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Abstract

Since the collapse of the Soviet Union, a leading scholar Samuel Huntington’s thesis in the field of social science has described ethnic conflicts as an inevitable post-secession resurgence of previously suppressed historical ethnic rivalries. An analogy of this approach view the post-communist era as “the fault lines between civilization will be the battle line of future”. This study uses an instrumentalist approach to examine the root causes of the civil war after secession and found politicization of ethnicity as an unrevealed cause of civil war after secession. Politicization of the ethnic conflict occurred through the three variables political elites as actors, using political rhetoric and Mass media as an instrument to politicize. Ethnicity is an instrument that can be used by political elites in order to achieve a collective or personal goal’s. Therefore, ethnicity cannot cause civil war unless if politicized. Two years after secession, South Sudan is seized by a civil war that has massacred an estimated of thousands and displaced millions. Conflict along the ethnic line erupted in December 2013, international media and some observers view ethnicity as the main cause behind the conflict but this thesis found politicization of ethnicity by president Salva Kiir’s and former vice president Riek Machar as an actor, they played a significant role in causing a civil war. The two political elites used political rhetoric and mass media as a tool to politicized Dinka and Nuer ethnic groups. Politicization of ethnicity was what triggered a civil war in South Sudan and not ethnicity as claimed by international media and observers.
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Chapter One

Introduction

Civil Wars are a growing subject in the world and the consequences are disastrous, a phenomenon that motivated the researchers to focus on the escalation of conflict and its causes. According to conflict prevention and Reconstruction Team (CPR) team, analysts (April 11, 2005) “differences in interests and opinions between groups are natural, but the way in which such differences are expressed and managed to determine the face of conflict, especially if the conflicts manifest themselves in primarily political (non-violent or violent way). When certain groups within a society (including government) pursue their objectives through a process that is in accordance with the specific laws and established norms of the society, this indicates that conflict is predominantly political in Nature. When a group turns to violence to pursue their objectives, it indicates the failure of the political approach to resolving the problem and it turns to violence that it may later escalate to civil war.

The history of the civil war that linked to secession first could be traced back to the year 1776 when the thirteen English colonies opted to form the United States of America. Thereafter, it followed by the National crisis that was due to the demand of eleven southern states to secede from the union. The crisis escalated to civil war. according to Richard (2006), slavery-united state history of America civil war 1861-1865, he stated that the economic and cultural was the causal factors of the American civil war. the War threatens to destroy the formation of the united states, the victory of the North’s States over the South rescued the union.

The second link of the history of the civil wars to secession, in former Yugoslavia. The breakdown of Yugoslavia occurred as a result of the spectrum of political uprising and Wars during the 1990s. the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia split apart but the unresolved issues lead to inter-ethnic Yugoslav wars. the reasons for the country’s split emerged from the cultural and religious divisions between the ethnic groups making up nation-state, based on the memories of WWII enormity committed by all sides, to centrifugal nationalists’ forces. However, a sequence of considerable political events capitalized as a catalyst for intensifying
inherent tension in the Yugoslavia Republic. For instance, Slobodan Milosevic Serbia’s president who took advantage of the gap created by a gradually weakening central state to politicize the Serbian by brutally deployed the use of Serbian ultra-nationalism to fuel the flames of conflicts in the other republic, in order to gain his political ambitions to the power. Milosevic’s policy resulted in the disintegration of Yugoslavia and balkanization of the region based on the ethnic line. Balkan countries experience civil wars after secession. Milosevic subsequently implicated Serbia in a series of strifes with the successor Balkan. (John B. Allcock 2018)

According to (Kaufmann, 1996), ethnicity can cause conflict if there is mass hostility, bigot political mobilization and security predicament (those three categories fell under the context politicization of ethnicity). Involvement of these three aspects can create a shape escalation to conflict if the preconditions mentioned above exist.

In term of history, historical interpretation of the ethnic group roots from its origin, history, and status must justify hostility toward another group and has to be strengthened by fear extinction and such ethnic group must have an ability to mobilize in order to strengthen the hostile attitudes. The population size of the ethnic group can play a vital role in the causes of conflict. Actually the ethnic can be powerful and stronger if their size is relatively big.

Civil war can easily occur if the conditions mentioned above are present and all these causal factors promote conflict escalation. What is so significant are the memories of the recent victimization or unfair treatment of ethnic status it will fuel the possibility of renewed conflict. These conditions are Fear of the ethnic group extinction it becomes strong when conflict erupted out. If the Ethnic group are geographically based in the different region and had a chance of mobilizing Historically base on Ethnic origin can justify hostility toward a state in order to gain special status. If all these conditions are existing. It is highly prone to conflict through the following reasons Extreme hostility has popular mass support. The probability of conflict increases based on the ethnic group is related to demographic size. The ethnic group glorified its history through a one-sided interpretation of its own victories and blame losses on traitor or weak leaders. Nourishing call for revenge contributed to creating organizational structures and culture of violence. Elite uses ethnic appeal, promoting fear and mass hostility and mobilization for conflict. The security dilemma arises, in which the hostile inflicted by the leadership on one side leads to radicalization of the leadership on the others.
Based on the following on the causal inferences represented above, the study postulated that the stronger the hostility among the ethnic groups (bases on historical interpretation, past victimization, the perception of their past based on a sense of solidarity and association to certain territory) the highly it is prone to conflict. The more acute the security dilemma, the fear of group extinction (based on nationalistic and language politics, and killing involving ethnic’s affinity problem) it is highly prone to conflict.

1. Research Statement and Problem

Arguably countries that emerge out of secession are prone to conflict, the creation of new-nation state after secession, coexist with a desperate demand for nation-building by the new leaders who know the challenges in exceeding ethnics, religious and regional loyalties. (for instance in former Yugoslavia, the successor's Balkan countries experienced several civil wars based on the ethnic’s line). According to E. Osughae, the violence and civil wars occurred in certain countries because “the Nation state project was Monumental failure due to uni-nation model is incompatible with a divided multi-nation situation” similarly, it is argued that, most of developing countries that emerged out of secession ethnically diverse and that ethnic diversity may lead to the civil unrest. The ethnic diversity may lead to an increase of civil wars, several scholars robust this argument in the scene of the civil war that erupted on ethnic line and by aggregate correlation. “For instance, Africa has not only the highest ethnic diversity but also the highest occurrences of civil wars”. several instances of civil wars after secession in Africa, Katanga secession civil war in Zaire, currently the Democratic Republic of Congo, Biafra war of Secession in Nigeria and Eritrea War of secession against Ethiopia.

Based on the above passage, it assumed that the outbreak of the civil war is increasing after secession, not only in Africa but all over the world. Yugoslavia is a recent example. This thesis unlike the other many studies that use certain variables to explain the causes of conflict after secession, referred to factors such as religion, economic, the scramble for resources, and the influence and operation of multinational oil companies to explain the reason of the Civil War after secession. this study focuses on Social grievance by using instrumentalist theory to answer the research question. The argument of this study is put forward clearly that, there is no direct correlation between ethnicity and Civil War but instead, the politicization of the ethnicity is a source of civil war in many countries, specifically in South Sudan after secession. opposite to the
claim that ethnicity cause civil Wars, the problem faced this study is that, there is no other research carried out a critical investigation on the meaning of tribalism and applied it to the cases of civil war outbreak after secession. therefore, it remains unclear if ethnicity leads to or is a root cause of the Civil War after secession. The reason South Sudan is used as an exemplary case study because of the current civil war after secession. Based on this note, the study argues that the phenomenon of ethnicity is not linked to conflict, that led the study to develop a hypothesis of this work.

The political crisis in the 1980s in Republic of Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia resulted to its disintegration (secession) but after the secession the successor's countries like Kosovo, Bosnia, and Herzegovina, Albania, Macedonia experiences civil wars. many scholars blamed ethnicity as the roots causes of civil war after secession but this study viewed ethnicity as an instrument that can only cause a civil war if politicized. This thesis argued that Politicization of ethnicity is a roots causes of civil war after secession.

1.2 Limitation and Variables

The theoretical analysis of this study is limited, not intend to cover all the independent variables that explained the causes of Civil War after secession but focuses on Social grievances and more specifically on the politicization of ethnicity. The main variables identified in this thesis within the context of social grievances in order to answer the research question properly, variables are linked to the hypothesis of this study as follows; dependent variable (DV), Independent Variable (IV) and intervening variable (Intv). Therefore, ethnicity is the independent variable, civil war is the dependent variable while politicization is the intervening. In essence, this thesis explores the three variables in order to improve the argument that, if any variance of the dependent variable arises, then it gets affected by another variable, generally called independent variables. According to this thesis, there is an assumed reason and effect on how the independent variable may influence the independent variable. However, the interaction of independent and dependent variables is affected by the third variable. For that reason, the study is to find out the root causes of the civil war after secession in relation to socially grievance and deeply to investigate how the intervening variable (politicization) could affect the variable of tribalism to lead to civil war.

The study is limited to the civil war after secession the case of South Sudan. South Sudan as a region has been through several occurrences of conflicts but this study is specifically
emphasizing on the civil war after the secession, that occurred two years after South Sudan independent.

1.3 The Aim of the Research
To investigate the roots causes of the civil Wars after secession in South Sudan, by examining the social grievances and specifically the politicization of tribes. to prove that ethnicity is not the main cause of the civil war after secession except if politicized. Ethnic is a secondary factor used as an instrument by political elites in order to attain their objectives.

1.4 Methodology
the methodology of This thesis based on following, first it selected instrumentalist approach as the main tool for analysis, secondly it aims to examine the roots causes of the Civil War after secession in South Sudan. there are numerous studies that viewed ethnicity as the main cause of civil war after secession however, this study trying to examine the politicization of ethnicity through unrevealed factors like Political elites as an actor, Mass media and political rhetoric as an instrument in order to provide an answer to the research question.
This is an exploratory case study on the politicization of the ethnic conflict in South Sudan and it impacts on the causes of civil war after secession. thus, this study intends to examine the casual factors of the Civil War after secession and to deeply look into the role played by political elites as an actor and mass media and political rhetoric as an instrument.
This thesis uses secondary data, that comprise of the published sources such as Books, articles in learned Journals, magazines, newspapers, encyclopedias Television interview, and theses.

1.5 The Structure of the Thesis
The thesis consists of five chapters, the thesis was organized into five different chapters, the first chapter consists of an introductory part that explains the aims and organization of this research
and then narrated on the method, while chapter two lay down a literature review that comprises of four different independents variables such as history and geography, Social grievances, political and economic factors. The criticisms in this chapter, exploring unexplained gaps on all four variables. The study focus on social grievances and particularly ethnicity. Chapter three is the theoretical framework that provided an explanation on the instrumentalist’s theory on how it links to this study. It will also shed light on definitions of the concepts that are used in this thesis. While chapter four, focused on the case study South Sudan and how does it link to the theoretical framework. chapter five is the final chapter that concludes the thesis.
Chapter Two

2. Literature Review

This chapter presents four different perspectives to explain the causes of the civil wars that took place in the 1990s. During that period, the risk of the civil wars has been systematically interrelated to different categories such as social grievances, history, and geography, political and economic perspectives. These four perspectives explain the causal factors of civil wars occurrence under each category. For instance, the first category history and geography emphasizes that a state which experienced numerous civil wars in the past is prone to another civil wars, and this particular state experience civil wars due to its geographic. The second category is the social grievance, this phenomenon comprises three causal factors- Religious, culture, and ethnicity but the study focus on ethnicity. And the third category is the economic perspective which explains low-income, educations trade, economic structures, and inequality to investigate whether these factors have linkage to civil wars. The fourth category is a political perspective which explains the political factors that lead a country to experience civil war.

2.1 History and geography

Apart from geographical location, a country’s history in which there were civil wars is likely to experience more civil wars in the future compared to a state without a history of civil wars. International review (2009) discloses that there is a widespread concurrence on a recent history of civil war as dangerous. Post-conflict states share different experiences on the renewing of conflicts, some experience less while others experience more conflicts and others even not at all. What has not been asked here, the question of why there were several occurrences of civil wars in some post-conflict states and not in others? Although, (Fearon, James D, and Latin, 2013) introduced the variable “War Prior” and has been used in many analyses in order to help explained its current inconsistent direction. “Variable war prior” did not measure any post-conflicts states wars. This might link to another factor that is related to the history of civil wars, in causing another conflict like geographical location.

A state’s geographical location plays a role not only in identifying the zone of civil war but it also helps in assessing the risk of civil war. This factor gives a better understanding of the
relationship between the region and the risk of civil wars. According to previous studies findings, every region has a potential prone to civil war whether by high risk or low-risk area occurrence of civil wars. Immediately it raises a question of why others regions having a higher risk of civil wars occurrence than others. Buhang and Rod (2004) find that a high correlation to predict the occurrence of civil war in both the territorial and anti-government rebellion within the state. However, in Fox’s (2004) findings are contrary to Buhang and Rod due to lack of evidence on its correlation. Instead, insecurity or a war in the neighboring countries cause a civil war.

2.2 Social Grievances and Civil Wars

Since the 1990s, most of the researchers on the civil wars have focused on greed vs. grievance. Collier & Anke & Hoeffler 2004, investigate the causes of civil wars by using new data set of war during the period of 1965-1999, the study is related to the economic conditions such as depending on primary commodity export and low income vs. social grievances and Surprisingly the results found, social grievances such as inequality, lack of democracy, ethnicity have had a little systematic effect on risky of civil war. Many authors related to the economics field conducted different studies all viewed the social grievances as motivated by financial availability. (Fearon, James D, and Latin, 2013), (de Sosya, 2002), (Ross, 2004), Economist when further to argued that social grievances are undistinguished from criminal organizations such as Mafia and pirates that is an industry organization, generates profits from looting, and insurgent are motivated by greed and it aims is based on profitable opportunity, (Grossman, 1999).

2.2.1 Ethnicity as a cause of Civil Wars

According to economist perspective, the ethics diversity has little to cause civil war, but instead reduces its risk, except if societies are characterized by one dominant ethnic group. Contrary to the economic argument, (Elbadawi, 2002) stated that tribes and grievances are factors that play a significant role in the causes of civil wars. To Mobilize rebels personal based on one ethnics, if coincide with exclusion and marginalization of that ethnic group by discriminatory state
government could play a pivotal to cause conflicts. Any horizontal inequalities by state Regime have a risk of conflicts, especially if applied to the identified ethnic group. The Economist argument that one dominant ethnic group may cause civil war rather than been diversity is questionable. For instance, in Nigeria there are more than three hundred ethnic groups but yet there are dominated by the three major tribes of Fulani-Hausa, Yoruba and Igbo’s caused Nigeria civil war of secession another example are Sudan, Darfur civil war 2003, based ethnicity yet Sudan is adversity. This rise doubt on the issue of ethnic’s diversity. Social grievance es plays an important role in the cause of civil war. The exclusion and inequality of certain ethnics group or region by the state government have a high risk of conflict. Brinkman H.J. Attree L and Hezer S. (2013) on the social contract, found out that, horizontal inequalities including economic, Political, cultural, gender and those related to security, justice, and social services – heighten group grievances and increase the risk of violent conflict. Inequality can be address through inclusiveness, fairness, responsiveness, accountability to all social groups and measure to strengthen intergroup relations. This will mitigate the divisions that can lead to conflict, violence, and underdevelopment. Cederman L-E. Gleditsch K.S and Buhang H. (2013) all argued that social inequalities-generate grievances that in turn can motivate civil war. Researchers have developed new indicators of political and economic exclusion at the group level. Social inequalities afflicting the entire ethnic group are likely to fuel resentment and the justification to attempts to the fight are identified as injustice. The easier solution to break the cycle of violence that driven by social inequality is to involve groups or region that has been marginalized in the state-building process in order to allow them to participate in the state institutions.

2.3 Political Causes Of Civil War

Mansfield E.D and J. Synder (2007), argues that the world would probably be safer if there were more mature democracies but in transition to democratic countries become more aggressive and war-prone. The world should realize the danger of encouraging democratization where the conditions are unripe like the cases in the newly emerging countries especially the countries that emerge from civil wars. The cases of violence increase if the democratic system is not in place especially when the mass electoral politics introduced.
The end of the Cold war and collapse of the Soviet Union reduced the international conflicts and instead increased wave of civil wars outbreak. That means during the post-cold era, the world had experienced high numbers of civil wars occurrences than international conflicts. International conflicts become less problematic than civil wars. It was obvious that the creation of the new state political borders and the transition process into a mature democracy or lack of democracy has an impact on the causes of the civil wars. This might be the case with these countries, which exist out of secession. However, some studies undermined the importance of the democracy or political system of the state during the post-Soviet Union or Africa post-colonial era as one of the causes of the civil war. We need to start with the notion that a weak state has a higher risk to experience occurrences of the civil war, for example, Yugoslavia, a former Soviet Union and most of the African post-colonial countries experienced such dilemma in which civil wars become inevitable. The political system of the state and the conflict occurrences have a link. The availability of such study is there. It begins with the observation that democratic countries never fight each other. (Peter Gleditsch, Scott Gates and Harvard) studies indicated that a purely democratic or purely autocratic system or regimes do not have a higher risk of conflict-prone instead, the most dangerous one is the system in transition toward democracy. Their argument spreads facts on the conflict in former Soviet states, which experienced the transition period after the disintegration of the Soviet Union. For a country to reach the level of a mature democracy is one of the very complicated processes that could face a lot of challenges which may reach to extent of violence or even collapse of states. Autocratic states to reach a mature democracy is not an overnight process, it takes a rocky transition, which could face a lot of obstacles from the authoritarian political elites. Changes in the political system deconsolidate state institution and raise the risk of armed conflict. Semi-democracy with less stability and always develop full political turmoil and conflicts. The transition of the political system whether in democratization or autocratization can create instability.

2.3.1 Leaderships On Power Struggle and Political Exclusion

Elite power struggle, especially during a post-colonial era in Africa, Middles East, and Asia, have left many negatives legacies, which include divisive policies, militarized politics, and fierce struggles for power. Those political leaders of postcolonial have sustained these dynamics of keeping power through neo-patrimonial networks, state capture, militarization, and coercion. They
in many cases promote ideologies of “Us” vs. “them” which excluded and marginalized certain groups within the state. Domination of state structure and resources by one political party, leader or group to exclude others are so dangerous to exacerbate social divisions. This provides incentives for those excluded leaders to mobilize the group to protest, which may later escalate to conflicts. In contrary inclusiveness, policies reduce the risk of any violence to occur. (Wyk, 2007) argued that political leaders are primary holders, controllers, and distributors of powers and resources in a particular State or territory. This show how crucial the role leaders may play in the causes of the civil wars during a transition period.

2.4. Economic Causes of Civil Wars

Economist argued that the country economy, in general, is a most predictable factor of the civil war rather than specific resources. This argument got support by some authors’ analyses, which assume that resources alone are not significant to the cause of the civil war but depending on specific resources as a source of revenue to generate income for the economic growth is the threatening policy. This part reviewing economics causes of the civil wars, such as economic growth, economical structural, international trade and education.

2.4.1 Low-Income as The Risk of Civil War

Start with the most accepted economical notion that economic correlate with civil wars occurrence; “states with high -income are less likely to experience civil wars than states low-income”. Jeffery Dixon (2009) found that prosperity, development and economic growth are consistently in direction and they reduced civil wars outbreak. Although (Abouhard; 2005) is the only study that found it opposite to the true but the effects are just marginally significant. Apart from that, there is a wide agreement on the importance of the relationship between economic factors and civil war and not just its direction. However, that relationship was not so clear if it holds its analysis at the state level. Buhang and Rod (2006) found the marginally significant effect of road density but under the sub-national level, not the state level.
2.4.2 Education as a Risk of Civil War

Education plays a vital role in reducing or increasing the risk of conflicts. Education has been identified as one of the factors to contemporary conflicts. (For instance; Collier and Hoeffler:2000; 2004; Then, 2006, Barakat and Urdal, 2009; Stewart, 2002). The point discussed focused on Education as a factor that reduces the risk of conflict as well as increase. Most of the contemporary conflicts happened in the “weak” states in sub-Saharan Africa. Where youths are left idles without educational training. This might increase the risk of conflicts since the youths are the largest population in those weak states. The opposite is true by having well-informed youths it might reduce the risk of conflict. There are more studies on education and conflicts and mainly focused on relationship of education to root causes of the conflicts and pathways to the contemporary conflicts, attractive with literature above (Novelli and Cardozo,2008, Ostby and Erdal, 2010, Hilker,2010.) above all, Ostby and Erdal, 2010, who created a theoretical propositions to measure the levels, expansion and inequality to education by examining the various proposition about the link between education and the conflicts, while king (2014) identified the theoretically the pathway through which educations intertwines with the root causes and development of the identity-based on conflicts. The both author’s findings still gave a limited explanation to features of education in relation to other condition in society articulated the various theories on the root of the conflict. Numerous agree that education alone does not prompt conflict. (Gurr, 1970, Arlow, 2004.Hilker, 2010) the link between education to roots causes of conflicts by focusing on specific features of the educational system it might not produce any significant due to the dynamics of the features in those weak states.

2.4.3 Economical structure as a Risk of Civil War.

The economic structure is an economic policy that the government may pursue, are theoretically changeable in term of government policy toward change, Redistribution of wealth is one of those policies. Many studies have examined the role of the structure of the economy and they found that vertical economy inequality (as measured by Gini coefficients) cause a civil war. However, Sweeney (2003) had a different finding that supporting a curvilinear relationship. Investment and
industrialization are other aspects of the economic structure that conciliate the effect of the civil war, although industrialization may have a curvilinear relationship with conflicts. However, both finding are tentative. Reynal-Querol (2002) used the same method but the finding was different while Christenson (2001) used the static measured of industrialization but the outcome is similar to Reynal-Querol (2002) studies.

2.4.4 Trade as a Risk of Civil War

Economist views Trade as one of the predictable factors of the civil wars. In case if the state, use particular exports of primary commodities as the main source of its trade. This argument match with idea that one particular type of primary commodities has significant evidence that associate with higher risk of civil occurrence, but there are no previous studies of the primary commodities exports that shown total percentage of trade instead of a study that showed the ratio of particular items of trade to state GDP.

2.4.5 Inequality

On the politics of inequality, exclusive and marginalization, there is increasing recognition that it is the nature of the inequality, rather than the extent of inequality, that determines the likelihood of the conflicts. Inequalities that align or correlated with specific culture, ethnic identities are more likely to result to cause of the civil war or violence. Especially when there are ‘multi-dimensional inequalities’- where certain groups are categorically defined by culture and they experienced or faced multiple forms of political, economic, social, security, injustice, and the cultural realm. Often these forms of inequalities, exclusion, and marginalization interact and compound one another. Politically unequal based on land and natural resources for an instant that may result from the lack of power and decision-making. A strong sense of collective injustice, due to actual or perceived exclusion based on social or cultural identity or regional part of any country, can increase a group’s feelings of been isolated from the whole nation. This may lead to animosity and resentment. Over time, such tension can foster that certain group to mobilize them and fuel conflict. It is not only the relatives deprived who may instigate violence but also involve the privileged elite (leadership), that fear of losing power and benefits. Government responses to those group are so significant to
determine the outcome of violent. If the state reacted harshly to specific non-violent protests, as opposed to seeking to address exclusion, then the chances of conflict are more likely to occur.

2.5 Criticisms

This section is examining the missing explanation on history and geography, political, economic and social perspectives on the causes of civil war. This thesis had reviewed these factors and finds a mixed empirical supports and missing explanation from the first three variables of history and geography, political, economic, while Ethnic factor under Social grievances are considered to be significant but it also misses a certain explanation on the role that it may play in causing conflict after secession if, is politicized.

2.5.1 Missing Explanation on History and Geography Variables

Scholars from the previous studies on civil wars found that history was so significant, if a country experienced civil war in the past, the risk for conflict renewal is much higher than in-state without civil war experience. This argument is questionable because some of the states with civil wars experience did not engage in any further war after the first one. It raises a question of, “why some countries experience recurring of civil wars and others not?” For example, countries like Congo, Burundi, Iraq, Niger, Iran, and Uganda all have experienced civil wars recurrences where conflict broke out not once, but in several occasion, while others countries like Greece, Costa Rica, Argentina are only experienced single civil war without any recurrence of another conflict. According to (Licklider, 1995; Doyle & Sambanis, 2001; and Hoddie & Rothchild, 2001) the explanation of the civil wars recurrence is related to previous wars. The earlier wars pave a way for another one to occur in later years. And the reasons are whether because the real grievances of the original war were not being addressed, or because the previous conflicts had created tribal ’s division, making it difficult for communities to live in cohesion with each other after the war, or because the war ended in favor of certain groups and left unresolved issue. (Walter, 2004) on his work does the conflict beg the occurrence of another conflict? According to Walter studies none of the above-mentioned reasons could be prone to another civil war if the state established a good political system after the war. The political system that is able to manage different groups’ interest
peacefully, provide an adequate guarantee of group protection, or accommodate growing demands for political participation can address all the above-mentioned problems by the scholar and avoided the further occurrence of another civil war. But yet there was not a specific political system that could be identified as the best amongst the others. This research instead discerns the civil wars reoccurrence are related to previous wars, especially if the previous conflicts had created ethnic division then it can create differences amongst the communities to live in cohesion with each other after the war. In this case, although ethnicity alone cannot directly explain the onset of conflict can be understood by taking the patrimonial characteristic of the post-colonial Africa states as the similar case to post-secession, in which ethnic utilize as a tool for political struggle. The ethnic emerges in a term of a secondary factor which plays role in causes of civil war if ethnic has been politicized.

According to (Buhaug and Gates, 2002) Geography is a prone to civil war, for instance, if the population is geographically scattered into more remote areas than the population that resided in the small urban areas. The risk of civil war is so high, because, it usually hard for government forces to control all parts of its territory. For instances the geography of the Congo where its population lives around edges of the huge area, with the three big cities in the further west, further south-east and further North. It’s easy for the rebellion to start a civil war rather than in a country like Singapore that could be a nightmare for rebellion. Since the insurgents are usually small in numbers compared to the state forces that are huge in numbers, insurgents will always look safe location to enable them to hide from the massive government forces in order to garner social support for their activities. So the geographical location of the state play role on the cause of civil war, for instance, a region or country with a mountainous or forest terrain and poorly served road more prone to conflict. It will increase the insurgency since they have a safe environment to carry out their activities, These variables make it difficult for the government to control insurgencies, rather than in total length of the road network, normalized by the area of the district that eases insurgents to start organizing a rebel’s force.

Geography as prone to conflict raises the question of why others countries with a similar pre-conditions but yet did not experience civil war. In comparison to the two paradoxes, the study rose another question whether there is a significant effect that might be caused by societies living in such geographical location. Collier and Hoeffler (2004): studies on Greed and Grievances, found that societies play a significant role on the causes of the civil war and their argument was that, civil war
is likely to occur in societies that are homogenous than in those which are heterogeneous. Contrary to study of Halvard and Gates, Geographical location may not be a safe haven for insurgents as they suggested, based on the masses of societies who are living there, if the societies are heterogeneous with multi-ethnic background then the rebel organization will always found it difficult to mobilize for the recruitment of their insurgents this may lead the rebel organization to focus their recruitment on the specific ethnics groups and excludes others ethnics group, and contrary to that state government may intervene and recruit a counter-insurgents from those excluded ethnics group. For instances Darfur civil war outbreak, when the war broke out between government and the main rebel groups, Justice and Equality Movement (JEM). The term counter-insurgency is a military subject when a regime confronted by insurgents it develops counterinsurgency. The logic is that government recruited individuals from the constituency of insurgency train and turn them into the counter-insurgency unit. To fight along the government regular troops in order to defeat insurgent and this is so far legitimate. Why government recruited individuals from the rebel constituency because those individuals know local Languages, local culture, local terrain and they are to supplement the regular forces in fighting insurgency but what happened in Darfur was totally different. The recruitment of counter-insurgency base on ethnic’s groups (Arabs ethnic groups) and used to encounter insurgency tribes against Fur and other African tribes who were the tribes of the rebellion leaders. The Government used the ethnic-based militias (Janjaweed) to mobilize their ethnic to attack others ethnics groups and the similar scenario occurred in Rwanda when Hutus the tribe of the president were used as counter-insurgent tribes against Tutsi who were the tribe of rebellion leader. The ethnics groups are not the problem but the problem is government counter-insurgency strategy. The government should not be allowed to use ethnic against another ethnic group in order to remain in power. This indicates that geography is influenced by another factor which needed to be investigated further.

2.5.2 Missing Explanation on Political Variable is Political Manipulation

The political literature concentrated on the political institution as the cause of the civil wars. Collier and Hoeffler (2000), Sambanis (2001) Hegre (2001) and Ellingsen (2000) found the countries with a midlevel democracy are more prone to civil war than in countries with mature democracies and autocracies. Previous studies on the links between the political systems of the states and conflicts
are available. It starts will the observation that democracy states will never go to war again each other. Nils P. Gleditsch, Scott Gate, and Halvard Hegre introduced and identified the different propensities on internal armed conflicts of the different political system and they found the states that are under transition toward democracy are more risk to conflict onset than the states that are purely in full democracy and purely in full autocratic systems. This argument has proved the considerable evidence on the conflict in the former Soviet Union which experienced the transition of the political system in midst of the disintegration of the central state. The road to democracy is complicated and can be marked by conflict and even the collapse of the state. Autocratic countries do not become mature overnight. These countries go through the rocky transition in politics are mixed with the authoritarian elite’s politics in a volatile way. Political change deconsolidates political institutions and heightens the risk of conflict. The semi-democratic political system is less stable and development inside such state is faced with turmoil and conflict. Political change is prone to conflict whether in form of democratic transition or autocratic transitions can create instability. The loss of the legitimacy by regime induces the discontented group to struggle against it. If the transition toward autocratic then the consolidation of the political institution also implies increasing repression. Political systems of the state cover the political aspects of the state, its concern about who should govern the state. Leadership conflicts refer to differences in a power struggle between different parties or within one party about the leadership of the state. This is especially true in the case of the weak countries when parties’ leaders within one party or different parties started to strive for the power of the privileged position in the state. The high demand for political reform can weaken the powers of some political elites, in order for them to preserve the power, they create conflict. That led into the Political manipulation of the communities by the political elites in order to gains their political scores. For instance, like what occurred in former Yugoslavia when Slobodan Milosevic manipulated the Serbs minority in Croatia, caused a devastating war based on the ethnic line that killed tens of thousands and displaced Hundreds of thousands of people. Serbs and Croats had never fought each other before secession. the most antagonistic adversaries between them only happened after the disintegration of former Yugoslavia. Therefore, States under political transformation will always face challenges from the political elites who seek to advance political objectives, in order to remain in power. Contrary to political literature (Reynal-Querol, 2002) investigated countries with the different political system by developing a simple theoretical model that captures the relationship between the political system and civil war onset and she find that, the
proportional system turned out to have a lower risk of civil war outbreak than the plurality systems. The author’s main idea was that, the more inclusive the political system, the higher the risk of civil war onset, therefore the low inclusive in the political system lowers the risk of civil war outbreak. Reynal-Queral study displays how importantly the structure of the political system can affect the likelihood of the civil war in a democratic system. The result indicated that there are some countries with higher levels of democracy suffered a period of violence; therefore, having a mature democracy does not seem to protect those states against violence. Reynal-Queral furthermore, argued that a representative system of the voters in government is more significant than the level, of democracy per se. contrary to the previous authors who argued that, the more inclusive the system, the lower the risk of civil war. If the voters play a significant role in the causes of conflict then the study regress to a question that asked what kind of societies are more prone to conflict as it was raised in this thesis, Collier, and Hoeffler (2004) answered this question by arguing that, heterogeneous societies are more prone to conflict than homogenous. Therefore, many studies on the conflict in heterogeneous societies and how to control it is often have been investigated in the political science literature. However, there is no agreement about which system promotes or reduces the outbreak of civil war in a potentially conflictive society. Not all multi-ethnic societies experience conflict. Therefore, the complexities to answer the question whether the democratic system can affect social behavior in heterogeneous societies will always continue. For instance, (Horowitz, 1985) on his defend, argue that in the heterogeneous societies, the democratic system is better than the proportional system because it motivates the creation of coalitions among minorities or smallest group. Contrary to Horowitz,(Lijphart, 1985) argued that, in heterogeneous societies, the proportional system is better than the democratic system because it allows the formation of the segment parties. The political system in explaining civil war is scarce, and, as this study pointed out before, there is a puzzle in the political science literature about what system is better to be implemented in the heterogeneous societies in order to avoid the conflict.

2.5.3 Missing Explanation on Economic Variable

Economist studies contemplated the causes of the civil war based on financial viability. According to theoretical studies such as (Addison, Tony and Le Billon, 2000) the understanding of the civil wars based on the availability of resources in order to finance war (Particularly the lootable
resources). While (Auty, 1998), (Collier, Paul, and Hoeffler, 2001), (de Sosya, Indra and Neumayer, 2007), (Ross, 2004) and others provided evidence that the existence of primary commodity exports massively increases the risk of civil war outbreak. A state with a haft of its national income generated from Primary commodity exports has a higher risk of conflict than a state without primary commodity exports. In general, the economists’ argument is that conflicts are far more likely to occur because of Economic opportunities rather than grievances. The availability of natural resources is a sufficient variable to measure the duration of the civil war (how long the war will last) rather than the war onset. However social scholars indicated that civil wars are often occurred due to political objectives whether to control state or to create a new sovereign state. Any objectives apart from political will change the reason why civil war is fought. Both dimensions of war differ from one another. Whether to create a state or to change the government, so for civil war to occur, intergroup antagonism and the grievance must exist, leaders must emerge to coordinate and manage recruitment, and resources and supplies must be available to support the movement over time. Therefore, resources and supplies availability is just one of an element that rebel needs to sustain their movement in order to reach organizational goals. Rebels has many financial support whether from the incumbent government by booty that they seized from government forces after achieving victories, or from Diaspora by citizen living abroad and also it could be from the society living under liberated areas, or from neighboring countries that are against incumbent government, for example, Tanzania supporting Ugandan rebels to help overthrown president the Idi Amin Dada. So, for this reason, the causes of civil war deserve more additional studies, especially on the ethnic and political issues that may risk the conflict onset. Moreover, the leaders of the rebel’s organizations are always prompted to a conflict against the government due to genuine and severe grievance unlike the economist perspective that, viewed rebellions as an ultimate manifesto of organized crime. According to (Grossman, 1999) the insurgents are compared to bandits or pirates. The economist sees the rebel organizations as the predations of the productive economic activities. The techniques carried by economist do not help its argument compared to compelling historical detail presented by histories of the protest, the economist approach seems arcane and technocratic that is why the grievance theory contributed little support on causes of the civil war under economist studies. The economist misses the significant argument by social scientists that, call the collective action Problem. Justices revenge and relief from grievances are for the betterment of the public. Therefore, if a citizen is affected by severe grievance from the government, that citizen may
prefer to rebel against the government rather than to continue to suffer from the grievances inflicted on him/her by the state, in order to benefit from the Justices their rebellion might achieve. So for the rebellion to achieve justices it probably needs to achieve victory to help on the enlargement of the organization because the small-scale rebellions face all the costs and risk of punishment since it was small compared to government forces. Consequently, individuals will be much more willing to join a large rebellion than smalls ones. However, obviously, the rebellion has to start small before they can become large. For the enlargement of the organization, rebel needs financial support to coordinate the movement in order to achieve justice.

2.5.4 Missing Explanation on Social Grievances Variable

In conclusion of this section, the social variables consist of religious, culture and ethnicity but this study focuses only on ethnicity as the main factor on the causes of civil war if it politicized. Politicization of the tribes is the missing explanation from the previous literature. For instances, Collier and Hoeffler (2004) argued that diverse societies are more prone to conflict if one ethnic group dominates its population by 45% than in a homogenous society. This research points out that even homogenous society is not safe from civil war occurrences’. Somalia is an example of a homogeneous society that experienced civil war despite been cultural, linguistically and religiously homogeneity. For this reason, even homogenous society does not guarantee the absence of civil war onset. The social scholars to view ethnicity as the main factor on the causes of civil war, its underestimated the complications of the societies and politics, distort scholars, attention from the real causes of the conflict, however, this study finds out from the previous literature that, ethnicity usually emerge as a secondary factor. Since ethnicity alone is not a prone to civil war then it emerges only as a secondary factor, that means if the tribe is politicized it’s become prone to conflict. This thesis is trying to analyze the politicization of the ethnic group after secession as the prone to civil war. (Webb, 2015) pointed out that “the secessionist groups formed coalitions through the amalgamation of formerly independent communities including ethnics and Kingdoms- for example, Igbo of Biafra, the N’Goyo, Loango and kakango Kingdoms of Cabinda, and Gao, Mali, and Songhai empires of Azawad- as shared recollections of self-government created a unity of purpose and direct toward independence from the parent state”. These ethnics group amalgamated due to the purpose of attaining independent from the predecessor state once that goal is achieved.
and there is no more common enemy the society with turn against each other like what occurred in Former Yugoslavia after the secession of the union, it followed by several civil wars based on the tribal line.
Chapter Three

3. Theoretical Framework

This chapter will provide an explanation of how the politicization of ethnicity is linked to the civil wars after secession. Based on the hypothesis of this thesis “Politicization of ethnicity as the causal factor of civil war after secession” In order to answer the research question “what are the roots causes of civil war after secession?” This study selected instrumentalism approach as an appropriate theory to explains how politicization of ethnicity after secession could cause civil war.

The theoretical analysis will focus on the instrumentalist approach, however; it is important to define, describe and explain the term politicization in order to address certain questions in this chapter such as; how the politicization of ethnicity is linked to the civil war after secessions, who politicize and how it had been politicized. This study asserted that ethnicity is not a cause of civil wars after secession but rather politicization of ethnicity. The theoretical framework of this thesis based on instrumentalist’s perspective that views ethnicity as an instrument that can be manipulated or organized in order to achieve political goals. Therefore, ethnicity is not prone to a conflict, but only it becomes prone if it’s politicized and linked into the history of violence, serious grievances whether it is true or false, it leads to fear of others as a threat, only in this case ethnicity can emerge as misconception based on social fragmentation.

Several studies view ethnicity as the main cause of civil wars after secession because of ethnic hatred, cultural differences, and ethnic border. Contrary to those views, this thesis argues that ethnicity is not the cause of the civil wars but instead the politicization of ethnicity is what can cause civil wars after secession. Instrumentalists theory is relevant and applicable to this study because it provides a useful explanation on the process by which ethnicity is politicized by elites. Instrumentalists assert that the way in which ethnic group can be manipulated to threaten the existence of a state that emerged out of secession. politicization of ethnicity initially may rotate around a single symbol such as language or another common characteristic. However, in order to raise internal unity for more effective hatred for the other group, it needs an increasing pressure of political rhetoric that includes a systematic incitement in the away that allow the member of the ethnic group to feel similar to each other and collectively different from others. The
insinuation is that for the ethnic group to involve in any ethnic conflict there should be a well-organized campaign that redefined the victim group as worthless, outside of web mutual obligations, a threat to the people, immoral sinners. For instance, Croatia seceded from former Yugoslavia on 25 June 1991. However, the Slobodan Milosevic’s political rhetoric that instigated fear to Serbs minority in Croatia, caused a devastating war based on the ethnic line that killed tens of thousands and displaced Hundreds of thousands of people. Serbs and Croats had never fought each other before secession. the most antagonistic adversaries between them only happened after the disintegration of former Yugoslavia. This indicate that; the politicization of ethnicity has a significant effect on the occurrence of civil wars after secession.

Some of the leading scholars have described civil wars that occurred after the disintegration of the former Yugoslavia, as an inevitable post-secession resurgence of previously suppressed historical ethnic rivalries (ethnic hatred). An analogy of this approach is Samuel Huntington’s thesis that view the post-communist era as “the fault lines between civilization will be the battle line of future”. These scholars, However, underestimated the politicization of the ethnic conflict after secession. for instance, Bosnia relished long periods of calmness as a multiethnic community in former Yugoslavia, without a single experience of any ethnic rivalries. Serbs and Croats the most antagonistic opponent today had never fought each other before the disintegration, it is only after the secession, they become hostile to each other. The millennium they spent as neighbors during the union of Yugoslavia was marked more by mutual indifference than by mutual hostility. Therefore, the causes of civil wars after secession cannot be explained by hitherto inevitable ethnics hatreds because the previous relations were marked by mutual difference rather than mutual hostile. the politicization of the ethnicity after secession played a significant role in the causes of conflict.

The assertion that view social diversity (cultural differences) as the main causes of ethnic conflict after secession is questionable, why because there are countries that are multi-ethnic but yet did not experience any single ethnic conflicts. Eritrea is one of those states that did not experience ethnic conflict after its secession from Ethiopia. Leave alone the cultural differences even homogenous countries are not safe from the civil war. Somalia is an example of a homogeneous society that experienced civil war despite been cultural, linguistically and religiously homogeneity. For this reason, even homogenous society does not guarantee the absence of civil war onset. The social scholars to view ethnicity as the main factor on the causes
of civil war, its underestimated the complications of the societies and politics, distort scholars, attention from the real causes of the conflict, however, this study finds out from the previous literature that, ethnicity usually emerge as a secondary factor. Since ethnicity alone is not a prone to civil war then it emerges only as a secondary factor, that means if the ethnic group is politicized it’s become prone to conflict. This thesis is trying to analyze the politicization of the ethnic group after secession as the prone to civil war. this study argued that “the secessionist groups formed coalitions through the amalgamation of formerly independent communities including ethnic and Kingdoms- for example, Igbo of Biafra, the N’Goyo, Loango and kakango Kingdoms of Cabinda, and Gao, Mali, and Songhai empires of Azawad- as shared recollections of self-government created a unity of purpose and direct toward independence from the state”. These ethnics group amalgamated due to the purpose of attaining independent from the predecessor state once that goal is achieved and there is a no more common enemy the society with turn against each other like what occurred in Former Yugoslavia after the secession of the union, it followed by several ethics conflicts. the reason is not that of ethnic differences, but because of the ethnic’s politicization.

Cultural differences, with regard to language distinction, indicated clearly that, linguistic differences between the ethnic groups are not significant in the causes of the conflict. For instance, Bosnia seceded from former Federal Yugoslavia although all the ethnic groups spoke Serb-Croatian, in spite of the scarce divergences, it experiences the civil war after secession, on the version, Slovenian is peculiarity at different Slavic language but did not experience instead as Bosnia. “Slovenian with a clearly distinct language but managed to secede peacefully from the federal state of Yugoslavia without exercising any violence after secession unlike Bosnia which is hard to differentiate linguistically instead follow with atrocities after the separation”

The final assumption was that after secession “traditional ethnics borders will replace the political and ideologies boundaries” ethnic borders is not risk to cause ethnic conflicts as long as the relation of an ethnic group is marked by mutual indifference. To view Ethnics borders as the cause of ethnic conflicts is questionable; regard to the definition of the ethnicity as procedures that interpret the random drawing of the ethnic borders through attribution of “us vs. them”, that means ethnicity is all about pursuing certain goals. Therefore, the demonstration of Ancient or profoundly embedded opposition in the conflict may not automatically be adequately proven
because ethnic borders are not natural, but rather persistently redefined. This study views the ethnic borders as “the created boundaries between “us and them” is persistently being renegotiated” For instance, the Kalenjin ethnic group in Kenya are only come to be known during the colonial time. That means the roots of the Kalenjin before colonialism is not traceable. as a result, the elderly people in Kenya today are not familiar with any existence of the Kalenjin before colonialism, and that is well known by educated Kenyan that the ethnic borders were drawn by European colonizer through their policy of divide and rule. For that reason, Kalenjin are constructed by colonizer, therefore, Kalenjin as a tribe appeared to be more politicized.

3.1 Politicization; Definition and Explanation of the Concept

The notion of politicization plays a significant role in how political power on different governmental levels in a society is attained. Therefore, the concept of politicization in this thesis portrays the ambition to control state authority or geographical area when the political elites struggle and attempt to obtain political power or are able to influence political decisions. However, this did not display whether politicization is a negative or positive. However, this thesis focused on negative politicization. In addition, the analysis will portray the problems on which the notion of politicization may cause civil war after secession, especially in a State that contained multi-ethnic groups. The meaning of the concept of politicization in this research is asserted by the Author of this study who found difficulty in finding a specific scientific definition. The study argues that politicization rotates around power struggle and maintenance of power in a State for that reason the aim of politicization is to control or preserve power.

Politicization is described as a phenomenon with a composition of the following features. The gaining of political character by a group, institution or activities; the obtaining of power by an individual or political interests and activities; and characteristic of behavior aimed at gaining or preservation of power. Based on this phenomenon, it can be argued that the activities aimed at obtaining political character very and its relevance to power and politic that intended for the acquisition and preservation of power.

3.2 What is Ethnicity?

Ethnicity is referring to the oldest human community. Ethnicity, in the sense of modern social science, is a concept that emerged in the 1950s. its originated from a Greek word “ethnos” that
means large, and a similar group of people. The modern meaning of ethnicity is referred to “familiar group of people sharing culture, an origin or language”. Ever since the earliest civilizations, the meaning of Ethnicity indicated a lack of individuation, the lack of differentiation within a group developed in response to the perception of “other”. The meaning and function of ethnicity are used as a tool for classification of people into “us” and “them” and that stand up to this day. Ethnicity is seen as an instrument whose main function is to stress and reproduce essential social similarities and difference among groups of people. (Roberson, 2001)

3.3 Definition of the Civil War
A civil war is a fight that occurs between a rebel group within the same state fighting against their central government or less commonly, between two countries created formerly from one united country. The aims of the rebel group are to take control of a country or region in order to achieve independence for such region or to change government policies. It is a devastating conflict, often involving a regular confrontation between armed forces, that is sustained, organized and large-scale. Civil war may result in large numbers of the casualties and the consumption of the large resource.

3.4 Definition of Secession
Secession is an expression of the interest to break away from a sovereign state or union with an intention to create an independent State. It became a common tendency in the world after the collapsed of Soviet Union because of injustice in handling regional affairs by the central governments.
Whenever a region declares secession from any sovereign state it causes civil war, in fact, any secession attempt whether is publicly declared or not is viewed by states governments as threat and betrayal of its sovereignty. In case if any region tries to secede from any sovereign state or union that region could face a risk of becoming a victim of the resentment and suspicion by its state government for breaching state sovereign. For instances like Katanga secession civil war in Zaire currently the Democratic Republic of Congo, Biafra war of Secession in Nigeria and Eritrea War of secession against Ethiopia.
However, this thesis focus on the repercussions of successful secession like in former Yugoslavia was the successor's states experience civil war after secession. the political crisis in the 1980s in
Republic of Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia resulted to its disintegration (secession) but after the secession the successor's countries like Kosovo, Bosnia, and Herzegovina, Albania, Macedonia experiences civil wars. many scholars blamed ethnicity as the roots causes of civil war after secession but this study viewed ethnicity as an instrument that can only cause a civil war if it is politicized. This thesis argued that Politicization of ethnicity is a roots causes of civil war after secession. former Yugoslavia is an experimental example.

3.5 Politicization of Ethnicity After Secession as The Cause of Civil Wars

This thesis is trying to analyze the politicization of the ethnicity after secession as the prone to civil war. the study pointed out that “the secessionist groups formed coalitions through the amalgamation of formerly independent communities including ethnics and Kingdoms- for example, Igbo of Biafra, the N’Goyo, Loango and kakango Kingdoms of Cabinda, and Gao, Mali, and Songhai empires of Azawad- as shared recollections of self-government created a unity of purpose and direct toward independence from the parent state”. These ethnics group amalgamated due to the purpose of attaining independent from the predecessor state once that goal is achieved and there is no more common enemy the society with turn against each other like what occurred in Former Yugoslavia after the secession of the many countries from the union, it followed by several civil wars based on the ethnic line (Webb, 2015).

On the process of secession those amalgamated independent communities and the ethnicity were mobilized base on the ethnic groups and united mainly by common grievances under the nationalist movement but once the movement achieved the secession, the mobilization of amalgamated ethnics groups will change from the nationalist movement to politicization of ethnicity. The disintegration will start after secession when the leaders of nationalist movement maneuvered to inherit power. The leaders who emerge from large ethnics’ groups unable to withstand the temptation of using an ethnic as an instrument to consolidate their political ambitions on how to attain power. an experimental example is former Yugoslavia on which Slobodan Milosevic was a former acting head of State and first of his Kind to be Charged with tried by an international tribunal for committing serious violence of international humanitarian law, including genocide. He was a Serbian leader when former Yugoslavia countries experienced the bloodiest wars after secession as hundreds of
thousands of people were killed and displaced by the wars in Croatia, Bosnia, and Kosovo”
Roberson, B. Agneza, 2007
Politicization of ethnicity after secession consists of three variables political Elites as the main actors, using mass media and political rhetoric as their mechanism for politicization.

3.5.1 Political Elites

The role of political elites and their decision to maintain power display a negative role after secession, if in their rhetoric they choose to instigate fear of others. For instance, Croatia seceded from former Yugoslavia on 25 June 1991. However, the Slobodan Milosevic’s political rhetoric that instigated fear to Serb minority in Croatia caused a devastating war based on the ethnic line that killed tens of thousands and displaced Hundreds of thousands of people. Furthermore, the Milosevic’s rhetoric caused chaos in Bosnia-Herzegovina after the referendum declaration which was boycotted by Serbs minority. Therefore, this study asserts that the higher the frustration, the higher the quality of aggression against the source of frustration. Instigation of fear is stronger emotional rhetoric that can be used by the political elite to manipulate ethnic group in order to control or preserve power after secession. the consequence of such rhetoric can encourage radicalization and militant against the identified threat. This is especially the case with the politicization of ethnicity after secession when the political elite polarizes the ethnic group by creating fear and hate against another ethnic group.

Ethnicity is identified as an instrument that can be manipulated or organized in order to achieve political goals. Therefore, ethnicity is not prone to a conflict, but only become prone if it’s politicized and linked into the history of violence, serious grievances whether it is true or not, it leads to fear of others as a threat, only in this case ethnicity can emerge as misconception based on social fragmentation. This indicates that ethnic identity can be used by political elites as an instrument to mobilize for violence or conflict in order to access power. This study views Political elites as the main motive behind politicization of ethnicity after secession. the elites play an important role in order to determine whether the politicization of ethnicity is going to take place through militants or peaceful approach in order to achieve their goals. In this regard, the elites do not hesitate to switch the powerful myths and symbol into kinds of experience that can be used for political gain. For instance, the elites will opt to the historical events and
victories, event defeats that need more clarification merely to let the whole ethnic group believe that the problem can only be addressed by force. The political elites serve their purpose as an opportunistic and self-promoting at the expense of the whole ethnic group.

3.5.2 Mass Media

Media is used as an instrument for the politicization of ethnicity, it plays a very significant role in mediation between politics and people. It is the main direct tool that links the majority of citizens to politics. Political elites used mass media as an instrument to broadcast their speeches and propaganda. Especially through television and radio that cover a large area in spreading the messages of the leaders. For an instant, Nigeria has experienced civil war after secession, (called Biafra civil war). The war erupted on May 30, 1967, when lieutenant colonel Ojukwe declared the Eastern region of Nigeria as an independent state and name it the Republic of Biafra through the radio. Ojukwe immediately after the declaration of independence cut off relation with the federal government and seized its properties in the region. After the secession of the Eastern region, lieutenant colonel Ojukwe used a radio Biafra as an instrument to spread his speeches and propaganda to his ethnic group (Igbo). The aim was to politicized Igbo ethnic group by inciting hatred against the northern ethnic group (Fulani- Hausa) and western ethnic group (Yoruba). The federal government under General Gowon made some efforts to reconcile with Ojukwe but all his efforts failed and he left with no option than to suppress the secessionist by using force. The Three years’ civil war ended on January 1970, when Nigeria Federal government forces defeated the secessionist. Ojukwe escaped to Ivory Coast and thereafter, Biafra integrated to Nigeria, but radio Biafra continues to on politicization of ethnicity up to the current days under a new leader call Mazi Nnamdi Kanu.

The power of media is not only in their role to survey the events of the day and make their focus on public attention but significantly is to interpret the meaning of the events and put them in contexts and speculate about their consequence. Since the people are not only selective to the kind of things they pay attention to but also to the sources upon which they rely, people often select the sources that are often related to their own views. Because of many televisions and radios stations, most people have already resulted to access only one station as the source of their daily news. As a result, the information about what they know and understand contemporary
politics often depends on what and how that radio or television branded to report. media cover mass communication of news and ideas and also has the ability to break through a large number of people and influences their belief systems. Contemporary media has been using for dispersion of political information rapidly to a large number of people.

3.5.3 Political Rhetoric

Political Rhetoric is an address of the political elites to people or speeches directed to the nations that are an integrant constituent in history. therefore, political rhetoric is an influential force in history. it can provide significant insight into certain historical phenomena. for that reason, it can be argued that a great number of people can be convinced to accept changes within the different aspects whether its social, political or even technological. Political rhetoric is an art of using language as a symbolic means so as to persuade or influence people who by nature respond to symbols. Through the political rhetoric, political elites voice feeling of those they address. This aiming for social (ethnic group) control is distinctly expressed in political discourse. It is what makes political rhetoric a serious matter of interest. Political elites use rhetoric in both as a mode of thought and as an instrument of expression and actions and that could be achieved through the use of language. The basic use of the language is to convey messages; the language articulates all views about politics. In its dimension, language is used to influence public knowledge, belief, and actions on political matters. Furthermore, the language can be used to produce conflict and consensus. As a result, it also produces empowerment of certain group and marginalizes others. Based on the above explanation, political rhetoric as an instrument can be identified as the best channel for any political elites to win the broad support for speaking in public. To echo Hitler statement here that “no man could be a true leader if he did not have a genuine ability to move them by his words” similarly to Hitler statement this study asserts that if any political elites have that ability to move the masses by his words then, in the same manner, those leaders would not hesitate to use that ability in order manipulate the ethnic groups for their own political interest after secession. like what happened in former Yugoslavia when Slobodan Milosevic used political rhetoric to instigated fear to Serb minority in Croatia caused a devastating war based on the ethnic line that killed tens of thousands and displaced Hundreds of thousands of people. Furthermore, the Milosevic’s rhetoric caused chaos in Bosnia-Herzegovina after the referendum
declaration which was boycotted by Serbs minority. political rhetoric plays a significant role by
inculcating the policies of “us vs them” into ethnic individuals. As the result, ethnic identity can
be used for political purposes, as long as the ethnic group shared common aspects such as
customs, linguistics, and historical background. The insinuation is that any political elites are
able to win more people by speaking rather than writing and the most successful movement on
the globe are led by greater speakers, not by greater writers. Therefore, each political message
has its outcome that resulted in the political consequences. Political rhetoric is classified into
rhetorical styles such as charismatic and demagogic.
Charismatic rhetoric is a political speech that appeals to reasoned argument and intellectual
explanation on any issues at hands. For instance, the salient issues are presented clearly in a
moderate language without any charges of emotional distractions. Political elites who use this
type of speeches usually avoid an emotional explanation because charismatic speeches strive to
produce genuine information, that allows the people to make a rational choice. Charismatic
political elites articulate ideas and emotions in the way that make their audience to feel they have
a representative. The people who associated with charismatic speakers have faith in whatever
they plead for.
Demagogic speech is unlike Charismatic rhetoric; it is an appeal to emotion with a clear intent to
turmoil prejudice, hatred, and bigotry. Political elites who use this type of speeches are
opportunistic and their main goals are to make people believe on what they want them to believe,
thus leaving little room for truth and fairness. A demagogue relies mainly on propaganda. Such
as intentionally use of suggestion, irrelevant emotional appeals, and pseudo-proof to bypass
human rational decision-making processes. A demagogue political elites use available social or
political problem in order to advance his or her own personal position.
Chapter Four: South Sudan-A Background Overview

4. Introduction

The modern land of the Republic of South Sudan Ruled by Ottoman Empire under dynasty of Mohammed Ali Pasha in 1820-1885, Mahdiyah rule in 1885-1898 and the Angola Egyptian condominium rule 1899 until Sudanese independence in 1956. In the post-independence Sudan, the people of South Sudan experienced two different civil wars; firstly in 1962 which ended by the signing of Addis Ababa peace agreement in 1972, as a result Southern Sudan were granted Autonomous regional government that lasted until 1983, immediately the second civil war erupted out and ended with the signing of the comprehensive peace agreement (CPA) in 2005. The (CPA), agreement granted people of South Sudan right of self-determination that is to be exercised through a referendum after the period of six years whether to stay unite under Sudan or to secede and form a new state, on 9 January 2011. The people of South Sudan voted overwhelmingly by 98% for the secession and South Sudan has officially declared an independent state on 9 July 2011. The Republic of South Sudan is the United Nation member state (UN), a Member of Africa Union (AU) and Member of the intergovernmental state authority on development (IGAD).

Two years after secession, South Sudan was seized by a subversive civil war that killed thousands and displaced millions of its citizen. The Conflict erupted along the ethnic line in December 2013, when Dinka’s militias killed Nuer civilian in Juba, and that prompted a circle of revenge on Dinka civilian in Nuer Villages. The International media and observers commenced to viewed ethnicity (ethnic hatred, cultural difference, and ethnic borders) as the main cause of the conflict based on the fact that former vice president Riek Machar was a Nuer and president Kiir was a Dinka. This undermined the causal factors of the ethnic conflict after secession in South Sudan. This thesis found that the Politicization of ethnicity was the main cause of ethnic conflict after secession. The politicization of ethnicity consists of three variables, political Elites (Machar and Kiir) as the main actors, using mass media and political rhetoric as their tools for politicization. Therefore, ethnicity (ethnic hatred, cultural difference, and ethnic borders) is not the cause of the civil war after secession unless if politicized.

The power struggle between president Salva Kiir and his vice president Riek Machar within the ruling party, Sudan people liberation army (SPLM) was the main motive behind the
The politicization of ethnicity, that led into ethnic conflict after secession in South Sudan. the party leaders, religious leaders, and Regional leaders tried on different occasions to reconcile president Kiir and his vice president Riek Machar but all in vain. the politicization of the ethnicity commenced immediately after the dismissal of Machar and the entire cabinets from the government by president Kiir. Machar and Cabinets dismissal was viewed as a full-blown national crisis underway but contrary to that Machar used charismatic rhetoric that persuaded the Nuer ethnic groups not to respond especially the youths, by stating that “president Kiir have acted according to his constitutional right, he has planned to take his seat in Parliament”.

The power struggle between President Kiir and His Vice president Riek Machar turned into ethnic politic when president Kiir seeks for the ethnic card. instead of resolving their difference within the party, Kiir opted to dropped his ethnic group in their power struggle with Machar by using demagogic rhetoric on his tour in Greater Bahr el Ghazal. The purpose of his campaign in greater Bahr el Ghazal region was to raise an internal unity among the members of the Dinka ethnic group in order to feel similar to each other and feel collectively different from Nuer ethnic Group. president Kiir instilled a systematic incitement against the Nuer ethnic group by using Bor Massacre as a slogan to redefined Machar and Nuer ethnic group as worthless, outsiders, immoral sinners and a threat to the Dinka community, therefore Dinka should be ready to defend themselves against them. the politicization of the Dinka ethnic led into the recruitment of Dinka Militias under president Kiir Command.

On responding to president Kiir, Machar used mass media to convey his message to his supporters through the press conference. Mass media is a tool that, elites used for the politicization. Machar’s message played a significant role in the mobilization of Nuer ethnic group merely after the eruption of the violence in Juba. On that press conference, Machar used charismatic rhetoric to raise awareness among Nuer ethnic group to be vigilant about what President Kiir is doing with his Dinka ethnic group. the aim of that message was to caution the Nuer to be ready in case of any ethnic violence from the Dinka ethnic group. mass media has played a significant role in mediation between Machar and Nuer ethnic group. the power of media is not only on its role on surveying the event and make it focus on public attention, but significantly the media interpreted the meaning of that event and put it in contexts and speculate about the consequence.
The power struggle between president Kiir and his former vice president escalated in the full civil war after the targeted killings of the Nuer in Juba and revenge killing of Dinka by Nuer in Akobo and Bor in Jonglei state seemed to bear this out. The coup was announced seemed to be started with a fight between Nuer and Dinka soldiers in the presidential guard following a meeting of the national liberation council (NLC), which Machar and had boycotted, and in which president Kiir had condemned Riek in severe terms. President Kiir’s Government has kept this version of events, and yet they do not have strong evidence to support their claim for a coup.
4. Geography

The Republic of South Sudan is a land lock country in Northern Africa, gained its independence from Sudan on 9, July 2011, following a referendum result, voted with 98%. The country is divided into three regions such as Greater Bahr al Ghazal, Greater Equatoria, and Greater Upper Nile, these Regions comprised of ten government administrative states; Central Equatoria, Eastern Equatoria, Western Equatoria (Greater Equatoria states), Western Bahr el Ghazal, Northern Bahr el Ghazal, Lake state, Warap (Greater Bahr el Ghazal States), Unity State, Jonglei and Upper Nile (Greater Upper Nile States), Greater Pibor Administrative (GPAA) established in 2014, and added to the ten States An estimated population of the south Sudanese amount to 12,940,448 million people, according to United Nation report, July 29, 2018,

4.2. Turko-Egyptian 1820-1885
The current territory and the people of South Sudan experienced numerous struggles merely after the first foreign invasion of Turko-Egyptian forces: Mohammed Ali Pasha the Governor of
Egypt invaded Sudan in 1820, hoping to Acquired wealth and human power (slaves), and the purpose was to build a modern Military army in Egypt, in an intention to challenge Istanbul (Ottoman Empire). However, the minerals he founded was worthless, and the slaves he obtained were unable to survive and serve in the army. Therefore, the Pasha resorted to the slave trade which was the rapid commerce to acquired wealth during that time. That diversion created a great division among the Sudanese communities based on the ethnic and religious lines. As it has been argued on the previous chapter of this thesis, that ethnicity is imposed by foreign forces or elites within the tribes is proven, in fact, the first ethnics division in Sudan had been inflicted by the Pasha policies. Turko-Egyptian government under Pasha rule has exempted the Arabs ethnics group from paying taxes and issued licenses for the Arabs Merchants (the Arabs ethnics group are Muslim), in order to captured and sold the Non- Arabs tribes which are predominantly Christians and non- religious (pagans). These Africans Ethnic Groups (Black race) are identified as salves. Contrary to the exemption of taxes granted to the Arabs tribes, Pasha enforced taxes harshly on Non-Arabs ethnic groups. Consequently, those tribes vacated their Kingdoms and Land, to escape for their safety from the brutal rule of the Ottoman Empire and the slave trade. Just to found themselves in the deepest forests and mountains in Southern Sudan. The brutal system of Muhammad Ali Pasha and the slave trade created tension between Arabs tribes and African tribes and also it originates the identity of inferior and Superior among those ethnics’ groups. The Turko-Egyptian lasted until 1885 when it was overthrown by national revolution under Imam Mohammad Ahmed al Mahdi.

4.2.1 Mahdiyah 1885-1898

According to Mohammed Omer (1968), The suffering of non-Arabs tribes continued under the Mahdiyah regime from 1885-1898. The Mahdiyah Era has widened the division among the Sudanese communities due to Islamization policies (Islamic State), that imposed Sharia Laws (Islamic laws) on non-Muslims by force. The Non-Muslims (Christians and Pagans) were identified as non-believers, therefore, Mahdiyah government allowed the Arabs merchants to continue with slaves Trades since the trade are carried on non-believers. The regime also forcefully converted the non-Muslim individuals into Islam and anyone who failed to compile with that, are prosecuted and punished. That led to the assimilation of some African tribes to Arabs Ethnic groups by adopting the Arabic language as the main language of communication
and converting to Islam in order to avoid prosecution from the regime. This widens the division that created earlier by Ottoman empire. Mahdiyah policies had divided the Sudanese communities into two camps Arabism and Africanism. The Arabs tribes are dominantly Muslim living in the northern part of Sudan and the African ethnics are predominantly Christian and non-believers, settled in the southern part of the country.

4.2.2 Angola-Egyptian Rule 1820-1885

British and Egyptians are the last foreign forces to invade Sudan in 1899 under the condominium agreement that resolved to jointly rule of Sudan until 1956, however, the British dominated the rule throughout that period. For that reason, Sudan was identified as a British colony until 1956 when She attained its independent. According to (de Hoyes, 1995), the British colonizers had imposed apartheid( segregations) policies in southern Sudan ( policies of divide and Rule) on the 1930s. those policies led to the further division amongst the Sudanese communities, especially between North and South. northern and southern Sudan were administered as separate colonies, the people of the two regions need Travel permits from the British Administration in order to travel between the two regions. Furthermore, the condominium government introduced the customaries laws, expelled all the Arabs Merchants from the south, banned the slave’s trades and banned any practices of Islamic religious and Arabs cultures included the Arab language, however, the missionaries’ scholars were introduced in Southern Sudan, and the infrastructure development and all other kinds of development only concentrated in northern Sudan while South Sudan was left poor.

The British have diverted their approach on South Sudan, from the policies of segregation (division) to the policies of unity. In 1947, British imperialist had integrated the two regions of northern and Southern Sudan under one administrative region, and Arabic were introduced again in South Sudan as an official language. That led to Arabs domination in the public institutions in the South, consequently, due to the expecting Independence and fearing of the Arabs domination the southern revolutionists stage a military muting in Torit in 1955. The Torit muting was suppressed but it was perceived as the genesis of the first Sudanese civil wars. Although Sudan attained its independence in 1956, the British left Arabs elites in power and the differences between the north and south Remained.

Major General Abbud overthrew the parliamentary government by coup d’état in 1958. The
A Abdullah regime believed that the only way to unite the two regions was through Islamization and Arabization. A dictator Abdullah used coercive force to imposed Islam and Arabic language in the south, as a result, that led to the full escalation of the civil war in 1962. Abdullah regime conducted the election and handed over the government to civilian after three years in power. However, that democratic government lasted only for three years. In 1968, General Mohammed Jaafar Nimeiri seized power by another military coup, and he ruled Sudan until 1985.

Nimeiri regime ended the first Sudanese civil war by signing of the Addis Ababa peace agreement in 1972, with the Southern Sudan Liberation Movement (SSLM). But in 1983, the Nimeiri regime abandoned the Addis Ababa agreement and declared Sudan as a Muslim Arab state and enacted Sharia Law instead of the constitution. That mark the beginning of Sudanese second civil war, which continued for over twenty years. The conflict erupted in 1983 between the Sudanese government and the Sudan people liberation movement/Army (SPLM/A). The war erupted due to the revoke of the Addis Ababa peace agreement and the enforcement of the Islamic laws by the Nimeiri regime.

In 1986 another democratic government ascended into power under the Prime Minister Al Sadiq Al Mahdi. The second democratic government initiated peace negations with the rebels and those two parties signed “Koka Dam” agreement that aimed to end the sharia laws. The Koka Dam was interrupted by another coup under Brigadier-General Omer Hasan Ahmed Al Bashir who rules Sudan up to now.

The final peace agreement that led to the South Sudan secession was between the military regime of Omer Al Bashir and Sudan people Liberation Movement (SPLM/A). The agreement started in 2002 and sustained in to signing of the Comprehensive Agreement on January 9, 2005, and South Sudan was granted an Autonomy government for period of six years and after the people of South Sudan voted for referendum whether to stay in united Sudan or Secede, and the people had voted for secession in January 9 2011 and then finally the independence of South Sudan was declared on July 9, 2011.

4.3 Drivers of Division; The patronizing of Ethnic groups

According to (Johnson, 2016) the political elites was the cause of the tension and exacerbated south Sudan’s fragility, whether through political or military institutions, the access to the public
office depended on the ethnic identity and the elites were used as the link. That degenerated into the absence of the proper function of the public institutions and the government lack some credible institutions to redistribute the public wealth. The ethnicity was viewed as the main qualification to access public offices and public funds.

Political elites were the Drivers of division, not ethnicity (ethnic hatred, cultural differences, and ethnic borders) as it was claimed by social science scholars. The political elites tried to politicize the ethnic groups through the civil and military institutions. They employed the civil servants and recruited military personal base on the ethnic line. The aim was to keep the fellow ethnic men around them in order to maintain their powers. Even if, you are not qualified for the job you will still get the job because of nepotism. Based on that, the instrumentalist theory has proven that ethnicity can be used as an instrument by the political elites in order to maintain their powers. term politicization in this thesis rotates around power struggle and maintenance of power in the State. Therefore, the aim of politicization is to control or preserve power. (Günther Schlee, 2008).

The South Sudanese communities knew that the access into the government institution depends on both ethnic identity and patronage, therefore, the ethnic groups started to agitate for more new Administrative peripheries (counties), these are preferable to the ethnic lines. The new administrative units would benefit the individuals in term of the salaries if the borders are constructed a base on ethnic lines. That could guarantee the benefits to one own community that was the first sign of division and fragmentation.

Consequently, in March 2012 the vice president of the Republic of South Sudan Riek Machar proposed the establishment of not less than Four Hundred (400) newly administrative peripheries (counties) that were five times more than the previous number. Machar inserted that the creation of the new counties will pave a way for the sufficient redistribution of the public Wealth throughout the country. There was a misperception that, the establishment of the new Administrative peripheries would inspire peace and especially if the demarcation of the new borders based on ethnic lines in which the people would be governed by their own communities. But the opposite was true, the more establishment of the Administrative peripheries the higher the competition you get for resources and the less the resources become the higher the risk of conflicts. This is another reason why ethnic borders should not be considered as the cause of conflicts, because those borders are drawn by individuals, and can easily be manipulated. The
aim of vice president Riek Machar was to create more ethnic borders in order to gain political support against president Salva Kiir. Machar as the vice president authorized all the governors to establish and implement the newly created counties which are contrary to the local government act of 2009. The governors and the states Administrative in the Upper Nile and Equatoria tried hard to avoid demarcation of the new borders on ethnic lines, but instead, they tried to Mixed ethnics groups with each another. The Machar policy was questioned if he wants to change National policies?

Machar orders were enforced by some state Governors, but the policy faced higher criticism from the United Nation mission in South Sudan (UNMISS) country coordinator that the new formation of the counties encourages violent in several rural areas all over the country and the reason was because of the new demarcated borders or the host of headquarters of the new Administrative peripheries.

Based on the above explanation, the Machar policy indicated a clear state of patronage and the obvious signs of the power struggle and resources. Formation of more new counties, along with the ethnic lines, would provide benefits for any leader who had ambitious for power. The communities that would benefit from the newly created counties would always increase the numbers of loyalties officials in favor of the creator of those counties and that will have an influence within the SPLM structures that means an increased on the numbers of representatives in the party Organ. (for continuing candidates for the chairmanship, the potential of such a development was clear)

For the other political Elites and tribal leaders down the line, the desire to extend their patron base on ethnic was important, course the particularism will never end. The tribes are divided into Clans and the Clans are divided into sub-clans and then families.

On the eve of the first independence anniversary in 2012, president of the Republic of South Sudan called off the Machar initiatives by saying that “the time was not right to establish a new counties and further assessment needed to be conducted” the president speech came as a sigh of relief to several governors but yet did not end the patronage politics. Cancellation of Machar initiatives by Presidents was a clear indication of powers struggles between the two leaders. The politicization of ethnicity emerges when there is a power struggle as asserted by the instrumentalists.

According, to local government Act 2009, the counties administrators (commissioners) are to be
elected by people and accountable to them, however, due to the political patronage, the commissioners were appointed by the state Governors and accountable to them. on the other hand, South Sudan transitional constitution gave powers to the President that limited the check and Balance within the three branches of government. For instance, in 2012 president dismissed three elected governors that were contrary to the constitution, course the governors were elected by people and can only be accountable for them, but dismissal and the reappointment by Presidents mean that the governors are answerable to the presidency. In addition to that, the president progressively appointed individuals from his tribe to the government key institution positions like central Bank and Judiciary in order to control power. That increased the tension. Consequently, president policy led to the centralization of power and division of South Sudan communities based on the ethnic lines, and that was cheap politics. It indicates that people from villages and common inhabitants did not have a combined platform to defy a leader, no vent to protest or complaints. In turn, this Avoid the accountability of the elites in the political offices at all level.

According to Johnson SPLM party (the ruling party) had conducted a widespread consultation throughout the country on the performance of the governances and party, June- August 2012. The party members were sent out to their constituencies to conduct a survey on the performance of the governances and party and report back to the party headquarter in Juba. All over the ten (10) States the results of the consultations indicated a prevalent dissatisfaction with both the party and government performance and there was a lot of disappointment and discontents. Prospectively, the consultation outcome turned into a weapon in the internal power struggle in the party, that led to the accusation of some members within the party for coordinating consultation result to put the party chairman in the negative image. Others used the outcome results to put blame on the president.

Hilde Johnson, the Special Representative of the Secretary-General (SRSG), and head of Mission in the Republic of South Sudan expressed her concern on this matter and argued the SPLM leadership to address their internal differences and various other government issues. She met the president in July 2012, and the two had a positive discussion. At least The four top SPLM leaders promised her that, they would address their differences within the party. Nothing took place between the leaders.

The second attempt was in August 2012 one month after the first attempts. The three prominent
members of the Nuer tribe tried to intervene between the two protagonist leaders in order to reconcile them. The three members combined of Taban Deng Gai, James Hoth, and Ambassador Ezekiel Lul, first they met their fellow Nuer the vice president Riek Machar and advised him not to contest for the chairmanship of the party. On early 2013, the three-party Members met president informally and discussed succession issue within the party and they were able to reach a compromise, that president Kiir would be a party presidential candidate in 2015, and then resign in 2018 two years before the 2020 election to pave a way for a new candidate. However, it was not clear if the president has accepted the agreement or not since the meeting was informal. On the other hand, the vice president began to talks to SPLM leaders separately, criticizing the party leader. Kiir and his companions knew Machar’s conversation, and the national security was also monitory such conversation.

When the news of the informal meeting between the three members and president broke out that succession was among discussed agenda’s. the members started to proclaim their interest to contest for the chairmanship of the party, started from Machar the vice president followed by Pagan Amum who is the SPLM Secretary General, James Wani Igga, the speaker of the parliament (but conditionally if the president is not going to Stand) and Rebeca Nyandeng wife of John Garang.

The tension between Riek and Kiir deteriorated and started to affect the government. Hilde Johnson intervened for the second time on 25 February 2013, and she urged President Kiir as the party chairman to initiate informal meeting before the party political Bureau convention which was officially been scheduled to take place in March of the same year. Johnson knew that any informal initiatives would prevent further confrontation during the party convention. But as usual president and other party members responded positively but again nothing happened.

The SRSG second intervention was different due to the commitment of party members to resolve the issue. A committee was formed that compromised of Deng Alor as a chair, Taban Deng Gai, Nhial Deng, John Luk Jok, James Kok, Kosti Manibe and Paul Mayom. Taban Deng Gai, Nhial Deng, and Deng Alor were the most active members.

The members met twice for consultation before meeting Machar separately then finally they met with president Salva Kiir. The vice president handed over a list of six points to the committee criticizing president Kiir Leadership, but the committee pointed out that Machar shares some responsibility from those six points he presented, and the members asked Riek to explained
reasons that made him contest against the party chairman. For the second time, the vice president was advised not to contest against the party Chairman but Machar was extremely angry about the proposal.

Speaker of the national legislative assembly and the third person on the row of the party’s leaderships James Wani Igga presented a prolonged account on the informal meeting that, the meeting lack proper protocol procedures and all the failures were put on the chairman of the party (president Kiir). However, Igga stressed that the blame should have been put directly on the discontented participants included Riek, because all of them administered the government during the interim period. The meeting outcome had created a negative impact on the effectiveness of the party’s leadership and that indicated as the turning point of president Kiir leadership.

In a matter of fact, Riek Machar was the vice president during the interim period and he has a delegated power from the president, in which Machar chaired most of the cabinet meetings. For that reason, the prominent members in the committee asked Machar to retract. Although he was opened to the earlier committee suggests that Kiir should continue until 2020 and he became the successor. Nothing was taken serious about that suggestion but instead, Machar received support from some party members in order to stand for the position of the chairman.

**4.3.1 Tension Escalated**

As it was stated earlier by James Wani Igga that, the last informal meeting lack proper procedures. On 6 March 2013 party chairman Salva Kiir summoned the Political Bureau. Due to the outcome of the previous informal meetings. The aims were to attain a general opinion on the proposal for the new party constitution and important documents. It was also a first time for Kiir to announce that he would contest for re-election in 2015. Riek Machar did not retract as advised earlier by some party Members but instead in challenged the party Chairman, “that it is time for a change” and announced himself as a candidate, Pagan Amum and Rebecca Nyandeng declared their candidacies too but neither of two was seen as the real challenger. James Wani Igga withdrew since the president would run in 2015. The meeting ended in failures as the members differ on the key Issues.
The outcome of 6 March 2013 meeting robust the Kiir Mistrust on some party Members and that turned him to deal with the members who were loyal to him in order to support his candidacy. Those members were entrusted high rank in the army and he granted them with Authority decision making. After the 6 March meeting till April no leadership meeting but the informal meetings were going on, Hilde Johnson continued to engaged the leadership to resolve their differences and she when further to Suggested for the external Mediator from the East Africa region but the committee considered it was too early for external mediators, they thought the issues were not yet out of control and they handled it.

On 15 April 2013 president Kiir decided to remove all the properly delegated powers from Machar under the 2011 South Sudan transitional constitution. According (Johnson, 2016) she learned from unconfirmed sources that, there was an initial plan to replace Machar will another Nuer leader (a leader from Machar tribe). President Kiir conducted consultation with A Nuer community’s leaders and he received warned statement from those leaders that, the stripping of the vice president’s powers it could lead to instabilities and that seemed not to be a more prudent route. In addition, Kiir suspended a National reconciliation conference that has been championed by Riek Machar. The reason was linked to legitimacy on how the national reconciliation has been run and the process of the conference was being politicalized due to the power struggle between the two principals. Due to the power struggle between Kiir and Machar, the two leaders have resulted to work with their supporters, which were mostly from their ethnic groups. The warning of the Nuer ethnic leaders (traditional leaders) to president Kiir is a clear indication that political elites can play a significant role in the causes of the civil war more than the ethnics leaders. Even the Nuer community’s leaders (traditional leaders) were concerned about the situation especially if president Kiir stripped the vice president’s powers from Machar, they think it would cause instability. President Kiir ignored the Nuer warning by suspending the National reconciliation that had been championed by Machar. That resulted in the intervention of religious leaders.

4.3.2 Intervention of Religious leaders

President Kiir decision to remove Machar’s powers has raised panic that the Nuer ethnic group would react violently. The Intervention of religious leaders is another reason why ethnicity
should not be considered as a prone to a conflict but instead the politicization of ethnicity as the main cause. Religious leaders realized the influence of the political elites are higher than the influence of the ethnic leaders (traditional leaders). that is why they were convinced to meet the elites. the clergymen comprised of the Anglican Archbishop Daniel Deng, the Catholic Archbishop Paulino Lukudu Loro and the moderator of the Presbyterian Church Peter Gai Lual, they met president Kiir and his deputy Machar on 26 April 2013, first, they met them separately then later together. On that day after the meeting, the clergymen released a statement that “we have tried but we come to a standstill” the religious leaders knew that they have tried but only their tried marked a surface. Despite the religious leader’s attempt, the two principals had repeated remarks about working together, but in a matter of fact, there was no real reconciliation between the two leaders. In spite of that, Machar and Kiir appeared on the National television embracing each other, and that display let the things calm down within the public domain.

According to (Johnson, 2016) president, Kiir informed her that, there was a little prospect of a settlement to the predicament. and the situation indicated that Machar would not be restrained. In addition, Kiir doubted Deng Alor loyalty and that became clear when Alor and Kosti Manibe suspended from the Cabinets on Charges of corruption. Their immunities were lifted and they faced an investigation on the alleged irregular transfer of $8 million. Although Manibe was clear from the initial investigation, however, Alor was referred to criminal investigation. Many scandals of corruption have been identified even some of the cases involving hundreds of millions of dollars but yet they were not prosecuted. The case of Alor and Kosti were viewed as been motivated politically. The religious leaders have proven once again that ethnicity is prone to conflicts

4.3.3 Press Conference Against the President

Machar makes things worse, on 4 July 2013 he gave an interview to the Guardian, expounding his decision to challenge Kiir for the presidency. Machar told the reporter that “even in your own country Margret Thatcher had to leave after been a chair of conservative party for a long time. Tony Blair had to leave after winning three consecutive elections and give ways to the next generation”. the aim of giving these examples in order for Salva Kiir to Follow and leave the power. He further stated that; “for South Sudan to avoid dictatorship and Authoritarianism regime, it is better to accept change. Our time is limited now, I have been serving under president
Kiir, I did my best serving him. I think it is time for a change”. President Kiir once becomes suspicious about any member’s loyalty, he responded whether by suspensions or dismissals of the member.

On 7 July, President Kiir dismissed Taban Deng Gai the governor of the unity State and Joseph Nguen Monytuel Whose brother a leader of a bigger tribal militia group in Unity state was appointed as anew governor. That was a sign of the political patronage, president Kiir tried to display. the dismissal of Taban Deng follows by the same measures against Chol Tong Mayai, Governor of Lakes State, who has been accused of sympathizing with Machar. Taban was also been allege that he had a less loyal to Kiir and suspiciously became a close ally to Machar, who criticized the Taban’s removal as unconstitutional. Machar uses media for his political rhetoric in order to rally for political support against president Kiir by defining him as the main reason behind the political crisis within the party. Media plays a significant role to convey Machar’s rally to his ethnic group.

4.3.4 Intervention of Regional leaders

In his speech to the nation on the second anniversary of the independent day, 9 July 2013 President Kiir did not recognize the presence of his deputy Riek Machar. In the evening of the same day, British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC) interviewed Machar who persistently reiterated the same message he gave the guardian during the first interviewed. Pagan Amum the party secretary-general who did not attend the independent day ceremony when publicly to criticized Kiir’s Leadership. The first attempt of the regional intervention was from Uganda’s president Yoweri Museveni who was in Juba for independence ceremony, extended a stay in Juba in order to talk to the president Kiir. According to (Johnson, 2016) the meeting between Kiir and Museveni remained undisclosed. Thabo Mbeki south African former president who also in the ceremony extended his stayed and met Machar and Kiir separately. Mbeki advised for suspension of the public Statements and party extraordinary meeting in order to resolve their differences. Both Machar and Kiir agreed but they did not set a day. Kenyan president Mwai Kibaki sent his envy General Lazarus Sumbeiwo with a message to president Kiir, although their meeting was confidential it was linked to a political crisis within the SPLM party. Ethiopia Foreign minister Tedros Adhanom visited Juba on 17 July 2013. Tedros met with Hilde the SRSG in South Sudan and he was briefed about the earlier idea of compromise that was
discussed in Juba between the SPLM committee under the chair Deng Alor and the two leaders. The SRSG and Tedros were worried about the likeness of the ethnic violence. The Ethiopia foreign minister accepted the proposal that Kiir Should be re-elected as the Chairman of the SPLM party and run as a presidential candidate in 2015, but should resign in 2018 to allow the party convention to choose for a new chairman before 2020 election.

The plan was shared between the two leaders before Tedros could discuss with them separately. He raised a concern fearing that, the army could split along the ethnic line, however president Kiir dismissed that, but he accepted the plan. Riek Machar on the other hand also dismissed any proximity of the crisis to any ethnic violence. Concerning the succession plan, he has to think about it, and that marks the end of the regional attempt. The Intervention of regional leaders is another reason why ethnicity should not be considered as a prone to a conflict but instead the politicization of ethnicity as the main cause. Regional leaders knew the power struggle between the two political elites would turn into ethnic violence if they appealed for the ethnic support. The regional leaders tried to reconcile the political elites, not the ethnic groups because they knew ethnicity (ethnic hatred, cultural difference, and ethnic borders) could not cause conflict without been politicized.

4.3.5 Dismissal of The Entire Cabinets

On 23 July 2013, president Kiir displayed a real dictatorship. He dismissed the entire cabinets including Machar. That was viewed as a full-blown national crisis underway. He further released another presidential order, suspending Pagan Amum, Secretary General of the SPLM, on allegation related to mismanagement in office. The committee would be formed to carry investigation and Amum was instructed not to travel or address any media. President acquaints the effect of mass media that is why he instructed Amum not to address any Media. Contrary to what people viewed earlier as a full-blown National crisis, Machar’s respond calm the Situation down. He publicly stated that president Kiir had acted according to his constitutional interrogative. Machar persuaded the Nuer Community not to respond especially the youths. He planned to take up his seat in parliament. Former vice president Riek Machar received Favorable international responses on his statement of Calm and SRSG argued him to continue in that manner. Why Machar’s Message was so contrary to what had been viewed earlier as a full-blown of national crisis underway because Riek Machar used the Charismatic
rhetoric. The Charismatic rhetoric is a political speech that appeals to reasoned argument and intellectual explanation on any issues at hand. For instance, the salient issues are presented clearly in a moderate language without any charges of emotional distractions. Political elites who use this type of speeches usually avoid an emotional explanation because charismatic speeches strive to produce genuine information, that allows the people to make a rational choice. Charismatic political elites articulate ideas and emotions in the way that make their audience to feel they have a representative. The people who associated with charismatic speakers have faith in whatever they plead for. Mass media play a very significant role to avoid ethnic violence if used positively by the elites. Political elites are the actor of politicization and the mass media was used as an instrument for the politicization.

President Kiir on the other Hand, continue with political patronage. He resorted to his close friend’s the former high command of the Sudan people Liberation Army (SPLA) that comprised of James Wani Igga, Daniel Awet and Kuol Manyang Juuk for a regular discussion concerning the appointment of the new ministers. The leaders of former high command SPLA came up with a list of new cabinets. President Kiir Went ahead and appointed the new cabinets but due to the political difference, no one associate with Machar was appointed in the new cabinets. James Wani Igga speaker of parliament was appointed as a vice president on 23 August. Speculation of Machar replacing Wani Igga come in vain when Riek refrained from standing for the position and another Nuer leader were appointed as speaker of the parliament.

4.3.6 President tour on Greater Bahr el Ghazal Region

President Kiir tour on greater Bahr el Ghazal region was a turning point when he used political rhetoric for the politicization of his ethnic group. as asserted by (Akhavan, 1998), Political Rhetoric is an address of the political elites to people or speeches directed to the nations that are an integrant constituent in history. therefore, political rhetoric is an influential force in history. it can provide significant insight into certain historical phenomena. for that reason, it can be argued that a great number of people can be convinced to accept changes within the different aspects whether its social, political or even technological. Political rhetoric is an art of using language as a symbolic means so as to persuade or influence people who by nature respond to symbols. Kiir actually used Dinka Language. Through the political rhetoric, political elites voice feeling of those they address. This aiming for social (ethnic group) control is distinctly expressed in
political discourse. It is what makes political rhetoric a serious matter of interest. Political elites use rhetoric in both as a mode of thought and as an instrument of expression and actions and that could be achieved through the use of language. The basic use of the language is to convey messages; the language articulates all views about politics. In its dimension, language is used to influence public knowledge, belief, and actions on political matters. Furthermore, the language can be used to produce conflict and consensus. As a result, it also produces empowerment of certain group and marginalizes others. that was exactly what happened when president Kiir visited Greater Bahr el Ghazal Region.

According to (Johnson, 2016), on 18-27 September, Salva Kiir went on a tour of the Greater Bahr el Ghazal region. President went specifically to the states capitals, Aweil, Wau, Rumbek, and Kwajok, on his speeches, Kiir explained his decisions on dismissals and reappointment of cabinets. However, president Kiir got a chance during his tour to derided and defamed his comrades, former’s Cabinets and the colleagues who had attended the reconciliation Meeting. (but only the party Members who were identified as loyal to Machar). Kiir at Home in his region Greater Bahr al Ghazal, spokes to his tribe in Arabic and Dinka Language, he thought that his speeches in Dinka to his tribe would not exceedingly be retailed.

President Kiir’s Speech in Rumbek had been particularly provocative. “the tiger has removed out its claws and is ready to Crush their faces, blood will flow” he released this statement to a crowd of Agar Dinka Youth. The ‘Tiger’ was a Salve Kiir’s nom de guerre during the struggle period. Meaning that Salva Kiir Have decided to fight his opponents. He told the Dinka tribe in Rumbek to Remember the massacre of their fellow Dinka by Nuer in 1991. and encouraged them to be ready to defend themselves against Nuer. Many interpreted the president’s Speech as an incitement. As it was asserted earlier by instrumentalists that, for the ethnic group to involve in any ethnic conflict there should be a well-organized campaign that redefined the victim group as worthless, outside of web mutual obligations, a threat to the people, immoral sinners. President Kiir recalls to the Dinka massacre in Bor and cautioned the Dinka youths to remember is a real campaign that redefined Nuer as worthless, outside of mutual obligation a threat to a Dinka and immoral sinners. Further, Kiir incited that Dinka should be ready to defend themselves from the Nuer. That was the most dangerous political rhetoric. President Kiir was able to manipulate the Dinka youths by recruiting them as his personal militias under his command. That militia
involved in committing atrocities against Nuer ethnic group in Juba when the war broke out on 15 December 2013.

President Kiir used Demagogic rhetoric. Demagogic speech is unlike Charismatic rhetoric; it is an appeal to emotion with a clear intent to turmoil prejudice, hatred, and bigotry. Political elites who use this type of speeches are opportunistic and their main goals are to make people believe on what they want them to believe, thus leaving little room for truth and fairness. A demagogue relies mainly on propaganda. Such as intentionally use of suggestion, irrelevant emotional appeals, and pseudo-proof to bypass human rational decision-making processes. A demagogue political elites use available social or political problem in order to advance his or her own personal position. Demagogic rhetoric was to get rode of Machar and his ethnic group.

Bor massacre was a slogan that Kiir used to politicize his ethnic group. for the reader to understand what is the Bor massacre, it is important for this study to explain it. based on instrumentalist perspective in order to raise internal unity for more effective hatred for the other group, it needs an increasing pressure of political rhetoric that includes a systematic incitement in the away that allow the member of the ethnic group to feel similar to each other and collectively different from others. Bor massacre is what makes Dinka ethnic group similar to each other and look collectively different from Nuer.

The Bor Massacre is an event that occurred after the two Senior SPLA officers (commanders) Lam Kol in the upper Nile and Riek Machar in Nasir differed with their leader John Garang and Called for his replacement. The differences led to the splits of The SPLA into two factions, Machar Faction, and Garang Faction. Mahmood Mamdani, African Union (AU) commissioner to South Sudan, explained in one of his public Lecture at University of Western Cape, in 2016 that, the two senior SPLA officers who split from movement in August 1991 accused the Rebel Leader John Garang of a been dictator. Machar stated in his interview with Journeyman.tv in 1991 that “Garang did not like semblance of institutions, of structures, of democracy within the Movement”. on the hand, Journeyman.tv also interviewed Garang and he suggested that “the SPLA is a tool, a tool cannot be a democratic, but instead the tool could be used to bring a democratic society”

According to Jok, after the splits of SPLA Machar designed two mechanisms to Manipulate the Nuer ethnic group in order to advance his political objectives. First, Nuer ethnic group Believe
that death by gunfire is similar to death by lighting, a ceremonially wealthy category of death, that are linked with the divine. Machar proliferated the Nuer belief that, there was another violence “government” (koor kume) which was exempted from conventional refinement rituals and restitution requirements and linked to Homeland warfare (traditional one) called “Koor Cieng” A Murderer and his relatives would be granted an immunity from any demand or appeal of Bloodshed cows from the clan of deceased. That means the perpetrator would endure no accountability for the massacre, it would be considered as an order from military commands. (Jok, 1999)

Second, Riek Machar benefited on fortune-telling of the eminent Nuer prophet Ngundeng to legalize the likely incursion of Dinka Bor. The Nuer prophet died in 1906 but his prophecy remained influential until the present days. Ngundeng had prophesied that “a terrible conflict would occur between Nuer and Dinka, in which the Dinka would be destroyed” the prophet further asserted that, the Conflict would be instructed by a Left-handed Savior from Nasir village, without scars of manhood marks on his forehead. (Nuer customary that male should be marked to indicate manhood), who would also be Married to A white woman. Machar personality matched would Ngundeng description, he was left-handed, his headquarter was in Nasir, his wife a white woman and without marks scars on his forehead. Therefore, Machar managed to manipulate and convinced the Nuer ethnic group, especially the Lou and Jikany Nuer youths that, any conflict they lead under ensign of political warfare would not have a divine or nonspiritual distribution. Jok indicated that the new type of the conflict has transcended all boundaries of the tribals limits on warfare which had been limited to cattle raiding without advance weapons just spear, in the previous generations however during Machar generations situation has turned to political violence with a military attack on both tribes of Dinka and Nuer civilians. Eventually, Nasir faction leader Riek Machar managed to mobilize an estimated number of 30,000 Nuer youths, in the military assault followed the disreputable 1991 Bor massacre, around 2000 reported of been killed. The robustly damaged Riek’s political reputation, it was a source of tool Kiir tried to use in order to mobilize his Dinka tribe when he visited Greater Bahr el, Ghazal. (Jok, 1999),

The study of Stephen Van Evera “Hypothesis on Nationalism” mentioned four hypotheses based on political factors that, the greater the past crime committed by tribes during the struggle, the high the risk of civil war. as long as these crimes are remembered by the victims the high the risk
of war, as long as the responsibility of those past crimes still can be attached to certain individuals or group on the scene, the higher the risk of civil war, the less remorsefulness and penitence displayed by the culpable individual or group the higher the risk of the civil war, the higher the coincidence on the power struggle between the offenders and the victims the higher the risk of war. (Van Evera, 1994). Those four hypotheses indicate that Bor massacre has played a very significant role on the cause of conflict in South Sudan.

4.3.7 Press Conference and The Party Meeting

The two unanticipated events Changed the viscosity in Juba dramatically
On 6th December 2013, Riek Machar and others 14 prominent SPLM members (mostly the Dismissed former ministers) held a press conference in Juba against the Chairman (president Kiir). Machar used mass media to convey his message to his supporters through the press conference. Mass media is a tool that, elites used for the politicization. Machar’s message played a significant role in the mobilization of Nuer ethnic group merely after the eruption of the violence in Juba. On that press conference, Machar used charismatic rhetoric to raise awareness among Nuer ethnic group to be vigilant about what President Kiir is doing with his Dinka ethnic group. the aim of that message was to caution the Nuer to be ready in case of any ethnic violence from the Dinka ethnic group. mass media has played a significant role in mediation between Machar and Nuer ethnic group. the power of media is not only on its role on surveying the event and make it focus on public attention, but significantly the media interpreted the meaning of that event and put it in contexts and speculate about the consequence.
Machar as a deputy chairman of the SPLM party released Press statement on behalf of the others members as follows; we the members of SPLM political Bureau, NLC and SPLM leaders have called this press conference to enlighten our people on the internal crisis that has engulfed the SPLM leadership and paralyzed its functions in the Government and also in our society. this crisis has manifested itself into following,
First, Anti Garang elements inside and outside the SPLM encircled around the Chairman president Kiir and that phenomenon comprised the SPLM position. The anti-Garang elements have created fascism within the party that precipitating open Quarrel within the party.
Second, the decision-making process shifted from the SPLM organs to regional and tribals lobbies around the Party Chairman.

Thirdly, the efforts to transform the SPLM from the liberation movement into massive based political party have totally been frustrated by SPLM chairman. Kiir ignored the grassroots views and demand that introduced between July and August 2012 for party reorganization.

Fourthly, there is no formal communication between the party structures, from the national level to the state, county, Payam and Boma level. President uses his executives’ powers to run the state and the party.

The crisis reached it a turning point in March 2013, when president Kiir postponed SPLM national convention and issue presidential degree withdrawing the delegated powers from his vice, then followed by the dismissal of the two governors of Lake and Unity States based on the false ground, as identified as unconstitutional. the dismissal of the whole cabinets and reappointment of new ministers, suspension of SPLM Secretary General. Machar stressed that these are Chairman personal decisions since neither Political Bureau nor national Liberation council deliberated on those decisions which had flourished implications in the country. Therefore, the party chairman has completely demobilized the party abandoned collectives’ leadership.

In the army, the commander in chief General Salva Kiir demobilize the session SPLA commanders and make them redundant. These actions are made to erase the historical legacy of the SPLM. Machar Suggested that Comrade Kiir is on track to form his personal army to be a presidential guard and intended also to form his political party link to National Congress Party (NCP) the ruling party in Khartoum. This decision has nothing to do with the historical struggle of the people of South Sudan.

The purpose of the Press conference to call the SPLM chairman to convene political Bureau in order to set agenda for NLC to correct the diversion of SPLM party vision and address present challenges within the party, with the view of revitalizing and restoring the SPLM to the driving seat. “the deep-seated division within the SPLM leadership, exacerbated by dictatoral tendencies of the SPLM Structure from national to local level are likely to create instability in the party and the country. Therefore, we the Political Bureau and the leadership of party are obliged to inform the public about the true state of affairs in the SPLM and how General Salva Kiir is leading our beloved Republic into Chaos and disorder”.
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The statement of the press conference displayed a first strong collective public criticism of Kiir’s leadership style that seems to be unprecedented and represented a radical change in the history of SPLM. The press conference can be interpreted as either worry or threat or both. The statement was clearly provocative, however, the participants did not call for a change from the top, which likely would have triggered an emergency, but in the state, they asked Salva Kiir as a chairman to convene the political Bureau prior to the meeting of NLC. The participants appeared to assume that they could mobilize support in a way that would force Salva Kiir to cave in, but they misinterpreted the situation. Their decision was widely seen as evidence that they considered themselves as indispensable as entitled to lead the party. The repercussion of the press conference did not go down well in all quarters.

First respond was from the new vice president James Wani Igga, instead of reconciling the members of the party behind the closed door, he immediately held his own press conference in the following day and made a provocative retaliation. Whether he consults president or not it remained unclear but his response has certainly contributed to worsening the situation. Since the president was outside of the country, people are waiting for his reaction which would be decisive but president returned and wisely decided not uttered any word. However, the president’s responded on NLC which was held on 14 December 2013, the speech was neither inclusive nor reconciliatory but provocative. Kiir launched an anterior attack on the SPLM members who had challenged his executive decisions, reference to those behind press conference. Kiir raised the campaign slogan that he used for the politicization of the Dinka ethnic again (Bor massacre of Dinka): “I must warn that this behavior tantamount to indiscipline Which will take us back to the days of 1991 split. We all know where the split took us from that time. This could jeopardize the unity of and the independence of our country and we must guard against such things, my comrade I am not prepared to let this happen again”.

As he asserted earlier during his campaign in Greater Bahr el ghazel that Dinka should not forget 1991 Bor Massacre that was inflicted by the Nuer. this is a clear politicization of the Dinka ethnic group by defining Nuer in general as their common enemy and if anything happened the enemy has been identified already as Nuer ethnic group.

Although there was a positive message from the speech, concerning the democratic process and unity of party the waring of 1991 has already caused damage. President Kiir joined a woman from the audience who sang a liberation song in Dinka language, according to Johnson the
meaning of the song “a call to action, urging that, it is better to fight and die than to be humiliated”. And this was identified by many as a reference to those who went publicly against president Kiir leadership. The speech did not address the risen issue by the members Who were behind the press conference. The violence erupted the following day of the NLC meeting, the study raises a question was it the president speech or NLC meeting that caused the violence? Or Machar and his allies attempted to overthrow the government by force? the triggered violence that erupted on 15 December 2013, was due to the politicization of the ethnics groups.

4.3.8 South Sudan Army (Military)

When South Sudan become independence on 2011, there was no army but at least three armies, the post –1991 SPLA, the Machar group which returned and reunified in 2002 and the Paulino Matif forces, South Sudan Defense force SSDF. The SPLM is not a standing army, even if, it is an organization that suggested the soldiers be mobilized for each operation and abandoned after the operation, it resembles the white army, the difference is that the SPLA have command structures and Some training that give minimum discipline. In December 2013, the SPLA was set to comprise roughly of 240,000 soldiers 200 thousand Militarily active and the remained 40000 are reserve including those with handicap and retired but on the payroll SPLA did not have the full payroll of the soldiers in the central commands, however, the payroll was under commanders Administration and the central command does not have any access to the lists of those soldiers, in order word SPLA is not a single integrated unit. The body Guard of president Kiir is mainly from his Dinka Tribes and Machar and Paulino Matif are mainly Nuer. Majority of Ministers in the National government had personal tribal bodyguard or Militias, a prominent politician in opposition, also have their own tribal army, for instant Lam Akol. SPLA central command tried to unite the army but all in vain, therefore, the numbers of SPLA soldiers were only to be Quest. The numbers of General Commands are relatively seven thousand Generals at the time of crisis, on December 2013. They were Four, (4) stars General, Night General with 3 stars, one hundred major Generals and uncountable numbers of Brigadiers Generals. The ration of the Generals in the SPLA reportedly higher than any others State army in the world. President Kiir policies Maintained the SPLA as the collection of Separate militias and postponed any
reform in the military section. The only things those militias shared in common, they all received their funds from government treasuring.

Generals are retired and appointed as Ministers or directors in the ministries, Generals become a top politician, the commander in chief (CIC) become president, a General become speaker of parliament and Brigadier become State governors.

4.3.10 South Sudan ethnic groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Ethnic group</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dinka</td>
<td>36 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nuer</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Zande</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bari</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Shilluk</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Toposa</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Otuho</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Lou</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Moru</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Murle</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Other ethnic</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
South Sudan is a multi-ethnic state, comprised of 64 ethnic groups

4.4 The Violence Erupted on the Ethnic line in South Sudan

According to Johnson, the violence erupted in SPLA General Headquarter (Giyada) at around 1:30 PM. SRGS received a phone call from Majok D’Agoot the former defense minister and former SPLA General stated that; “Hilde if this is what it seems [...] it can trigger Major ethnic killings. You have no idea what can happen in this country, this can set off ethnic violence between the Dinka and the Nuer which can drive us all down. This can become another
Rwanda”. Majok urged Hilde to conduct both president and his former vice president Riek Machar in order to ask them to make a public statement ordering for restrained and for an immediate cessation of hostilities, he believes that SGRS was the only person who could reach both leaders and persuade them. The major intention was that if Machar and Kiir release a public statement and order their forces to stop the fight, their respective forces would stand-down. However, SRGS tried to reach the two leaders but their phones were unreachable, either off or busy but Johnson managed to talk to the defense minister Kuol Manyang and the minister of national security Obote Mamur, and minister of information Barnaba Marial Benjamin. The three ministers all replied that “the president is managing the crisis and not available for any talk” it appeared like there were together in the same operating room. Johnson argued the Ministers to pass her message to the president that him to come out strongly and order for the calm and request the all forces to cessation the violence. the same message would also be pass to Machar to do the same.

On the other hand, Riek Machar received the same message verbally from SRGS. First, he received it via text and later verbally when he called Johnson back, but Riek stated that he would consider releasing a public statement if the president would do the same. If Machar and Kiir would have released a public statement immediately those forces would have considered their order and cease the hostile. Finally, SRGS were able to reach the president personally through phone conduct and explained their earlier conversation with Machar and she requests the president to do the same but the president was unmoved. The following day on 16th the fight spreads to others in Juba, such as Nyakorun residential area, Tongping residential area near UNMISS base close to Bilpam another SPLA head Quarter in the northern part of Juba. UNMISS received a report that estimated numbers of 300 SPLA soldiers were engaging in a fight and the fight base on the ethnic line between Dinka and Nuer within the presidential guard’s forces. Since the might night of the 15 December, civilian in hundreds had gathered near the gates and premises of the UNMISS at both sites in Jebel and Tongping and the civilian were in desperate situation, at Jebel some even had to get through by cutting the fence and entered. At 7:30 the SRGS order the UNMISS security to open both gates for a civilian to enter.

The first public Statement released by the SPLA Spokesperson stating that “the situation is under control; people should not panic. The General Command is acting his situation Would fully be
brought under control any moment from now” SPLA spokesperson order all soldiers to report to their bases and further announced that president will speak to the nation Later. SRGS reiterated the prior message to Machar to come out strongly and issue a statement of calm since the president is going to speak to the nation, Johnson even proposed to Machar to release a statement immediately through Radio maraya, the UN station via phone. Machar, on the other hand, urged that the overnight killing of Nuer made such statement difficult however he told SRGS that, he would call the UN radio if he decided to make a statement. The killing of the Nuer overnight was not yet reached UNMISS by then but the civilian is fleeing their life.

4.4.1 Announcement OF Coup Attempt

Since the eruption of the violence president did not appear on the public, but on 16th December at around 11:30 AM, president Salva Kiir who had never appeared on the military uniform since 2005, has been displayed on the State television in full Military Uniform. He wore the tiger apparel (presidential guards was Named the tiger battalion) Kiir Announced that he had successfully suppressed a coup attempt in the Capital Juba. He narrated that, “unknown person at the evening around 18:00 PM fired a bullet into the air near the conference center Where the NLC was finishing it two days’ session, and subsequently a group of army allied to Former vice president Riek Machar had attacked the SPLA headquarter. He further affirms that the security situation was under control and that the SPLA was pursuing the attackers. He announced immediate curfew from 6:00 AM to 6:00 PM until further notice. The security organ would conduct a full investigation about the attackers and whoever held responsibly will be brought to book for full accountability”.

President Kiir against used Demagogic rhetoric by reiterating the emotive 1991 Bor massacre, instead of ordering the forces to protect civilian or express any regret for those who lost their life. the president’s rhetoric turned things acrimonious on Nuer ethnic group. as he stressed that the soldiers are pursuing the criminals it seems to be like they are pursuing the whole Nuer Ethnic group. based on president Kiir’s rhetoric that released during his campaign in the greater Bahr el Ghazal and repeated in the different occasion by defining the Nuer as an enemy of Dinka and Dinka should be ready to defend themselves. the SPLA soldiers entered into several neighborhoods in Juba with tanks and conducted house to house searches, reportedly looking for
Nuer Men despite being civilian or Soldier. However, the SPLA soldiers turned the violence against a civilian. The politicization of the Dinka ethnic group by Kiir has a significant effect on the escalation of the conflict.

4.4.2 Two Narrations on the Coup Attempt

The government’s version following the event was that, at around 6:30, on 15 December 2013, during the last day of NLC meeting, an unknown individual had fired into the air near the Nyakorun cultural center (the Avenue of the NLC meeting) and escaped. That was interpreted as an indication for an attack in SPLA headquarters by Soldiers of presidential guards loyal to the former vice president Riek Machar. Based on the government version, the incident happened when a group of soldiers within the presidential guard attempted to get a key of arms store and in the process, one soldier was killed and that ignited the fight. The following day the same event happened in Bilpam another SPLA headquarters in the northern Juba, soldiers attacked and broke into arms depository and their aims were to loot guns in both HQS. That was interpreted by a government as the proof for plotting rather than an extemporaneous eruption.

The second narration of subsequent of the event was that, “the Dinka Commander within the presidential guards decided to disarm the Nuer soldiers (those loyal to Machar) and that they resisted, then they broke into depository where their arms were store and violence erupted. Machar group and loyal to him adapted this version. The increased members of Dinka soldiers in presidential guards were linked to the killing of Nuer Ethnic group in Juba, that was also interpreted as a part of the plan, course the same Dinka’s recruited kept out of formal military payroll and place under president were involved in committing atrocities against Nuer ethnic group in Juba. For that reason, the accusation of a coup viewed as a scapegoat by the president to sideline his opponent within the SPLM party.

After president’s press conference turned things acrimonious on Nuer ethnic group. the statement that President Kiir released during his first media outlet as he stressed that the soldiers are pursuing the criminals it seems to be like they are pursuing the whole Nuer Ethnic group. the SPLA soldiers entered into several neighborhoods in Juba with tanks and conducted house to
house searches, reportedly looking for Nuer Men despite been civilian or Soldier. However, the SPLA soldiers turned the violence against a civilian.

Based on the widespread house to house searches, sweeping neighborhood by the SPLA soldiers against Nuer Ethnic group, the number of internally displaced person’s IDPs increased in UNMISS compounds. Some of those IDPs reported horror stories. Many of IDPs managed to get into UNMISS champs those include children clinging to their parents crying, women with babies, elderly walking with a stick and teenagers are frightened. Civilian wounded by gunshot were taken to UNMISS hospital. The number of the IDPs raised to 16,000.

The United Nation soldiers who escort the water tanks truck observed numerous dead bodies in the street of Juba, and in many others places there were assigned to, indicated clear evidence of extrajudicial killings of one ethnic group (Nuer). Perpetrators Were identified as the government forces. UN Human right robust this information by gathering similar data from the IDPs.

4.4.3 The victims as eyewitness

According to Johnson, the victims were an eyewitness for what happened to Nuer ethnic group. the Nuer who survivors the violence reported to UMASS human right office that an approximate number of 300-400 Nuer men, all civilian forced out from their houses in three neighborhoods within Juba city, lined up and escorted to police station and lockup in a separate room. On the process, anyone who resists was shot dead, their crime just because they were Nuer. On the same day in the evening at around 8 PM, a number of unknown men came with guns such as PKM (standard issue Russian machine gun), and AK47 then started shooting through the windows. Furthermore, the men came again at night with a flashlight to check if any survive from the earlier shooting. although most of them were dead, those who found alive were either shot or stabbed to death, however, few reportedly 12 in the number who hide under dead body survived to tell the story. The twelve survivors some escaped and the others who did not be released when national security officers realized the gruesome site. This event was identified as one of the gravest incidents since the outbreak of violence. The media played a significant role in the escalation of the conflict especially when the local and international media houses started to reports about the Massacre of the Nuer ethnic group in Juba. Another source of information was the eyewitness, those Nuer who survived the massacre called their relatives in villages via mobile phones informed them about their killing by Dinka in Juba. As a result, that led to the
Revenge by Nuer against Dinka in Nuer villages. So media is not only an instrument that can be used by the elites for the politicization of ethnic conflict but it can also be used for the ethnic mobilization.

According to Johnson, after the release of UNMISS human right report on June 2014, she received information from a source within the security forces that, those who are in charge of rounding Nuer from their houses have gone to their superior to received orders when they returned hours later that was massacre begun. That indicates that the massacre was planned intentional and authorized from superiors not committed on the push of the moment by criminals who had instantly one crazy or were heated up by ethnic hatred.

Furthermore, Johnson received very credible information from SPLA high-level sources explained that on 16 December some retired generals had been called back to lead the operation in the SPLA armory in the Bilpam (SPLA head quarter) that morning. To command the resume forces of presidential Guards (the newly recruited militias by presidents). Those generals led a pure speaking Dinka soldiers and entered neighborhoods, search house to house looking for Nuer ethnic group. many sources included the Nuer Survivors mentioned that the forces under the retired generals were in charge of the Nuer ethnic group massacre. During the house to house searches, soldiers interrogated people in Dinka language, if anyone responded in Nuer or Arabic would be arrested for further investigation or Shot immediately especially if they had Nuer facial marks their fate would often be sealed.

The eyewitness of the Massacre, execution, and arrest that circled around Juba were the victims themselves, the wounded one in the UUMISS clinic, and those who streaming live throughout the gate, furthermore, some of the victims had even been chased right up to the UN bases by would-be killers. Numerous sources indicated that the Nuer and particularly the Nuer men were the main victims throughout Juba and the culprits were the government security forces mainly from the Dinka ethnic group. the fight within the Presidential guards had turned into a deliberate massacre of Nuer ethnic group.

On 17 December, the violence continued in which several women reported being raped during the violence although the targets were Nuer men. The sexual violence against women was used as a regular weapon of war. the government security forces that supposed to protect civilians,
were not able to protect their own relatives and loves one, member of national security, SPLA and government official taking their relatives and the loved one into UN bases for protection. The worse of all, director-general of external security, a Nuer major General Thomas Douth Guet released a statement advising all Nuer ethnic group in Juba to go to UNMISS compound for protection. The national security and polices vehicles were seen dropping relatives to UN premises throughout the day. That indicated an extremely bad signal that even, the government security personnel was unable to protect their own relatives. For those who have taken that decision were right to do so, course SPLA soldiers stationed on the roadside waiting for a civilian who escaping to UNMISS.

4.4.4 Rebellion Declaration

The full escalation of the civil war emerged after rebellion declaration. Riek Machar appeared in the national and international media from an undisclosed location for the first time since the outbreak of the violence in Juba. On the interview, Machar stated that “my bodyguard at vice presidential resident were summarily executed’ the statement raised concern on the social grievance. He continued “they attacked it with tank shells and then burned, it is rabble now, they fired on my resident” he further stressed that some closed relatives were killed. “My life was in danger; my colleagues were being arrested for no reason (the formers ministers and governor who were together with Machar on press conference against Kiir), they are not plotters, it was not a coup. Nobody wants that; I was used as a scapegoat” by president Kiir in order to avoid reform that they have been calling within the SPLM party. “AL Jazeera television, reported by Hannah Mcnesih on 19 December 2013” the massacre of the Nuer ethnic group in Juba led Machar to Accuse president Kiir of inciting ethnic divisions “claiming that Kiir is no longer south Sudan’s legitimate president, the coup allegation was a covered for his inefficiency in managing the country and the army. The full escalation of conflict occurred when Riek Machar declared army resistance against Kiir government and further stated that he would lead the rebellion. There were three main reasons for the escalation of the civil war after secession in South Sudan the political elites’ president Kiir and his former vice president Riek Machar, using political rhetoric and media as an instrument for the politicization of ethnicity that led into the Nuer Massacre in Juba, that contributed to further division in the army based on the ethnic line, that
led to the defection of Nuer soldiers and officers from the main army in all fronts and joined Machar. Those soldiers receive orders from their commanders. For instance, after the announcement of the rebellion by Machar, the following day Peter Gadet a Nuer Commander in Charge of SPLA’s division 8th declared his loyalty to Machar by taking with him a number of soldiers, their armored vehicles and heavy weapons. Gadet after defection has turned to be a major figure in mobilizing Nuer forces against the government. “the manipulation of the ethnic group by Individual” second, the killing of Nuer in Juba make it easier for the Nuer elites to mobilize the Nuer youths base on the social grievance. The killing had united the Nuer ethnic group to rally for Machar, the motive was revenge and protection of their ethnic group from Dinka. Thirdly the majority of the security forces in the three main states (Jonglei, Unity and Upper Nile states) were Nuer that was the reason why the civil war started from those states because most of the Nuer who were in the security forces defected to Machar.
Chapter Five

Conclusion

This thesis explored the roots causes of the Civil War after secession in South Sudan by investigating the position taken that ethnicity does not lead to war after secession unless if politicized. This argument has been discussed in the most chapter of this research, this conclusion would maintain the argument that, civil wars after secession are not merely displayed of ethnicity. Instead, it will be argued that civil wars after secession occur when ethnic differences are politicized by certain individuals or actors.

The findings in this study indicated that a wider expansion of the notion ethnicity related its meaning to enclose everyone, all ethnic groups in society or Nation. Ethnicity was described as a social construct which is conditioned to politicization, a situation that can encourage conflicts. Based on the ethnic boundaries and distinction in form of Us vs them. the study explains that the structure and concentration of numerous ethnic group with different traditions in any society or country may cause discontentment and unrests in the case of any existence of imbalance among the ethnic groups as a result of political repression.

Politicization of ethnicity leads to causes of civil war if it is not controlled, and the actor who politicizes the ethnic are politicians. This happens exactly when there is a power struggle within the political parties or even within one party. Based on this thesis the notion of politicization and ethnicity are so convoluted that whenever civil wars breakout after secession, it mostly linked with politics. As indicated as an instrument used to politicize ethnicity, the study narrated differences discerned within the context of the ethnic group.

This thesis selected the theoretical background that concentrates on instrumentalists’ theoretical perspectives in order to investigate how ethnicity is politicized.

Instrumentalist method highlights the significance of the politicized ethnicity on which the word ethnicity conceptualized as a social construct which is used in certain periods, that means ethnic is situational when certain individuals strive for and pursue particular goals, usually towards the attainment of the political end. Further, the instrumentalists endeavor to confirm the argument that the ethnic boundaries are not fixed but rather are created based on the interest at stake, therefore, those lines are drawn arbitrarily.
The greatest devastation stream is that of the political squabble among various leaders struggling for power whether, at national or state level, politician seeks ethnic card, drop their tribes into conflict by explaining to them that, it is for the benefit of the whole tribe that is stake. In their concepts the ethnic last two trends the ethnic composition of the country and the political struggle are interlinked and they are the main causes of the Civil War after secession in South Sudan.

The high-risk behavior from the leaders make everything worse, this included the three key action

- the total exclusion of the faction within the SPLA party from the new cabinets, followed by president mobilization in the Greater Bahr el ghazel region on ethnic line and finally the public confrontation whether on media or meetings.

- The second is military, president recreated youth as militias from his tribe and they were kept out of the normal structure of the army, in addition, more forces of the SPLA army were moved to capital Juba, this could be interpreted as preparation for the military confrontation.

- Politicizing the ethnic by spinning 1991 Bor Massacre for polarization of society and disarmament of the certain tribes. These three events contributed to cause security dilemma.

The last trigger was the President Kiir speech on national liberation council, the speech sock everyone included the south Sudanese leaders themselves that why some of the leaders did not attend in the second day. The mass killing of the Nuer ethnic group in Juba by the Dinka militias from Bahr el Ghazal triggered revenge. With the SPLA splitting on the ethnic line and joined by the white army the opposition reached numbers within a short time. Machar and Kiir they had that opportunity to prevent this civil war a long time ago if they could have acted differently and listened to the previously advised from the international community, regional leaders, and religious leaders.
5 APPENDICES

Appendix1. The hypothesis of this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Politicization</th>
<th>Civil wars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dependent</td>
<td>intervening</td>
<td>independent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix2 table of South Sudan ethnic groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Ethnic group</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dinka</td>
<td>36 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nuer</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Zande</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bari</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Shilluk</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Toposa</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Otuho</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Lou</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Moru</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Murle</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Other ethnic</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: http://www.worldatlas.com/articles/ethnic-group-south-sudan
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