia leader) – both of whom Khartoum has refused to hand over. Several other Sudanese, including Darfur rebels, now have ICC warrants out for their arrest, but the big one is Bashir. On July 14, 2008, Chief Prosecutor Luis Moreno-Ocampo announced that he was seeking an arrest warrant for Bashir. He finally got that warrant on March 4, 2009. Bashir and other NCP members are now being charged with war crimes and crimes against humanity (notably not genocide), although no one has been surrendered to The Hague yet.

Costs and Benefits. U.S. targeted sanctions attacked the personal wealth of several members of the NCP and their supporters, resulting in some concrete costs. First, OFAC’s SDN List grew from 125 in 2000 to 170 individuals and entities under the Sudan sanctions program. According to the U.S. Treasury, during the period May 2007 to May 2008 alone, OFAC and U.S. banks blocked 641 transactions, resulting in a disruption of at least $133.2 million in business for Sudan. The Sudanese government also began selling off assets of businesses recently added to OFAC’s SDN List shortly after the May 2007 sanctions were put in place. Lower business earnings translate to lower government tax revenue, and because a number of these businesses were owned or controlled by NCP members or supporters, targeted sanctions reduced the governing council’s ability to buy support and fund its security services. Second, a number of third-party banks cut their ties with Sudan over reputation concerns, which decreased access to financing for both the government and the business sector. Third, some companies on the SDN List had trouble attracting foreign investment because brokers did not want to be labeled as abetting genocide. Fourth, sanctions continued the previously discussed penalties to Sudanese agriculture and the oil industry. Fifth, the May 2007 sanctions disrupted Sudanese oil transactions because they could not use U.S. dollars anymore. Sixth, regarding the private and public divestment campaigns, the Genocide Prevention Task Force, a subgroup of the Genocide Intervention Network, identified 37 companies that aided the Sudanese
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government’s ability to conduct genocide and encouraged state and private institutions not to invest in them. The Task Force claims that thanks in part to its efforts to blacklist these companies, the businesses on its list have underperformed their peer group average by 7.22% over five years, 22.23% over three years, and 45.97% over one year (2008 data). The increase can be seen as the result of a divestment campaign that strengthened over the five-year period.

One could conclude that the combination of these economic efforts represents a large opportunity cost for noncompliance. Indeed, according to a U.S. Treasury report:

high-level [Government of Sudan] representatives have repeatedly expressed strong concern in meetings over the impacts of U.S. sanctions, including frustration that sanctions impede [the government’s] ability to transfer funds or to find banks that will operate accounts for it… [and despite] years of conflict and mistrust, [the government] seems to place a high priority on normalizing relations with the United States.

Regarding UNAMID, the movement from an AU peacekeeping mission to a UN-led force was one step closer to a U.S.-led international takeover of the Sudanese state, something that had already happened in Afghanistan (2001), and Iraq (2003). Combined with the AU’s rejection of Bashir for its head post, it must have seemed to the NCP that fellow African countries were increasingly willing to hand Sudan over to the West. Such a threat goes right to the NCP governing council’s fear of regime change.

Lastly, the U.S.-led efforts to refer Darfur to the ICC must had been particularly unsettling to the NCP elite as it required the consent of their international protectors – China and Russia. Indeed, Flint and de Waal claim it is “the one international action to date that has truly worried President Bashir and the Security cabal.” The ICC may not have threatened the NCP leadership’s ability to pay elites or fund its security apparatus, but it did threaten to put them in jail for the rest of their lives and signaled increased international willingness to confront them over the issue of genocide and mass killing. Now, prosecution can only be deferred on a year-to-year basis by the Security Council, which would require U.S. approval.
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Behavior. Just as in previous time periods, this one has been full of hope in despair. No positive development was bigger than the January 9, 2005 signing of the CPA, ending major hostilities between the North and South. However, both the NCP and SPLM have violated the treaty on numerous occasions by failing to redeploy their forces and by committing more attacks. Elections and revenue-sharing agreements have both been delayed. Ironically, some evidence suggests that flare-ups of government aggression have actually been reactions to U.S. policies designed to stop violence. Following the May 2007 sanctions, a Northern military commander in the South was given orders not to withdraw his troops. The North also suspended oil payments to the South and remobilized the Missiriya Arab militias; Bashir even stated publicly that the latter move was a response to the U.S. sanctions. Also, the militant faction of the NCP governing council stopped negotiations over Abyei in the summer of 2007; Nafie threatened to kill Ali Osman if he brokered a settlement. The NCP even threatened sanctions against United States, saying it would cut off gum arabic exports, thereby destroying the American cola industry.

Furthermore, less than two months after Moreno-Ocampo announced he was seeking an arrest warrant for Bashir, major clashes between the Sudanese military and SPLA in Abyei killed 89 people and displaced 50,000. The violence threatened to unravel the whole peace deal. Then, immediately after the warrant was issued in March 2009, Bashir expelled or shut down 16 humanitarian aid organizations, a move that affected 50% of aid in Sudan.

There is hope, though, for the CPA. Elections are slated for April 2010, and both the NCP and SPLM have said publicly that they will abide by a July 2009 international arbitration that resolved the status of Abyei. Whether either side sticks to its promise remains to be seen.
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NCP behavior in Darfur has been a similar muddle in recent years. There was a relative break in the violence for much of 2005, but intensified again during 2006-2007. On May 6, 2006, Minni Minawi (SLA faction leader) and Majzoub (NCP negotiator) signed the Darfur Peace Agreement (DPA). The deal was a failure, though. In traditional NCP fashion, Majzoub refused to make concessions. Instead, Majzoub sought to buy off every important member of the SLA and JEM with money and positions in government. Abdel Wahid and Khalil Ibrahim elected to continue fighting. Minawi kept fighting too – this time on the government’s side.

A new government offensive began at the end of August 2006, with more aerial bombings and militia attacks. Killings in Darfur reached the highest level since December 2004. Within weeks of Bush’s signing of the DPAA in March 2006, the worst aerial bombing in three years took place in a Masalit village in western Darfur and a USAID democracy officer making preparations for elections was murdered. Bashir also rejected calls for a UN peacekeeping force in September 2006 before finally acquiescing two months later. In 2008 and 2009, violence in Darfur continued to simmer; armed groups on all sides perpetuated a state of utter chaos. It continues to this day.

Rather than hand over any suspects to the ICC, some actually received promotions. In a sadistic twist, Ahmed Haroun became the government liaison for the UNAMID peacekeeping force in January 2008, and Musa Hilal (the most powerful Abbala militia leader) became Minister for Tribal Affairs.

Explanation. U.S. economic pressure entailed real costs for the NCP governing council, but those costs simply were not significant enough to affect behavior. Despite U.S. sanctions, Sudan’s GDP growth topped 10% for both 2006 and 2007, thanks in large part to its ever-growing oil production. In response to U.S. attempts to freeze Sudanese oil transactions out of American banks, the government decided to fly
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mounds of cash straight to Chinese buyers waiting in Bahrain.\textsuperscript{211} The NCP reacted similarly to targeted sanctions aimed at individual assets as well. NCP elites and their supporters moved their assets out of the United States and other Western countries before they could be frozen, limiting the impact of targeted sanctions.\textsuperscript{212}

What about the divestment campaign, which seeks to put pressure on foreign companies that invest in Sudan? Natsios claims that it is “completely ineffective,” citing foreign companies’ strong business connections to the Sudanese economy.\textsuperscript{213} As of 2008, China received 7\% of its oil from Sudan, most of it through CNPC.\textsuperscript{214} The state-owned company buys 50-80\% of Sudan’s oil,\textsuperscript{215} while Malaysia’s Petronas and India’s Oil and Natural Gas Company (ONGC) are also major players.\textsuperscript{216} The divestment campaign has placed costs on its list of companies, but has been unable to force them to abandon their Sudanese assets. As in past periods, U.S. economic leverage was greatly hindered by foreign investment.

Clearly, U.S. economic pressure did not place any severe restrictions on the NCP governing council’s ability to buy loyalty or fund its security services. In 2005 and 2006, the percentage of Sudanese small arms coming from China remained around 90\%, and a total value of $55 million was imported for the period 2003-2006.\textsuperscript{217} China also sold Khartoum military trucks, aircraft, tanks, and infantry fighting vehicles during this period.\textsuperscript{218}

Evidence suggests that the personal efforts of Ali Osman and John Garang were more instrumental to the 2005 CPA than international pressure. Garang’s death just months after the agreement’s signing opened the door for increased NCP intransigence. Also, the relative calm in Darfur in 2005 was likely a result of the NCP’s moderately successful counterinsurgency campaign, which left the rebels divided and in disarray.\textsuperscript{219} By November 2005, the SLA was officially recognized as two different groups – SLA-Abdel
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Wahid and SLA-Minawi – representing a split in the Fur-Zaghawa alliance. Violence surged again in 2006, especially after the failed DPA talks in May. Two months before the deal, Khalil Ibrahim told Ali Osman that if JEM’s demands were not met (single Darfur state with a vice-presidency), “war will continue and we will take the whole cake.” Ibrahim almost made good on that promise on May 10, 2008, when JEM attacked Khartoum. These domestic developments played a much greater role in shaping the NCP’s behavior regarding genocide and mass killing than did U.S. economic pressure.

Events at the UN were similarly ineffective. Most members of the AU and Arab League condemned the ICC indictments. Even heads of state who previously admitted that they despised Bashir rallied behind him, declaring the ICC actions “Western neocolonialist impositions.” Nor did ICC arrest warrants have any chance of being served. Suspects would have to be seized by a foreign military intervention, but China protects NCP leaders from such a possibility. Similarly, AMIS and UNAMID became mired in the extremely complex and chaotic security situation that is Darfur, and China prevents the creation of a larger and more effective peacekeeping force with its veto power.

**Final Assessment**

U.S. pressure did seem to help achieve modest goals, like access for humanitarian aid or agreement to the presence of international peacekeepers. There is little or no evidence, though, that any U.S. efforts had an appreciable impact on the NCP’s decision to pursue genocide since 2000. Positive developments in NCP behavior were largely superficial, meant to disguise their continued intransigence. As stated in Part II, influence is essentially a bargaining process in which the sender tries to convince the target that compliance with its demands is better than all other alternatives. The problem in the case of U.S.-Sudan bilateral relations is that the NCP always had better alternatives, thanks mostly to foreign investment in its oil industry. Khartoum could forgo the benefits of bilateral trade and aid without significantly hurting its ability to pay elites and fund its security apparatus. In fact, Sudan’s greatest period
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of economic growth has occurred during U.S. sanctions. It would seem that the United States’ inability to impose costs or offer benefits that could not be replaced by other states almost presupposes an inability to influence NCP behavior at all, let alone regarding an important issue like genocide. Bashir’s own words tell this lesson better than anyone else ever could: “Just when some countries gave us sanctions, God gave us oil.”

China’s protection at the Security Council and willingness to sell military arms and equipment to the Sudanese armed forces also ensured that UN responses to the NCP elites’ genocidal practices would be weak and unable to damage their most important interests. Roberta Cohen’s experience at the UN illustrates this point. Once, she arranged a stack of UNSC resolutions to raise her seat for a panel discussion; a Sudanese Ambassador in attendance remarked, “That is the best use of those resolutions I ever saw.”

The simultaneous occurrence of two economic developments over time undermined U.S. influence efforts. First, Sudanese oil production and exploration not only increased from 1999 to 2004, but it soared after the 2005 CPA signing. The more oil Sudan has, the less economic leverage America can exert over the NCP decision-makers. Second, because of the U.S. sanctions, the Sudanese elite moved their assets out of Western countries and into Asia and the Middle East over time. The impact of U.S. efforts to freeze assets decreased over time because fewer and fewer Sudanese assets were under U.S. control. As Natsios notes, “All of the investment going on is outside the international system that we created.” Both trends meant that NCP immunity to U.S. influence efforts increased over the years.

The bottom line in this assessment is that despite concrete costs to the NCP governing council’s interests, and in spite of the tangible benefits offered for compliance, nothing the United States took from or promised to the NCP elite outweighed the value it placed on genocide and mass killing as a means to achieve its most important political and military goals. Genocide was seen as a cost-effective way to
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undermine challenges to NCP rule and to ensure the regime’s survival. Once again quoting Natsios, “All of the things we have done are annoyances to the regime, but they do not threaten their existence.”

**PART V
CONCLUSIONS**

*Implications for Theory*

Scholars who claim the sanctions do not work in general, and that they do not prevent genocide specifically, can point to this case study as evidence of their claims. However, the lessons of this study are not that simple. They both support and undercut a number of other claims in the literature on influence.

This study reaffirms the importance of sender credibility regarding threats and promises. Danforth’s claim in July 2004 that serious international sanctions were imminent proved to be a gross exaggeration, and the NCP governing council likely knew that. Also, Bush’s decision to abandon his promise of normalization because of Darfur undermined the credibility of future U.S. promises. Indeed, it actually strengthened the position of the NCP hard-line factions, which had always been skeptical of U.S. promises anyway.

This study also supports a number of other claims. It bolsters the argument that decision-makers bargain not just with international actors, but with domestic ones as well. In fact, in Sudan it appears that domestic interests take a much greater precedence. Clearly, the relationship between the sender and the target also matters. The United States kept imposing sanctions and issuing criticisms against the NCP over the course of the last decade, so the governing council increasingly saw America as an adversary. Rather than make concessions, the NCP governing council chose to maintain as much strength as possible in anticipation of future conflict. Ali Osman even became increasingly isolated due to America’s public confidence in him. Also, as some scholars suggest, economic sanctions actually made conditions harder for portions of society that had nothing to do with the state’s decision-making, as was the case with the poor Southern farmers working in the irrigated farming sector. It was not until the DPAA in October 2006
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that the United States started trying to limit the sanctions’ effects on people living in Sudan’s periphery.\textsuperscript{231} Additionally, there are clearly limits on the extent of the deprivation an outsider can impose on a state. Despite numerous attempts, U.S. efforts to increase the costs beyond those already imposed during the Clinton administration were limited.

Haass and O’Sullivan claim that states where decision-making is highly concentrated and with acute economic and strategic vulnerabilities make better engagement partners. They also argue that influence works best when carrots are accompanied by credible sticks. This case study saw all three of those characteristics in play, yet the state’s behavior was largely unaffected. However, Haass and O’Sullivan also note that modest goals and multilateral cooperation are more likely to result in successful influence efforts, which is reaffirmed here. If anything, this study does not refute any of these claims, but rather demonstrates the overwhelming importance of the latter two. The detrimental effect of the international community’s reluctance to take a hard stance toward Sudan – especially China – on U.S. efforts to influence the NCP governing council’s behavior cannot be emphasized enough.

This study also supports Valentino’s claim that decision-makers use genocide to achieve their most important political and military objectives. In fact, genocide in Sudan was seen as a tool to protect the ruling regime from overthrow. Therefore, the external efforts to stop genocide have to actually threaten the acting regime’s survival. No U.S. efforts to influence the NCP’s decision to pursue genocide actually threatened the governing council’s survival, and were therefore ineffective.

Besides these contributions to the literature on influence, this study demonstrates one other important point that was not part of the literature discussed in Part II. First, despite the tendency to think that economic pressure increasingly wears down the target’s desire to resist the longer that pressure is applied, unilateral or limited economic sanctions actually become \textit{less} effective over time. Because globalization has created a world of economic alternatives, the Sudanese simply moved more and more of their assets to places outside U.S. or Western control as America continued imposing sanctions. U.S. attempts to influence NCP behavior were not just weakened by Baldwin’s “scar effect” (target is less willing to cooperate on issues in the future), but also a “transference effect” (target has adjusted in such a

way that it is less dependent upon the sender to fulfill its needs and more dependent on other states that do not demand a change in behavior). America now finds itself in a position that is severely weakened vis-à-vis the NCP ten years ago.

**Implications for the United States’ Sudan Policy**

The Obama administration released its Sudan policy on October 19, 2009. It offers the Sudanese government guarantees that the removal of sanctions and improvement of bilateral relations will be selectively applied based on the government’s efforts to stop violence and implement its commitments to peace.\(^{232}\) It also links the conflicts in the South and Darfur together as a single issue, meaning that policy will not change in response to developments in just one area or the other. However, the current administration is in a tough position: any further negative sanctions are unlikely to change the NCP’s behavior, and any improvement of relations before progress is made on the ground would be seen as too soft.

What then can the United States do to reduce the violence currently taking place and prevent mass killings that could occur in the future? The question is still relevant, despite the relative peace in Sudan over the last four-plus years. Peace agreement or not, more civilians died from fighting in South Sudan during a 6-month period in 2008-2009 than during a 15-month period in Darfur (Jan 1, 2008 to March 31, 2009, about 700 civilian deaths).\(^{233}\) In fact, spring 2009 saw the largest spike in violent deaths in South Sudan since the signing of the CPA.\(^{234}\) With serious political hurdles just around the corner, including the April 2010 elections and 2011 referendum, mass killing and genocide could once again flare up in Sudan in the near future.

What the United States cannot do is impose any more unilateral economic sanctions because it has nearly exhausted all of them already.\(^{235}\) The focus now has to be on finding ways to engage the NCP elites


\(^{235}\) The one exception is gum arabic, a major Sudanese export, which the United States still imports.
while communicating to them that they must improve their behavior regarding genocide. U.S. sanctions have lost nearly all their traction over the years, and it is now time to reestablish some economic links with the Sudanese that America can use as leverage when it needs to later.

If the United States does want to continue pursuing coercion, it has to get other important members of the international community on board. Sudan’s major export markets are: Egypt, United Arab Emirates, Saudi Arabia, Malaysia, China, South Korea, and Japan. Its major suppliers of imports are: European Union, China, Malaysia, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, and India. Without getting most these actors – especially China – to cooperate with a U.S.-led sanctions policy, economic coercion to prevent genocide in Sudan will not work. What it would take to get these countries to cooperate, and whether or not the political costs are worth it to U.S. policymakers, is a topic for a different discussion. Clearly, though, the United States alone does not have the economic and diplomatic leverage to coerce the NCP governing council.

Should engagement and/or multilateral diplomatic and economic coercion fail to prevent the NCP from pursuing genocide in the future, military intervention may be the only possible solution. The Sudanese air force, which has been a major component of genocide in both the South and Darfur, is small and could be destroyed relatively easily. Precision air strikes could accomplish the task. Also, all Sudanese oil revenues go through Port Sudan, and blockading the city would bring exports to a screeching halt. Military intervention carries its own costs to the United States, and those costs may very well be more than Americans are willing to pay (as noted in the Introduction). That, too, is the topic for another discussion. Simply put, though, if significant engagement cannot be achieved, and if a strong multilateral effort does not development, then the only way to stop genocide in Sudan may very well be a military intervention. If it refuses to take that step, the United States has to accept the reality that it is not willing to do what it takes to end genocide in Sudan.
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APPENDIX A: OIL IN SUDAN

Source: European Coalition on Oil in Sudan (www.ecosonline.org)
APPENDIX B: DARFUR VILLAGES DESTROYED AS OF AUGUST 2004

Source: Digital Globe, Inc. and Department of State via USAID
APPENDIX C: DEATH TOLL IN DARFUR AT THE HEIGHT OF THE CONFLICT

Total Deaths and Excess Deaths* in Darfur and the Chad Refugee Camps
High and Low Estimates, March 2003 - January 2005

* Deaths owing to violence, disease, and malnutrition attributable to the conflict.

Source: Department of State, Bureau of Intelligence and Research
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