

Genocide in Darfur, Sudan?

By Christian P. Scherrer

Professor at the Hiroshima Peace Institute, HPI

Genocide in Darfur, Sudan?1

Failed state – criminal governance..... 1

Divide and rule tactics and terror— now also
against Muslims..... 1

Genocidal pattern of violence..... 2

The world’s ‘worst humanitarian crisis’..... 2

The miserable non-response of the international
community..... 2

Peace process in southern Sudan enables more
violence in Darfur..... 2

Plight of the refugees worsens by the day 3

**Explication of Key Issues: On International Law
and about Sudan..... 3**

Definition of genocide according to the UN anti-
genocide convention of 1948 3

Definition of crimes against humanity by the Rome
Statute of the International Criminal Court (ICC)..... 4

Genocide in Southern and Central Sudan..... 5

Genocide in Sudan is committed by different
methods since the mid 1950s..... 5

Genocide or ethnic cleansing in Darfur? 5

Civil war in Sudan..... 6

Clique regimes in Sudan 7

Conflict resolution in Sudan..... 7

Dinka, Nilotic people, biggest ethnic group in
Southern Sudan (ca. 3 million)..... 7

Discrimination of women - double moral in Sudan 7

Divide & Rule policy 7

Ethnic cleansing 8

IGAD-mediation in Sudan’s wars 8

Janjaweed militia in Darfur 8

National Islamic Front of Sudan, NIF 8

Oil riches in Sudan 9

The Sudan is one of the world’s most deadly places. The largest country in Africa has suffered horrific mass violence ever since it gained independence from Britain in 1956. In the past 50 years more than 3.5 million people have been either slaughtered or starved to death. The Sudan has been a particularly deadly place for minority peoples and rebels ever since civil war broke out in the south of the country in 1955 with the Anyanya separatist movement of the Southern Sudanese. This conflict continued from 1955 to 1972, with some violence continuing up until 1979. Major bloodshed was halted at that time by the dictator Numeiri’s promise of autonomy for the Southern Sudanese, only to resume in a more devastating fashion in 1983, this time with the Sudan People’s Liberation Army (SPLA) becoming the principal foe of a succession of Khartoum regimes. The SPLA, led by Dr. John Garang, is strong among Dinka, Nuba and some Nuer.

Failed state – criminal governance

Ninety percent of this horrendous death toll can be attributed to nefarious government forces and their allies amongst Arab tribes. The victims were mainly unarmed civilians from the African peoples of the Dinka, Nuer, Shilluk and Equatorians in southern Sudan and among the Nuba of central Sudan. Only recently has violence spread to Darfur in western Sudan.

The same brutal tactics were applied in this region as was the case earlier in southern Sudan: the predominantly civilian victims from among the non-Arabic (African) peoples invariably suffered indiscriminate genocidal attacks by Arab militias and were subjected to the deliberate premeditated use of famine as a weapon by successive governmental regimes, be they either “democratically” elected or military in nature.

Divide and rule tactics and terror— now also against Muslims

The only differences in this case in comparison to previous assaults are that, firstly, the Darfur rebels of the Sudan Liberation Movement (SLM) and Justice and Equality Movement (JEM) are much younger and weaker than the

Genocide in Darfur, Sudan?

By Christian P. Scherrer, HPI, Nov 2004

21 years old SPLA, which became a formidable opponent of the Northern Arabized clique regimes, hence they are much less able to protect the very people they claim to be fighting for.

Secondly, for the first time the victims are almost entirely fellow Muslims, a surprising fact for a government that has imposed draconian Sharia law throughout the country, and is known to be composed of hard-line “good Muslims” – offshoots from the 1989 coup by the fundamentalist National Islamic Front (NIF) and its sympathizers in the army.

Genocidal pattern of violence

In relation to Darfur, the mass media has referred to “ethnic cleansing” a term that implies the use of various policies designed to remove forcibly members of a particular ethnic group or several groups by a particular attacker – usually a state or a state-sponsored armed group. This constitutes a gross violation of human rights, as are forced emigration and state-ordered population transfers. In extreme cases, if the international community chooses to look the other way, it becomes a prelude to genocide.

This seems to be what has happened in Darfur since the fall of 2003, despite some engagement by the international community, and after the crisis was described as the world’s “worst human disaster” by UN humanitarian coordinator Egelund. Violence has increased and displayed a genocidal pattern, and has been accompanied by organized mass rapes of girls and women, systematic killings of men among the Fur, Masalit and Zaghawa peoples and destruction of their villages, food storages, and mosques.

The world’s ‘worst humanitarian crisis’

The Darfur crisis of 2003/2004 clearly came about as the result of criminal policies pursued by the military junta in Khartoum. As happened earlier in southern Sudan, the regime incited nomadic Arab *Baggara* tribes – more precisely, from among the Bani-Helwa, Bani-Hussein, Rizegat, and Misiyria tribes – to assault and terrorize the indigenous, sedentary African

Muslim peoples of Darfur in order to punish them for their alleged support of local rebels.

The regime provided militiamen with modern weapons and mobile phones, and granted them full impunity to carry out killings and the raping and kidnapping of girls and women from among the Fur, Masalit, and Zaghawa peoples. The assaults of armed gangs called Janjaweed on the defenceless population caused widespread panic and a mass flight to safer areas and into Chad since the fall of 2003.

The miserable non-response of the international community

UN organizations and international NGOs warned of a major disaster in Darfur as early as November 2003 but no effective action took place. Despite international efforts to put a stop to the killings and widely reported atrocities committed by Arab militiamen in conjunction with Sudanese army and police forces, the mass violence continued.

The militias were not disarmed and it is estimated that by May 2004 they had killed up to 50,000 people and driven one million into “internally displaced people” (IDP) camps in Darfur and an additional 200,000 into refugee camps in Chad. Janjaweed militiamen have clashed with Chadian government forces along the border.

Peace process in southern Sudan enables more violence in Darfur

The peace process initiated between the Sudanese government and the SPLA in the 50-year old conflict in southern Sudan unfortunately provided the regime with the opportunity to redeploy as many as 20,000 of its soldiers and as many policemen into the Darfur region.

Allegedly they came to stop the militia terror being waged against the civilian population, but in reality it was to combat the rebels. The murderous attacks of the Janjaweed have not stopped. Despite the passing of strongly worded UN resolutions (of July and September 2004), no international humanitarian intervention has taken place. The second resolution recognizes

Genocide in Darfur, Sudan?

By Christian P. Scherrer, HPI, Nov 2004

the special role to be played by the African Union (AU). A few hundred observers have been sent by the AU. 150 Rwandan troops were sent in August to protect them. A force of 3,000 to 5,000 AU peacekeepers shall be deployed—depending on funds and facilities provided by EU and USA.

Plight of the refugees worsens by the day

Meanwhile, as predicted by the UN and humanitarian NGOs, the scale of the humanitarian disaster increased dramatically with the arrival of the rainy season in July. Lines of communication were interrupted and food could not be delivered to the neediest people. Currently there are almost two million IDPs and refugees in the Darfur region, and up to one hundred thousand civilians are believed to have been slaughtered. More may die from famine in the coming months.

The scale of the Janjaweed campaign of terror has led to comparisons with the Rwandan genocide. For many observers, the tactics used in Darfur are more akin to the ethnic cleansing campaigns carried out in the former Yugoslavia, although here a more genocidal pattern has become clearly visible. So far, however, neither the United Nations nor the African Union considers that the Darfur conflict constitutes genocide. This could hamper the planned AU peacekeeping operation (PKO). Meanwhile the AU and Sudan agreed about the deployment of some 3,000 peacekeepers. Instead of backing the AU effort as a UN PKO the AU was left alone. Until early in November only a few hundred troops were sent. No funding was provided by those who spoke loudest about genocide (USA). UN envoy Pronk warned of ‘anarchy’ in Darfur, with violence escalating.

Explication of Key Issues: On International Law and about Sudan

Definition of genocide according to the UN anti-genocide convention of 1948

The “Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide”, as approved and proposed for signature and ratification or accession by General Assembly resolution 260 A (III) of 9 December 1948, entered into force on 12 January 1951, in accordance with article 13. The definition made by the convention is the only legally relevant definition which is therefore policy-relevant.

Extracts

Being convinced that, in order to liberate mankind from such an odious scourge, international co-operation is required,

Hereby agree as hereinafter provided:

Article 1

The Contracting Parties confirm that genocide, whether committed in time of peace or in time of war, is a crime under international law which they undertake to prevent and to punish.

Article 2

In the present Convention, genocide means 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.

Article 3

The following acts shall be punishable:

Genocide in Darfur, Sudan?

By Christian P. Scherrer, HPI, Nov 2004

- (a) Genocide;
- (b) Conspiracy to commit genocide;
- (c) Direct and public incitement to commit genocide;
- (d) Attempt to commit genocide;
- (e) Complicity in genocide.

Definition of crimes against humanity by the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court (ICC)

PART 2. JURISDICTION, ADMISSIBILITY AND APPLICABLE LAW

Article 5: Crimes within the jurisdiction of the Court

1. The jurisdiction of the Court shall be limited to the most serious crimes of concern to the international community as a whole. The Court has jurisdiction in accordance with this Statute with respect to the following crimes:

- (a) The crime of genocide;
- (b) Crimes against humanity;
- (c) War crimes;
- (d) The crime of aggression.

Article 7: Crimes against humanity

1. For the purpose of this Statute, “crime against humanity” means any of the following acts when committed as part of a widespread or systematic attack directed against any civilian population, with knowledge of the attack:

- (a) Murder;
- (b) Extermination;
- (c) Enslavement;
- (d) Deportation or forcible transfer of population;
- (e) Imprisonment or other severe deprivation of physical liberty in violation of fundamental rules of international law;
- (f) Torture;
- (g) Rape, sexual slavery, enforced prostitution, forced pregnancy, enforced sterilization, or any other form of sexual violence of comparable gravity;

(h) Persecution against any identifiable group or collectivity on political, racial, national, ethnic, cultural, religious, gender as defined in paragraph 3, or other grounds that are universally recognized as impermissible under international law, in connection with any act referred to in this paragraph or any crime within the jurisdiction of the Court;

- (i) Enforced disappearance of persons;
- (j) The crime of apartheid;
- (k) Other inhumane acts of a similar character intentionally causing great suffering, or serious injury to body or to mental or physical health.

2. For the purpose of paragraph 1:

- (a) “Attack directed against any civilian population” means a course of conduct involving the multiple commission of acts referred to in paragraph 1 against any civilian population, pursuant to or in furtherance of a State or organizational policy to commit such attack;
- (b) “Extermination” includes the intentional infliction of conditions of life, *inter alia* the deprivation of access to food and medicine, calculated to bring about the destruction of part of a population;
- (c) “Enslavement” means the exercise of any or all of the powers attaching to the right of ownership over a person and includes the exercise of such power in the course of trafficking in persons, in particular women and children;
- (d) “Deportation or forcible transfer of population” means forced displacement of the persons concerned by expulsion or other coercive acts from the area in which they are lawfully present, without grounds permitted under international law;
- (e) “Torture” means the intentional infliction of severe pain or suffering, whether physical or mental, upon a person in the custody or under the control of the accused; except that torture shall not include pain or suffering arising only from, inherent in or incidental to, lawful sanctions;
- (f) “Forced pregnancy” means the unlawful confinement of a woman forcibly made

Genocide in Darfur, Sudan?

By Christian P. Scherrer, HPI, Nov 2004

pregnant, with the intent of affecting the ethnic composition of any population or carrying out other grave violations of international law. This definition shall not in any way be interpreted as affecting national laws relating to pregnancy;

- (g) "Persecution" means the intentional and severe deprivation of fundamental rights contrary to international law by reason of the identity of the group or collectivity;
- (h) "The crime of apartheid" means inhumane acts of a character similar to those referred to in paragraph 1, committed in the context of an institutionalized regime of systematic oppression and domination by one racial group over any other racial group or groups and committed with the intention of maintaining that regime;
- (i) "Enforced disappearance of persons" means the arrest, detention or abduction of persons by, or with the authorization, support or acquiescence of, a State or a political organization, followed by a refusal to acknowledge that deprivation of freedom or to give information on the fate or whereabouts of those persons, with the intention of removing them from the protection of the law for a prolonged period of time.

3. For the purpose of this Statute, it is understood that the term "gender" refers to the two sexes, male and female, within the context of society. The term "gender" does not indicate any meaning different from the above.

Genocide in Southern and Central Sudan

Genocide has been accused much too late by the US Holocaust Memorial Museum's committee of conscience in 2000; that time already more than three million people, mostly civilians, have died in Sudan and five million have been displaced over the past 50 years as the result of an endless civil war. The committee wrote that "Primary responsibility for this devastation belongs to the Sudanese government, a military regime based in the north. The principal victims include the Dinka and Nuer peoples in southern Sudan and the Nuba of central Sudan."

Genocide in Sudan is committed by different methods since the mid 1950s

There is abundant evidence for several methods falling under the UN anti-genocide convention of 1948 being systematically and intentionally applied in South and Central Sudan since 1955, in Central Sudan (Nuba Mountains) since the late 1980s, as well as in Darfur since 2002. According to the convention, Article 2, "genocide means 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. But the most devastating effects for civilian population had the use of famine as a weapon by successive Khartoum regime in a planned attempt to weaken the rebels. It became the single most deadly means in the counter-insurgency war of the regime. According to the anti-genocide convention this constitutes the crime genocide as defined in Article 2, (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.

Genocide or ethnic cleansing in Darfur?

The scale of the Janjaweed campaign has led to comparisons with the Rwandan genocide, a parallel categorically denied by the Sudanese regime. For many observers the tactics used in Darfur are more akin to the ethnic cleansing campaign used in the Former Yugoslavia though a genocidal pattern became clearly visible. After long hesitations the US congress and the Bush regime—while committing crimes against humanity and war crimes in Iraq—consider the Darfur conflict to constitute genocide. After the USA tabled a second UNSC resolution on Darfur-Sudan, the council authorized an inquiry into whether the attacks met the legal definition of genocide, to be delivered until end of September 2004. However it became clear that both, the UN special envoy Jan Pronk (a former Dutch minister) and the acting chairman of the African Union and president of Nigeria, Olesgun

Genocide in Darfur, Sudan?

By Christian P. Scherrer, HPI, Nov 2004

Obasanjo, did not consider genocide at work. Pronk said that 'atrocities, very bad killings, rape, burning of villages have taken place' (NYT 24 Sept 04)-- stopped short of using the term genocide. Obasanjo said there was no evidence of a government planning to eliminate a particular group. This statement can be seen as challenged by the facts. Though the regime doesn't commit all-out genocide similar to Rwanda it nevertheless implemented an orchestrated and vast campaign of mass murder clearly targeting three specific Non-Arabic ethnic groups, as it had done so since decades in South and Central Sudan (since the times of Numeiri and al-Mahdi). This could be called a silent genocide.

Civil war in Sudan

This almost 50-years old war was first characterized by confronting the Arabized Islamic North against the African South, where Christianity and traditional animistic religions predominate. This has changed in the course of the war. Most people tend to think about the conflict in Sudan as only North vs. South conflicts; but the conflicts in Sudan are much more complicated. There are five armed conflicts in Sudan: 1. first comes the North/South conflict, which is still the dominating conflict; 2. in the so-called North there are genocidal ethnic conflicts like the one against the Nuba in central Sudan. 3. the aggression against the Fur in the Western Sudan, which started in 1991, 4. against the Ingessana in central Sudan and Blue Nile, and 5. against the Beja peoples in the Eastern Sudan. All five victim groups happen to be Non-Arabic African peoples, despite the fact that some of them are Muslims. In order to capture the complexity of the deadly conflicts in Sudan the history of slavery is central. Ever since independence in 1956 rival northern factions and clique regimes have vied to control the country and dominate the south. This violent process was greatly exacerbated by the Cold War and the global search for allies of one's camp. Massive injections of weapons magnified these ethnic and political divisions. Rebel forces in the south Sudan were armed (through pro-US Ethiopia) by Israel in the 1960s and after the

Ethiopian revolution in 1975 by the Soviet Union from the mid 1970s and throughout the 1980s. This was matched by even larger arms flows to successive northern gov'ts from the Soviets in the 1960s and by the USA in the 1970s and 1980s, after 1991 (fall of Mengistu in Ethiopia) the superpowers switched sides and the flow of arms from the USA to the Sudanese gov't ceased; the Russian Federation discontinued the Soviet policy. Exacerbation by of the Sudanese conflict by foreign actors did not stop fully; it continued on a lower level by Arab aid for Sudan, including aid by al-Qaeda for the NIF regime and several pro-Khartoum groups. Another central issue is the greed of the North for the resources of the south. Most oil wells lie in the settlement areas of African peoples; the same goes for minerals and vast water resources. Due to ecological reasons the (semi) nomadic Arabic tribes keep pressure on the neighbouring African peoples and try to shift the ethnic boundaries further south. This is an extremely bloody and ruthlessly violent process. The Nuba peoples who have suffered equally badly as the southerners live in central Sudan, and many of them are Muslims, as are the African indigenous peoples of Darfur, who were aggressed since 2002. Another government strategy of the "divide to destroy" scheme has been to encourage splits in the Southern resistance movement and cause fighting within and among groups in the South, especially the Dinka and Nuer. According to the UN anti-genocide convention of 1948, Article 2, "genocide means 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. There is abundant evidence for both methods being systematically applied in South and Central Sudan since 1955 as well as in Darfur since 2002. But the most devastating effects for civilian population had the use of famine as a weapon by successive Khartoum regime in a planned attempt to weaken the rebels. It became the single most deadly means in the counter-insurgency war of the regime. According to the anti-genocide convention this constitutes the

Genocide in Darfur, Sudan?

By Christian P. Scherrer, HPI, Nov 2004

crime genocide as defined in Article 2, (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. The later is done by campaigns of mass rape und abductions of girls and young women by Arab militiamen, with tacit support by successive governments.

Clique regimes in Sudan

successively dominated by one of the following four groups of traditional powerbrokers in Sudan's system of Northern Arab-Nubian based regimes: the Umma party (linked to Ansar sect), the DUP party (linked to Khatmiya sect), the NIF (linked to the fundamentalist Muslim brothers) and (last but not least) the commanders of the armed forces. The later usually allied with one of the three political groups; they were in power most of the time.

Conflict resolution in Sudan

depends largely on a solution in the dominant North vs. South conflict. There will be no solution for Darfur unless the AU intervention succeeds; but even so, a solution will not be sustainable in Darfur. Sudan's and its neighbour's conflicts are interrelated and spill-over boundaries since decades. There will be no peace in Sudan as a whole, neither in the north of Uganda, NE Congo, Chad and Eritrea unless a sustainable peaceful solution is reached between Khartoum and southern Sudan, which constitutes the heart of conflict. Many experts believe that there will be not implementation of the Naivasha agreements signed in May 2004 (on power sharing and sharing of the oil spoils) until the Khartoum regime falls. And even that is no guarantee. The present regime came to power because its predecessors wanted to sign a peace agreement the very day of the coup.

Darfur, province of Western Sudan

Darfur has the size of France or Texas; it was independent earlier, and became a neglected famine area (1991) and the world's worst humanitarian crisis area 2003/2004. The majority people are the indigenous Black-African Fur around Darfur mountains (Jebel

Marra); Fur are Muslims. Other peoples include Zaghawa and Masalit (both also in Chad) are also non-Arabic Muslims. Nomadic pastoralists such as Beni Helwa, Beni Hussein, Rizegat, Misiyria, a/o. Arabic-speaking are small minorities but they were armed by successive Sudanese regimes against the SPLA in the South and since 2003 also against rebel groups (SPM, JEM) amongst the African Muslim sedentary population; The SLA is generally associated with the Fur and Masalit in the center and South of Darfur; it is member of the opposition alliance NDA (National Democratic Alliance). The JEM is associated with the Zaghawa of the northern half of Darfur; JEM leaders were NIF members and are known to be fiercely Islamic. There are about 50 distinct ethnic groups living in Darfur and surrounding areas of Chad, Libya, the Central African Republic and North and South Sudan.

Dinka, Nilotic people, biggest ethnic group in Southern Sudan (ca. 3 million)

pastoralists, formerly an acephalous society (as are their neighbours the Nuer); the Dinka are considered the main social base of the SPLA/M, led by the Dinka Dr. Garang; Dinka traditional cattle economy is on the brink by war and drought.

Discrimination of women - double moral in Sudan

Since June 1989 Sudanese women have to wear heavy dresses and disappeared from the public space, as in Wahabit Saudi Arabia, adultery is punished by stoning (of women, only), alcohol is prohibited in a country that is still led by the renegade general al-Bashir, a man who was earlier known as a womanizer and hard drinker.

Divide & Rule policy

applied by the British colonialists, similar to the situation in other former colonies; the Colonial Office in London applied this notorious colonial policy, called *southern policy*, with the aim of developing the south apart from the north; 1920 a *Nuba policy* was introduced in Central Sudan.

Ethnic cleansing

The term refers to various policies of forcibly removing members of a particular ethnic group or several groups by an attacker, usually a state or a state-sponsored military group. It constitutes massive violations of human rights and is virtually indistinguishable from forced emigration and state ordered population transfers. In severe cases it merges with forced deportation accompanied by mass violence, which can not be seen as violations of human rights anymore but as crimes against humanity. In extreme cases, if the international community turns the other way, it becomes a prelude to genocide. This seems what happened in Darfur since 2003, despite some engagement of the international community, after the crisis was called the world's "worst human disaster" by UN sources.

IGAD-mediation in Sudan's wars

IDAD was earlier IGADD (*Inter-Governmental Authority against Drought and Desertification*), comprising the governments of Ethiopia, Eritrea, Djibouti, Kenya, Uganda and Sudan); under its auspices so-far four rounds of talks concerning Sudan's civil war took place; in 1/94 the (then) two SPLA factions agreed to negotiate with the Khartoum regime; a declaration of principles adopted by all but the Sudanese government delegation on 20 September 1994 after acceptance of Self-Determination for the South on 19 July 1994 by another government delegation (and by Umma, not by DUP); this initiative for negotiations offered certain hopes, since it is clear that those neighbouring countries of Sudan involved are interested in seeing an end to the war because it became a too heavy burden for them. These hopes were dashed and the regime went back to war only to sign on to the same principle of self-determination again in the Machakos Protocol of 20 July 2002, eight years after, this time with a six years period until realization. Two meetings in Naivasha ended with agreements about sharing of the oil revenues and a power-sharing (May 2004) and merging the armed forces, while keeping the main lines of the Machakos Protocol.

Janjaweed militia in Darfur

The name of marauding Arab militias of the nomadic Bani Helba, Bani Hussein, Rizegat, Jalul, Ereigat, the Mahariya of top commander Musa Hilal and other Arab tribes and clans which are terrorising the much larger sedentary African societies of the Fur, Masalit and Zaghawa in Darfur, Western Sudan; etymologically the term combined the Arab terms of *jinn* (daemons) and *jawad* (horse); for the indigenous peoples of Darfur these gunmen indeed are seen as daemons on horses; they were recruited by the Khartoum regime to terrorise the civilian population as a ruthless means to attack the social base of two rebel movements, the Sudanese Liberation Movement (SLM) and the Justice and the Justice and Equality Movement (JEM), who started limited armed struggle against the regime since early 2003. In charge was vice-president Taha (see Taha), who controls the hypertrophous secret services. Dictator Bashir had very good reasons not to rely on his 90,000-strong regular army: It has a large contingent of Darfuri foot soldiers. Obviously these soldiers would come into paralysing conflicts of interest if told to go against their own people. To avoid a large scale army mutiny or worse he gave orders to "outsource" the aggression on the population; hence the Janjaweed militias were created from amongst those who were in a traditional feud with the sedentary farmers. Government agents in Darfur are now trying to absorb Janjaweed elements into its paramilitary force, the Popular Defence Forces (PDF) as well as into its police force.

National Islamic Front of Sudan, NIF

NIF is also called Sudanese Islamic Front, SIF, later called Islamic Popular Congress, IPC, was formally founded by followers of Egyptian fundamentalist in 1985, out of the Muslim brotherhood who were protected by dictator Numeiri. The Islamist movement was established under the leadership of Hassan Abdullah al-Turabi and other Islamic scholars in 1985 but it has roots in the Islamist student movement in the 1960s. NIF was a well-organized shadowy elitist group, which wielded

Genocide in Darfur, Sudan?

By Christian P. Scherrer, HPI, Nov 2004

considerable economic influence but little appeal for the masses. NIF lost the 1986 election to the Umma party; clearly NIF could only come to power in alliance with a faction of the Sudanese Army; the NIF-infiltrated faction of the army made a coup d'état in June 1989, led by Omer Hassan el-Bashir. In 1991 Dr el-Turabi (brother-in-law of Sadiq al-Mahdi) founded the Popular Arab and Islamic Conference in an attempt to organise the many disparate Islamic groups and movements worldwide. The undisputed leader of NIF remained until his arrest Turabi (the creator of the Sharia September 1983 laws). Other influential NIF-members are: Ghazi Salahuddin Atabani, former minister of the presidency (head of the crucial delegation to the IGADD-meeting late 1994 where he refused any compromise), and Nafa'a Ali Nafa'a, boss of Sudan's ruthless secret service, as well as Ali Osman Taha. November 2003 Sudan's vice-president Taha accused his former mentor Turabi of encouraging sedition in Darfur. (All the three, Turabi, Bashir and Taha, have been the masterminds of the 1989 coup.) Turabi fell out with dictator Bashir in 1999 (after signing an agreement with the strong-again SPLA) and for the second time (after the 2000 split of the Peoples Congress) he was arrested in Feb 2003 and again in March 2004, due to links with Darfur JEM rebels. September 2004 dozens of IPC leaders were arrested in charges to have plotted a coup.

Oil riches in Sudan

Oil is found in the South but it is exploited under control of the Khartoum government; the oil is mainly found in the Upper Nile province, where Africans live. 300,000 barrels of oil per day, worth more than \$4 billion a year is currently produced. In the Naivasha Protocol of May 2004 the gov't of Sudan and SPLA agreed to share the revenues; this is still not implemented. Sudanese government oil revenues rose from almost nothing in 1998 to more than half of the total state revenue in 2004. Since the late 1990 the regime finances its war in the South with oil money; the oil companies became complicit in the war and massive displacement of the population. Lately

there are prospects of Sudan to boost oil production to 500,000 barrels per day. Some suspects that USA got active to pressure Sudan and threaten sanctions against its oil sector (see UN SC resolutions of July and Sept. 2003) due to the fact that the USA is completely excluded from it, a situation similar to the one in Iraq before the 20 March 2003 US-UK invasion. This was not always the case; US oil firms were prominent in the beginning. After Chevron installations at Rubkona were blown up by the SPLA most US oil companies left. The picture has changed dramatically. Today the dominant players in Sudan's oil development and production are the state-owned oil companies of China (the state-owned China National Petroleum Corporation, CNPC, via Petro-China), state-owned oil companies of India (ONGC), Malaysia (Petronas), Arab countries, Iran, and a smaller Russian TNC (Tatneft). In order to finance its endless war in the South the Khartoum regimes accumulated a huge external debt; hence the country is critically dependent on oil revenues. The rest of what is left after debt service will be spent for the military and large development projects (such as the electrification of Khartoum area and the oil region). The beneficiaries of the oil revenue in Sudan are a tiny minority.