

Full Length Research Paper

State Formation and National Security in North East Africa: A Case Study of Sudan

Mansour Arbab Younis Omar^{1*}, Asiimwe Muchwa Solomon² and Edaku Charles³

¹Nkumba University, and Lecturer, Kampala International University, Uganda.

²Security Studies, School of Social Sciences, Nkumba University, Uganda.

³Development Studies, School of Social Science, Nkumba University, Uganda.

*Corresponding Author E-mail: manyounis@gmail.com

Received 17 September 2021; Revised 27 October 2021; Accepted 28 October 2021; Published 12 November 2021

ABSTRACT: The purpose of this study was to look into State Formation and National Security in Africa: A Case Study of Sudan. The study assumed that, despite the fact that Sudan has institutions built through the process of State formation to protect the State of Sudan; its national security is continuously threatened. Sudan has only had peace for a decade since its independence in January 1956, and it has already lost one-third of its territory. Sudan's national institutions have failed to deal with local disputes, which have widened again, and international institutions have either perpetuated the interests of aliens, as faced during State formation, or have exacerbated societal, environmental, and political threats through policies based on assistance provided. The respondents who took part recommended that constitutions be created as a result of citizen participation to specify the functions of institutions that protect national security; there should be national identity through national language and unity, involvement and equality in resource distribution, and equality before the law.

Keywords: State formation, national security, North East Africa and Sudan

INTRODUCTION

In Africa, States frequently mobilize resources to ensure national security against both internal and external threats. States formed through unbroken processes are not associated with problems such as civil war; ethnicity, regional politics, and governance are secondary and are not referred to as failed or collapsed States (Robert, 2003). National security and the coherence of State institutions are known to be byproducts of what happened during State formation. The weaknesses and incoherence of Sudanese institutions can be traced back to the process of State formation. Despite national, regional, and international efforts to stabilize the political situation and strengthen State institutions, different regions of Sudan, such as Darfur, the Blue Nile, and the Nuba Mountains have erupted in armed conflict, implying that there are no comprehensive and long-term efforts to achieve national integration. With no clear efforts by State institutions to deal with such national security threats, social inequality and uneven regional development

have been increasing; thus, this study attempted to examine how Sudan's State formation has greatly influenced its' national security.

Background

The Republic of Sudan was established in 1956 and inherited the borders of Anglo-Egyptian Sudan, which had been established in 1899. The use of the term "Sudan" for the territory of the Republic of Sudan prior to 1899 is somewhat anachronistic, and may also refer to the more general concept of the Sudan (Metz, 1991). Sudan is an African State bordered by Egypt to the north, the Red Sea to the east, Eritrea and Ethiopia to the east, South Sudan to the south, the Central African Republic to the southwest, Chad to the west, and Libya to the northwest. River Nile divides Sudan into two halves: eastern and western.

Sudan's independence was declared unilaterally and unanimously by the Sudanese parliament on December 19, 1955 (Qysten and Cherry 2015). On January 1, 1956, the British and Egyptian governments recognized Sudan's independence. The US was one of the first foreign powers to recognize the new State. However, the Arab-led Khartoum government broke promises made to Southerners to establish a federal system, sparking a mutiny by southern army officers that triggered a seventeen-year civil war between 1955 and 1972. Hundreds of northern bureaucrats, teachers, and other officials serving in the South were massacred during the early stages of the war, according to Dispatch (1955). Sudan is multi-ethnic, multi-cultural, multi-religious, and multi-regional, with an African and Arabic Muslim West, East, Middle, and North, and an African south that is predominantly Christian with a few Muslims. Because of the conflict between these two realities, Sudan has only had ten years of peace since gaining independence in 1956, according to El-Sadany (2012). In the months leading up to the victory over colonialism, the political, economic, and security instability caused by Sudan's independence began to take shape.

Sudan has experienced civil wars (Anya-Nya one 1955–1972, the second Sudanese civil war (Sudanese People's Liberation Movement/Army (SPLM/A) against Sudan government 1983–2003), Darfur civil war 2003–present, war of the two areas (Nuba mountain and Blue Nile) 2011–present), military coups (November 16, 1958: Ibrahim Abboud overthrew Abdullah Khalil; 1964: The armed forces of Sudan Gafar Al-Nimeiry deposed Ismail Al-Azhari on May 25, 1969; July 19-22, 1971: Failed communist coup; April 6, 1985: Abdurrahman Swar Al-Dahab led the transitional military government after a successful popular revolution against Gafar Al-Nimeiry; and June 30, 1989: Omar Hassan Ahmed Al-Bashir deposed Ahmed Al-Mirghani) (Adams, 2004). Sudan today is characterized by political instability, protracted and intractable civil wars, and insecurity.

The formation of a State in Sudan, as in many other African countries, was hampered by the arrival of foreigners such as Turks, British, and Egyptians who were forced to subdue indigenous people who had their own way of life. It could be argued that the foreigners established institutions to protect their own interests rather than those of the indigenous people. These institutions were later inherited by Sudanese leaders and could no longer be used to protect Sudanese. This resulted in insecurity in Sudan, with South Sudan's secession appearing to be the climax. Sudan's inadequacy in national security, like that of other African States (Libya, Central African Republic, Democratic Republic of Congo DRC, and others), is a classic example of how a poor, incomplete, and/or inappropriate State formation process deliberately initiated by European colonization and imperialism has produced threats that have compromised national security (Abdal-

Rahim, 1968). State formation in Africa, particularly in Sudan's country-territories, has not been immune to the deficiencies of a poor, incomplete, and inappropriate State formation process. Military coups, civil wars, poor neighborliness, and complex humanitarian emergencies have all occurred in Sudan. While many solutions have been sought as recommended in studies on the relationship between civil war and State formation, and there is no studies on the relationship between State formation and national security have been conducted. This lack of research contributes to the ineffective measures, strategies, and approaches proposed by various actors to ensure the security and safety of the State of Sudan, Sudanese people, the nation, and society, not to mention the international benefits. Sudan, as a State, is a prime example of how the process of State formation affects national security. Sudan witnessed the cessation of what is now the newly recognized State of South Sudan, which was a part of Sudan in the south known to have been inhabited by black Christians, or the Christian south (Anders et al., 2010). The Turkish conquest, and later the Turko-Egyptian conquest, explain how the State of Sudan was formed first by the Turkish and Egyptians, and then by the British, who encouraged Christianity. This sequence of events explains the failures that emerged during the formation of the State of Sudan, which later manifested in social, economic, military, and political threats that jeopardized Sudan's national security. In the end, the very threats that were emphasized and used by the Turks, Egyptians, and British led to the cessation of Southern Sudan to form the Republic of South Sudan due to issues of race, religion, economic marginalization, and differences between the ruling Arab North and the black African Christian south that were emphasized and used by the Turks, Egyptians, and British (Breidlid et al., 2014). Sudanese State formation is regarded as an important process that has determined the country's political and military security. The earliest plans for fostering national integration through Arabization and Islamization of Southern Sudan were also a reflection of the State formation process, which the leaders expected to work as well as it did in the North. The belief that what worked in the north by incorporating Arab culture and Islam into the process of State formation in Sudan would expose the State to national security threats. The rebellion was only one of the immediate indicators of Sudan's threats to national security, but it was far from the last, as massacres, nepotism, corruption, discrimination, and a slew of other factors undermined national security.

Concept and conceptualization

The concept of a State

The term "State" can refer to both health and economic

conditions. This concept has also been applied to a geopolitical swath of land, such as the United States of America. In other contexts, it used to refer to a 'nation' or a group of people who speak the same language and share the same culture and beliefs. In other circles of thought, the term "State" refers to a group of people who run the affairs of a particular political entity. While the concept of 'State' has been used differently as demonstrated, the discipline of political science deviates significantly from other uses of the same concept. From a political science standpoint, the term "State" refers to a political entity with territory, a population, a government that runs its affairs, and the power to do so. It is thus critical to note that different disciplines develop their own concepts to refer to given phenomena, which can be abstract, concrete, or tangible, in order to distinguish them from others.

The different standpoints that arise from the features of the State in the different regions and the existence of the State have led to the different definitions of the 'State'. Since concepts isolate features of reality considered important at the moment, the different authors like Woodrow Wilson (1909), James Wilford Garner (1928) and others have given different definitions about the State.

Bluntschli defines the State as the coming together or friendship of men who control affairs in a given polity and those who are controlled by them (Kaspar, 2000). It is important to note that Bluntschli envisions a given territory that is linked up with certain values that are sound and help bind the people in this geographical space. This definition is similar to that of Laski (1935), who defines the State as a territory occupied by a group of people, but there is a division between those in government and those placed under that government who has claimed what is in this territory, including power over all institutions in this area.

The definitions of the two authors capture the important features of the State, which include territory, population, government, and sovereignty, which comes from the people who claim everything in the area, according to Professor Laski's definition. It is from this point that one recognizes that the people are the ones who give those in power the mandate to control the subjects for specific outcomes.

According to Garnner, (2008) a State is a political concept that consists of people who form a political community that resides permanently in a given area and is independent of any other political body outside of itself, and the people who live in the organized political entity submit to it (Garnner, 2008). This definition captures many of the important characteristics of what modern States can claim to be and provides a picture that is comprehensive enough to show the relationship between those within the polity as well as the polity and the rest of the polities nearby.

In addition to the preceding authors, Woodrow Wilson

(1909) asserts that a State is a group of people who live in a legally controlled territory. This definition introduces the legal aspect of control, either between those who govern or between those who governed. It also implies that some States may impose themselves on others without agreement, resulting in a disorganized and difficult-to-manage polity. The implications of these definitions vary, but they affect people within the States and have an impact on their well-being and welfare. Importantly, all of these definitions encompass the characteristics of territory, population, government, and sovereignty. The concept of the State from the perspective of the African State implies that the concept of the State represents a polity with institutions that can be used to protect the people as security referents and the State's borders (Buzan et al., 2003).

State formation

The term "State formation" refers to the process of establishing an integrated form of government structure in a geographical area where it had not previously existed. Tilly (1975:70) defines State formation as the merging of State control, the distinction of government and other organizations, acquiring self-governance and being recognized as such by other political organizations, the acquisition of autonomy and mutual recognition by some governments, the concentration of power at some level of organization, and the existence of harmonization. Tilly (1975), like other authors, identifies some common factors required for State formation, among which is cultural similarity, which galvanizes unity of the various organizational models of the various groups of people who aspire to live together. This implies the amalgamation of societies into a larger territory, which eventually elevates the leaders of the smaller societies to a larger administrative setting.

Furthermore, Tilly (1975) identified the presence of the peasantry, which survived alongside a landed elite group of people, as a factor that led to the belief that land is the source of wealth, and the presence of a decentralized pattern of political structure as a factor that would lead to the recognition of the need for harmonization. Deng Majok discusses how the South Sudan People's Liberation Movement (SPLM) was forced to form a provisional government throughout South Sudan following a referendum, and to proclaim a State, which resulted in the formation of the State of South Sudan in 2011 (Deng, 2007). The State was to be made up of ten States based on democratic governance and a constitution requiring a decentralized system of governance. The process of State formation as demonstrated by Deng Majok does not bring out the differences that frequently underpin the situation prior to State formation and, as a result, may lead to a violent conflictual process, as has occurred in many examples

leading to States such as Eritrea and Djibouti in the Horn of Africa. As a result, it is critical to link this reality to theory in order to explain State formation under various conditions. Given the diverse needs and values of people in Africa and Europe, a State with institutions capable of protecting its people and borders is desirable (Kitler, 2011).

National security

National security refers to the safekeeping of the nation from the events that threaten to degrade the quality of life for the inhabitants of a State dramatically and in a relatively short period of time, or that threaten to significantly limit the range of policy options available to the government of a State (Romm, 1993). He suggests that the threats identified by the Copenhagen School; the military, environment, society, and terrorism are examples of such threats.

National security has been defined as the State's ability to provide for the protection of its citizens or to defend the territory in which the citizens live Makinda (1998). This definition implies that the protection provided to the people of any given State is supreme. There may also be a sense of protection for a territory with resources, but these resources are again intended for the people in a given territory. As a result, it is critical to examine the Copenhagen school's concept of security and threats in order to understand what a State must consider in order to protect and defend its citizens. Considering the threats stipulated by the Copenhagen school, one can say that national security looks at the protection of the State's fundamental and enduring needs, which include the protection of people's lives and safety, ensuring the State's sovereignty is not jeopardized, defending the State's values, institutions, and territory, and making securing decisions.

The reviewed literature reflected on the study's variables. Carroll, (2009), Spencer, (2010), Tilly, (1975), Charlotte, (2008), and others whose writings were reviewed provided diverse perspectives on State formation and national security. The literature provided a rich account of how the process of State formation can affect a given State's national security. The conquest and social contract theories, which were used to explain the realities of State formation, go further to explain what happened specifically in the continent of Africa, where Sudan is found as an example. The core of the explanation was provided by the conquest theory, and other theories, such as the contract theory, provided another angle of explanation. However, it is clear that the conquest theory provides less explanation for what happens after a State is formed. This is because the process of State formation takes a long time. As a result, it was critical to employ other theories, such as Max Weber's, that emphasize the importance of territoriality in

explaining what happens once the process has reached a certain level. Locke's contract theory also explains the formation of institutions and administration. This theory has a flaw in that it does not demonstrate the use of coercion in forcing people to enter into a contract. In all of this, it is important to note that the literature reviewed captured the themes of study, which include the process of State formation, a State's security needs, and how State formation as a process can have an impact on a State's national security threats.

METHODOLOGY

The study used a case study design with qualitative approach. The study population includes; Members of executive, parliament, judiciary, and social institutions selected using purposive and convenience sampling techniques, and analysis was done descriptively.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

To examine how the State formation process influences national security in Sudan, the participating respondents were initially asked how they define security and national security and their opinions were captured in the following expressions.

Respondents' conceptualization and understanding of security and national security

While having an interview with the participating respondents in Khartoum, it was revealed that several of the participating respondents defined security in terms of the safety of human beings that reside within the territorial borders of a given State which they often referred to as a country since they could not conceptualize the disciplinary description of the State under international relations. One respondent (R16) defined security and noted that:

"Security is the safety of individuals or an individual economically, socially, politically and environmentally without any dangers from anything" (Interview in Khartoum 24nd December, 2019).

While some authors like (Christianson, 2004) have associated the concept of security, to the utilization of the concept on economics in the feudal ages of the period until the 18th century. In Rome, the concept of security has been largely associated with the protection of the human being whether in a State as it is known today or in any other form of environment an individual is talking about. It is because of this that Christianson, (2004) talks about the environment which is without of threats and

these threats can come from different aspects of the surroundings. The fact that different people live in different environments, therefore the threats may be different and this may also result in the differences in the definitions of the concept security. This can be seen from what some other participating respondents defined as security. One of these participating respondents (R6) defined security and expressed that:

“Security is the capability of an individual or society to guard, shield, and keep oneself safe from those that want to destroy or take away what one has. The things that one has maybe property, life, land, and other valuable things that help preserve the life of individuals and the society as a whole” (Interview in Khartoum 18th November 2019).

The definition that was given in another interview by another participating respondent (R9) was not so different from the one given above as another participating respondent (R9) said that:

“Security is the situation where one is free from anything that can compromise the wellbeing of his or her or the society’s preservation. This can be a human made situation or a natural happening in a given area”. (Interview in Khartoum, 2nd December, 2019).

A whole lot of literature has been written about the concept of security and it can be asserted that this literature is common on one thing of protection from the threats that can compromise the wellbeing of the referent of security as put forward by the Copenhagen school. It is the need to protect the individual in a given environment that the State needs to have institutions that must be built to protect every other aspect that can be a threat towards the individual in the African State as put forward by the Copenhagen school (Barry, 1997). The revelation about the safety, freeness, and guarding of an individual or society is agreed upon by many authors that have studied the aspect of security.

In several instances, safety which is linked to security implies physical safety but on the other hand, the need to feeling safe or secure is at the nethermost inner issue (George, 2005). This is the same need which arises when political entities have human beings in them. When the polities get the security they need, that is when the question of belongingness becomes an issue. For the State as a referent of security, belongingness is towards the international system where the colonial masters integrated the African government of a State (Romm, 1993) which had not yet acquired the security they needed (Maslow, 1943). However, on the side of human beings as a referent of security, it is the State or nation-State where identity and integration are critical to the security of the individual. It is these needs that ensure the capacities of the States in form of institutions that

become the protection seeking apparatus (Maslow, 1943). While in Khartoum and Darfur having interviews with participating respondents on national security, respondents again gave different definitions of national security. One of the respondents (R27) who was found in Darfur, in her own words defined national security as:

“The sustenance of the necessities of the citizens, life, existence of the people, dependability, individuality and wholeness of people and autonomy, possession of property by people, peacefulness and stability in the country, and the sureness of living by the future generations” (Interview on 17th February 2020).

What this respondent was talking about does not only indicate the security of the State but it also makes a revelation about the security of the individuals within the boundaries of the polity in which the individuals live as citizens. This notion of national security is not dissimilar to what (Ziêba, 2004) describes when it was argued that security in terms of a nation involves sustaining the needs, life, survival, reliability, uniqueness and self-government, ownership, tranquillity, and the certainty in development. Staying as the ultimate human necessity and societal collections, it similarly develops into the fundamental requirement of States and international system. From an exclusive view satisfying the security requirement is a circumstance for the survival of the human beings, but then again also it can be a creativeness to accomplish certain aspects in life and the future livelihoods. The revelation by the participating respondent from the Eastern region was made even more plentiful and full. This was restructured by the participating respondent (R2) in an interview which was held in Khartoum where the respondent in his own words defined national security as:

“National security entails the protection of the borders of the State, the individuals in the boundaries of the country, the environment and all those things which are seen and not seen which keep the people together as citizens who aspire to live in harmony with their neighbours” (Interview on 2nd November 2019).

While it can be true that the definition given by the participating respondent is not detailed enough to capture what the meaning of the “environment “and “all those things which are seen and not seen”, it can be argued that there are many aspects of life which cannot be seen, but they happen to be very crucial in the stability and survival of the State. For example, one could talk about integrity as one of those aspects which would keep a State safe. This kind of reasoning is quite similar to what (Kitler, 2011) observes when he explains that national security does not only mean protecting the continued existence of the State and the individuals against the threats, but it also involves the preservation of the

principles and beliefs which are held as important by the citizens of a given State. This means that the customs, culture national identity which cannot be seen are as important as any other physical attributes put forward by George (2005). Therefore, it is important to argue that, the moment such aspects are not protected as the case was in an African State like Sudan, national security is threatened.

Components of national security

Considering the definitions given by different respondents, and the literature reviewed about security and national security, it can be argued that every aspect of human life can be a component of national security. While different people can point out different components, it can be revealed from the respondents what some of those components of national security can be given the environment of the individual. During the process of data gathering it was evident that social, economic, environment, political, military are all crucial components of national security regarding the State and individuals as referents of security. For example, in an interview in Khartoum one participating respondent (R8) intimated that:

“The most important features of national security are the homogeneity and social cohesion of the people of Sudan, which should be made by the constitution which laws, must be derived from. The constitution is the one that makes the social contract and coexistence of the nation/people of Sudan” (Interview on 30th November 2019).

This view was made stronger by the opinion of another participating respondent in Khartoum (R10) who explained that, when the people of a given State come together they can agree on the different issues which they feel are paramount in making them secure in economic, social, military, environment and political arenas where their agreement is put in a document which binds them in a legal way. In his words one of the participating respondents noted that:

“The constituent features of national security are wars, internally displacement camps, unrest political competition, the degraded economic situation ... and the problem of one side controlling the reins of government in Sudanall these problems can be settled when the people make a constitution which guides whatever is to be done in the borders of a given body politic” (Interview made in Khartoum on 4th December 2019).

Romm, (1993), expressed that the aspects of national security are associated with occurrences that “endanger severely and over a reasonably short period of time to destroy the quality of life of the citizens that live in the

boundaries of a State, or endanger extensively to tighten the variety of policy options existing to the sovereign of a State; he proposed that, the dangers as recognized by the Copenhagen School are: the military, environment, societal, economic and political are all components that can be identified by the different scholars and are expressed differently by the respondents and individuals who see what appears in their environments as elements of security which solicit either States or individuals for protection.

The revelation on the aspect of the components of security further explains how the magnitude of security goes further than the traditional military component (Hard security) its extra substantial non-military the non-combatant, governmental, commercial or economic aspects, environmental, educational, the cultural and societal (Social security). All these are in tandem with what (Czaputowicz, 2012) observed when he argued that the contemporary international system is currently going through the advancement of national security by initiating the realm of security newest areas of social actions.

By carefully examining the other components of security, which may include the societal, environmental, political, and economic, it can be revealed that the process of State formation in Africa that was interrupted by the colonialists was not spared in regard to these components which would have been fully developed by the indigenous people to protect their nations. Even in social aspects such as language and education were not spared where the children learnt from their own parents using their languages (James et al., 2015). By being introduced to foreign languages, the generations of African children could not clearly protect what was theirs, but the interests of the colonialists. This contributed to the construction of feeble institutions which could not protect the national security of Sudan.

Threats to national security of Sudan

In 2012 Garbert argued that, a threat can be practical or identified, but it does not but becomes a concern so long as there emerges a feeling of insecurity and there should be some response actions to get back to security. This therefore, makes it imperative for one to debate a threat and show that threats will mean a security threat which is a danger that is identified by a structure that runs the affairs of a State in contradiction of the security of a State's relevance or national interest. Very often, it is not the security in itself that is the aim of the threat; nevertheless, it is some other resources or treasures that are of implication. This was connected to what one participating respondent (R20) expressed when he noted that:

“The problem of the border demarcation, the disintegration of the State itself (South Sudan), the problem of the State's army and its fighting ideology, the

militias of the tribes and other Janjaweed, and the security institutions remained partisan ...” (Interview made in Darfur 2nd January 2020).

While it has been argued that the threats can be explained differently by the different authors, these explanations have been put forward with the European State in context where the States were formed in a different process as compared to the State in Africa. It is important to express the fact that the borders of African States were artificially drawn many in the Berlin Conference and the Africans did not have a hand in drawing the borders of their States (Asiwaju, 1984). Many families were divided into two and this is a threat in itself since an insurgency that is started in one State can be easily being supported across the border. This is unique in Africa where the threats from within can easily become threats from outside. This may not even be State versus State military threats as put down by the traditional security studies. This type of explanation has been supported by Martinussen, who discussed the challenges in the contemporary evaluation done by intelligence services because in several States found in Sub-Saharan Africa ethnicities are located transversely on borders of States and once they develop grievances (Martinussen, 1997), these may easily ferment insurgencies which are supported by cousins across the border and this can easily lead to secession.

According to Carl et al.,(2017) there have been secessions in Africa which explain the threats to the national security of several States where States have been broken apart, like Ethiopia and Eritrea, and Sudan and South Sudan. In all these States there have been cases of ethnicities which were bundled together in borders drawn by colonialists and in some cases, the divisions within these ethnicities were aggravated by the aliens who wanted to achieve their interests. (Rogers, 2016) has also agreed with the fact that there is a well-defined sign of what State formation influenced in terms of national security because there have been actions of States of sovereign States supporting rebels in other States which have ethnic groups which are found across borders of two neighbouring States. The examples are the Ogaden area between Ethiopia and Somalia, the western province between Kenya and Somalia, and the internal conflicts in Cameroon between the English-speaking and French-speaking sections of the populations in Cameroon. These conflicts have been very influential in threatening the national security of such States.

The notion of traditional security threats intertwined with human security threats is not strange when it comes to the explanation of security threats in African States like Sudan where the ethnic structures that were built by the colonialists could not promote national integration and identity and this often leads to refugee warrior communities that will often come back and fight for their

fair share of resources and power in their State. Sudan has been an example of this when the people of Darfur have fought for their rights like several others, and in cases where ethnic relations have shown across borders support has been received. Such issues are a threat to the national security of States like Sudan. This view was confirmed by another respondent (R27) who asserted that:

One of the biggest threats to Sudanese national security is regional, tribal, and ethnic polarization ... poor management of economic resources ... delaying and imbalanced development (Both infrastructure and human development) in Sudan ... the fragility of forming political parties ... the emergence of political parties with regionally, racially, tribal, and sectarian components ... all of the political parties which are exist, either for discrimination or as a result of discrimination countering discrimination ... and importing political parties ideologies from abroad (Umma, Muslim brotherhood, Democratic Union, Communists Party, and Birth Arab Socialists. (Interview in Khartoum, 17th February 2020).

The revelations from the above opinions of the participating respondents confirms that national security in several African States whose State formation was interfered with and have regularly endured threats of national integration which is a societal threat. Ethnicity and ethnic conflicts have been the core of security threats in several States.

Smith Dam has maintained that ethnic conflict causes continued violent conflict of the minority with the aim of defying the sovereign with the purpose of changing the status quo (Smith, 2001).

This is familiar in Africa where the political map of Africa was drawn by colonialists who bundled ethnicities. These ethnic conflicts have been a promoter of not only insecurity dilemma in Africa but a threat to national security of States like Sudan.

It is therefore, important to note that national security threats come from a wide range of aspects of human life (Human security) and State concerns.

Further still, there is an extension and enlargement of geographical range of security which is connected to the shared entrance of two of its measurements that is domestic and universal and it implies exploring by State security further than their own boundaries.

States often have a responsibility to protect the population within the confines of the borders of a given State as indicated by the social contract theory where there is agreed exchange of freedom for security. States have populations which cannot be a means but an end. Therefore, States have a duty to safeguard the citizens from every source of threat (Barry, 1997) which can be external or internal in form of sources which may be economic, societal, political, environmental and military.

Reduction in the capability of Sudan to protect its citizens and territory

According to Samuel (1996), it is very hard to define national security without putting in place the quest of protecting and defence of the inhabitants or nationals that live in the territorial space. Successively, the requirement to protect citizens in the State demands the construction of institutions that are envisioned to defend the State (Traditional security) and human beings (Human security) from all threats. Individuals and States have needs and these needs must be protected from threats (Barry, 1997) which can emerge from external or internal sources as suggested by the Copenhagen school.

The idea of safeguarding the citizens in a given territory that (Baldwin, 1997) shows, has categorized as 'traditional security' which considers the military as an institution to deal with threats from external military threats. This is also in line with what (Nesadurai, 2005) perspective points to. This implies that a State like Sudan had to build such institutions which could deal with the national security threats. It is imperative to argue that the interruption of the process of State formation weakened the construction of institutions in Africa and Sudan, and therefore, their capacity to stand in the way of threats was compromised. While interviewing one of the participating respondents (R24), the same reasoning was brought forward when the official said that:

"The weakness of the institutions that have diminished Sudan's ability to protect itself and its citizens, Sudan's inability to control its borders; the entry of militias from outside Sudan to protect the former ruling party; the Janjaweed coup against their masters and the emergence of great political ambitions" (interview in Darfur, 20th January 2020).

Another respondent (R26) who discussed the same theme about the weakened capacity of the State in defending the citizens and the State, that:

"The things that diminished Sudan's ability to protect its citizens are environmental and economic factors ... The proportion of the population compared to the geographical area of Sudan are few ... compared to the large population increase of the Sudanese neighbouring countries, especially Egypt and Ethiopia, with a very high population percentage, so the two countries covet in the Sudanese lands and these creating border problems between Sudan and Ethiopia, on the one hand, in the Al-Fashaqa region, and between Sudan and Egypt, on the other, in the areas of Halayeb and Shalateen. In addition to external interference that weakened Sudan's regional, international and local positions. Sudan has become a target for all greedy of its fertile lands and its high-quality natural resources" (Interview in Darfur, on 23rd January 2020).

According to Ayoob, (1995) the insecurity that has made several States like Sudan to be referred to as failed States, may be a consequence of their "lateness" in the State formation process. This begs the question as to whether the process of State formation is a linear process, which is not the case, but it can easily be argued that there was an interruption in the State formation process and this interruption damaged the State formation process in States like Sudan and institutions that would defend the State and citizens were never built by the colonialists for fear of losing their interests.

It is imperative to argue that the discussion of the weak capacity of the African State in regard to the protection of the State and the citizens without talking about the period before the coming of colonialists and what happened in the aftermath of their coming may lead to distortion of facts. The pre-colonial States which were branded as "Quasi States" first of all paints a generalized picture that all societies and polities in Africa were the same (Charlotte Ng, 2008). Africa had its own governance and culture before the coming of the colonialists; these were destroyed through slavery and colonial divide and rule, and the new wave of the latest form of colonialism.

This line of thinking was upheld by (Wyk, 2007) who argues that the contemporary African State like Sudan is an unwanted residue of a past colonial State featuring characteristics of institutions forced on the Africans. In the perplexity created by the colonial disturbance of State formation in Africa, the post-independence African leaders inherited colonial institutions which could not protect the citizens and the State because they were built on divisions of tribal and cultural levels and totalitarian grounded values (Farah, 2011). This was also supported by authors like (Copson, 2001) who assert that the colonial State in Africa featured totalitarianism and it was an unyielding system of domination and was never an institution of democracy as planned by the colonialists to protect the State that was given to Africans, though it was built to protect the interests of the colonialists.

Important national security policies that Sudan needs

When the respondents were asked for their opinions on what important national policies the State of Sudan requires, it was revealed that several aspects were identified under which policies were to be developed in order to protect Sudan's national security. During an interview with one of the participants (R2), it was revealed that:

"The most important national security policies that Sudan needs include, reforming security institutions and making them national institutions ... This is the cause of the problem in Sudan, which is the lack of nationalism of State agencies in the country" (Interview in Khartoum, 3rd

November 2019).

According to the information presented above, security cannot be the overall goal of the threat; rather, it is other assets and means, as well as valuables that are important. A threat can often manifest as practical or abstract, but it causes fear as long as there appears to be a sense of insecurity, and as a result, some response actions should be taken to restore security, which is consistent with what Garbert Lee articulated when discussing threats and how to deal with them (Garbert, 2012). This implies that once a threat is identified, it is the sovereign's responsibility to conduct a threat assessment, which eventually leads to policy actions, in this case the establishment of institutions capable of protecting the national security of a State like Sudan.

The concept of building institutions supports what (what (Ellett, 2008) discusses when he claims that the primary institutions that are supposed to assemble and command political and economic activities that (which (Kitler, 2011) revealed as critical for national security are generally fragile due to not being built to operate for the post-independence State in Africa (Ellett, 2008). It is therefore necessary to argue that the way the institutions were built was intended to serve the interests of the colonial masters rather than the indigenous Africans in Sudan, and that there is a need for policies aimed at combating external and internal threats such as economic, political, social, environmental, and military threats.

In his conceptualization of security (Rajapaksa, 2011), he links the concept of security to the preservation of Sudanese society's norms, values, and institutions, and he further discusses the need to protect all of these from military and non-military threats. Social institutions such as religious institutions, cultural institutions, schools, and universities that conduct studies that concretize the State's national security should also be incorporated into the policies that Sudan requires to defend its national security. Similarly, while several African States formally strive for separation of powers, the legislative institutions in a number of these States are so unstable in their representative, supervision, and law-making duties and roles that regime extremes, government malfunctioning, and political disaffection and unfriendliness are common characteristics of their authority processes. This is consistent with what Fitz Nganje discusses when he says that after capturing power, many leaders begin to strengthen their authority and use institutions to strengthen their hold on power, with many examples in Africa (Nganje, 2014). Another participating respondent (R5) made a strong case for the establishment of State institutions, stating that;

“The most important national security policies that Sudan needs are include, for our diplomacy to be based on interests but not on slogans ... raising awareness of the Sudanese citizen ... enhancing and activating the three

government arms/ institutions (The parliament, the executive, and the judiciary) ... and agreeing to constitute a permanent constitution for the country” (Interview in Khartoum, 10th November 2019).

The revelation in the respondent's opinion captures the case for building institutions that guarantee the people of Sudan's justice and economic interests, and the fact that the issue of Sudanese citizens is raised demonstrates how important the question of national identity and national integration is as a policy to unite the people of Sudan. In Sudan, where there are over 600 ethnicities, (Chuei, 2009) and (Ryle et al., 2011) emphasize the need for a national integration policy because laws emerge from specific societies where principles, beliefs, and values of a given society evolve into rules, which are then transformed into laws that make the constitution, which details every aspect of a given State. Constitutions specify official languages, resource exploitation, military institutions, and how a State will interact with other States in the international society of States.

As a result, it is critical to State that the threats must be studied and assessed in order to develop policies to address the threats. Furthermore, if one considers how State formation, which involves the construction of, was disrupted, a lot was disrupted, right from the values, norms, and principles were disrupted, the process of national integration was dismantled, and the progress of social-economic institutions that ensure national security was undermined, making it difficult for citizens to recognize that the (Lancaster, 2008). A closer look at the divide and rule policy, which was intended to divide people primarily along ethnic lines (Michalopoulos and Papaioannou, 2011), suggests that there is a need for a policy to counter what the colonialists did. This, however, does not imply that such a policy will be without hiccups, as forces from outside the modern international system continue to force African States to fight the same people who colonized them.

This implies that if national security policies are to be developed, it is necessary to assess both traditional security threats and internal security threats, as the line between what is domestic and what is international is thin. It's even worse in Africa and in countries like Sudan, where borders were artificially created, and once a conflict breaks out, it's easy to get help from across the border.

Imagination that the State's survival in Sudan is threatened

According to Buzan et al. (1997), a State is founded on the control of an unchanging territory and prescribed belonging or inclusion with an executive body, whereas society is concerned with identity and the means by which societies and individuals' identities and the way

they see themselves. As a result, societal security threats emerge when societies believe their identity is under threat. As a result, the concept of identity serves as a unifying or structuring concept in a given society (Barry, 1997). It can also be argued that society security threats occur when any community identifies any event as a threat to the community's survival. Michael Sheehan, for one, contends that security in the eyes of a traditionalist emphasizes the military and the application of theory (theory) (Sheehan, 2005). Individually, the two debates may not clearly demonstrate how the State of Sudan is threatened and its survival is at stake.

In order to comprehend the threat to the survival and threats to the State of Sudan, it is necessary to examine both referents of security, namely the State and the citizens. This is what Ole Waever attempted to advocate when he argued that there should be a connection between the State and society, elucidating that the security of the State is about sovereignty, whereas the security of society is about identity, and that when one is threatened, the other is destroyed (Wæver et al., 1993). Looking at what happened between Eritrea's secession from Ethiopia, one can see that territory was lost and citizens' identities were altered. The same thing happened to Sudan with the secession of South Sudan, and the people of South Sudan are no longer Sudanese, but South Sudanese. One of the participating respondents (R27) Stated in describing the survival of the State of Sudan and whether it is threatened that:

"The survival and continuity of the Sudanese State in its current form is threatened ... Sudan is threatened with dividing internal and external factors ... internal factors are known for example, the marginalization in the civil service ... as for external factors, for example, there is a Major General in the Sudanese army, went to Britain to participate in a conference and he found a map, shows that Sudan is already divided into five States". (Interview in Darfur, on 10th February 2020).

Another participating respondent (R12) did not dwell so much on the details but noted that;

"Despite what Sudan is passing through, I am very optimistic ... especially since the breakthroughs that have been made by Abdel Fattah Albertan (The current president of Sovereign Council) we can guarantee the survival of the State of Sudan if it remains united" (Interview 9th December 2019).

The revelation from the respondents' opinions implies that the unity of the State, whether in terms of the territory that is one of the features of Statehood, can lead to an increase in the security of the State and that once that unity is compromised; the security of the State is jeopardized. It also revealed that what happens within a State can lead to territory loss, as South Sudan has

experienced. It is difficult to consider secession from outside the borders, and what comes from outside is not always in the form of military threats, but can also threaten what the Copenhagen school has identified as sources of threats.

The need to consider the survival of the Sudanese State and whether it is threatened necessitates the application of Friedrich Ratzel's explanation that States and humans have needs that may be shared, such as the need for space for survival (Ratzel, 1982). This argument is similar to that of (Cloke and Johnston, 2005), who argue that it is critical to recognize that the survival of States is dependent on resources, which can be in the form of economic or environmental resources, and thus space becomes critical for the survival of the State. In the case of Sudan, the threat is that South Sudan has already seceded, which means that not only space, but also population, has been lost. When a population is lost, questions about identity, unity, and resources in terms of national security arise, because space or territory, as well as population, are features of Statehood.

Interestingly, if Sudan tries very hard to protect what is left of the Sudanese State in terms of societal security or territorial integrity, this may arouse the attention of other ethnicities that may want to secede, or neighbouring States may perceive Sudan's moves differently. That perception can easily lead to a security quandary. This is similar to what (Barry, 1997) argued when he Stated that if one people try to increase the security of their own society, another people counter, causing a security dilemma; and Jervis (1978) strengthens the argument by arguing that many of the methods by which a given State attempts to increase its security reduce the security of other States (Jervis, 1978). This implies that whatever Sudan attempts may elicit a response, which may also become a threat.

Survival of citizens in Sudan

According to Adam Saleh (2010), there is a high likelihood of intra-ethnic conflict in States with many ethnic groups. These may not be latent conflicts, but rather manifest conflicts that may be violent or armed. Such conflicts have characterized many African States, such as Rwanda and the Democratic Republic of the Congo, where conflict between different armed ethnic groups has caused these States to experience the occurrence and threats that have compromised internal security, as explained by (Kitler, 2011). The persistence of such armed or violent conflicts, as seen in Somalia and Libya, can lead to State fragility or collapse. As previously Stated, such situations can lead to alien involvement and ethnic support from across borders, not to mention terrorism. When some ethnic groups are forced to become refugees, it is common for refugee warrior communities to form that can attack the country of origin,

as it was with Rwandan refugees in Uganda. It is also worth noting that when persistent ethnic conflicts occur, the environment suffers and the economy suffers, as was the case with the Kurds in Iraq in the 1990s. It can also be argued that some States can use nationalistic methods to assert their authority over certain ethnicities in order to establish a Nation-State and gain acceptance by imposing their own viewpoints on the people, but this can lead to insurgencies, which often threaten not only the citizens but also the State's national security. A participating respondent (R14) while answering a question asked during the interview relating to the survival of citizens observed that:

"Citizens, if they found good services, can go to their new homelands in case Sudan disintegrates but this is associated with problems of demarcations of land, one can see the problems in Abyei, in Darfur and other places after the secession of South Sudan. Citizens cannot be safe that is why you see refugees everywhere..... it is troubling more so when the State cannot hold together". (Interview, 22nd December 2019).

Undoubtedly, the disintegration of the State leads to confusion and, at times, violent conflict as the State tries to maintain the status quo. Sudan has not been immune to this phenomenon, with the government in Khartoum frequently conducting bombing raids in various places where insurgents have emerged in Darfur, South Kordofan, and Blue Nile, as well as in South Sudan. People have been killed in all of these cases, and some have fled their homes. It has also been common for some people who were thought to be with descendants in Southern Sudan to be denied services and harassed in order to force them to travel to South Sudan. This is a reenactment of the colonial past, which (Alex, 2007a) describes as "carelessly racist," emphasizing the superiority of Arabs while attempting to demonstrate that they were protecting "backward" societies (MacMichael, 1954). It's only because they didn't want an uprising against their rule. This demonstrates how the citizens' survival can be jeopardized as a result of the way the State was formed. In order to show the gravity of the threats towards the survival of citizens Alex De Waal writes that:

The Islamist government in the 1990s developed policies with echoes of the British: a "civilization project" to promote Arab-Islamic identity, and a "return to the roots" policy to seek legitimacy in custom and tribal identities. While primarily aimed at bringing Arab-Islamic traditions into the schoolroom, "return to the roots" was interpreted by many non-Arabs (especially Southerners and Nuba) as a charter for exploring their distinct "African" heritage (Alex, 2007, p. 4).

as well as the arguments advanced by Alex De Waal, confirm that the manner in which the State of Sudan was formed can seriously jeopardize the survival of its citizens. The British clearly divided their area of influence along ethnic lines, putting the lives of southerners in danger, and the occurrence of slave trade in the south put the lives of the people of the south in jeopardy as they were left to be traded in like commercial goods. What happened in Sudan echoes Thouthal Aidan's argument that the biggest threat to many African States is State failure, where there is evidence of weak and non-functioning institutions, and in so many other cases, these institutions are abusive and absolute in their execution of their would-be constitutional mandates (Thouthal, 1974). This can be traced back to the time when the British were unable to build institutions to protect the southerners in the State of Sudan.

Dam Smith has argued that ethnic clashes lead to persistent violent clashes between smaller groups in order to defy the sovereign and force a change in the status quo (quo) (Smith, 2001). This occurs primarily in Africa, where the artificially drawn political map of Africa indicates ethnicities that have frequently defied the sovereign and the other crushing smaller groups that perceive their survival is threatened.

As a result, one could argue that when the State is threatened, it is also necessary to consider how that threatens the individual, and vice versa. Because of this, authors such as Barry Buzan (, (Williams, 2007) discussed five sections in his book "Security Studies: An Introduction" that can threaten the survival of individuals in a given polity, and these are: the military, economic, political, social, and environment. This explains why all of these can be sources of threats to citizens' survival, and why the State has a responsibility to build institutions to protect citizens. Because of the way African States were formed, this is not always easy.

The uniqueness of security threats towards Sudan

The respondents who took part in the survey were asked about the uniqueness of Sudan's security threats. Their responses revealed a wide range of aspects indicating that Sudan is threatened by almost every threat described by different scholars, including those who advocate traditional security and those who advocate human security theory. While those who support traditional security threats may not easily believe that security is all about the State, some authors, such as Robert McNamara, who argue for State security, have stated that security does not imply only military hardware (McNamara, 1968). McNamara contends that security includes the protection of values, both economic and social. McNamara's arguments have not only integrated

economic strength power in military hardware and military force, but economic power has evolved into a core Mansour et al. 51

component of national security, necessitating the existence of economic institutions to ensure national security. Some respondents also mentioned economic, social, and political factors in their responses. In one of the interviews that were held, one respondent (R10) said that:

“The security threats that Sudan faces are great threats, but by strengthening national unity through education and making the existing State institutions more national and participatory ... especially the security and justice institutions (The army, security, police, and judiciary) ... balanced and sustainable development, maintenance and construction of infrastructure such as roads, and bridges and railways, these threats can be reduced to its minimum” (Interview in Khartoum, on 4th December 2019).

The revelation that a State can be threatened by other factors apart from the traditional security threats can be explained using the Copenhagen School thinking that States can disintegrate when they have not been attacked from out or interState conflicts makes sense. This is in line with what (Beckley, 2010) argued when he was stated that the collapse of militarily strong Soviet Union could be expounded by the deteriorating economy, but at the same time the economic potency of Japan, China, and Germany explains the military influence of those States. This is further explained by the fact that Sudan is finding it hard to provide services as it has lost much revenue from the oil that comes from South Sudan through Hagleig (Elzahra, 2019). The economics of oil in Sudan can also explain the national security of Sudan when one considers the conflicts in Abyei and the relationship of South Sudan over the revenues from oil.

Societal security threats can also be used to explain how South Sudan was forced to secede from Sudan. Many of the factors that led to the protracted armed struggle of the Sudanese People's Liberation Army (SPLA) are grounded in social factors which were explained by Buzan, et al., (1998) and others considering the fact that ethnicity, language, religion, the use of sharia law (Chuei, 2009) and (Alex, 2007b) have indicated when it came to the threats that confront the State of Sudan. While this is the case it is also important to point out that these threats were inherited from the process of State formation which was constructed by the colonialists who built a State on divisions.

In trying to show the social evil that have threatened Sudan since the State was handed over to the indigenous leaders in Sudan Alex De Waal, (2007b) has written that;

“Sudan is one of the most unequal countries in the world. National economic statistics are unreliable but the best

estimates are that about half the nation's income and assets are in the capital Pg., 5“The 2005 CPA is the

most sustained attempt to resolve Sudan's structural crisis since independence. It is a bold attempt to square several circles at the same time. It tries to balance the SPLM's demand for a “New Sudan”- a project to replace the polarized identities of the Sudanese with a common commitment to a national project of equality and democracy - with the NCP's insistence on retaining Islamic law in the North” (Alex, 2007b, p. 20).

The centrality of the societal threats in Sudan has also been revealed by another participating respondent (R9) who thought that the disunity in Sudan has been one of the most perpetual threats. In her own words she observed that:

“Sudan to disunite, but if we unify Sudan, we must unite without discrimination and there must be a balanced development, decentralization of government, the marginalized regions required for the necessary services from water, electricity, and security”(Interview in Khartoum, on 2nd December 2019).

The above reveals that friction between the State and its ethnic sub-groups threatened the territorial reliability and political sovereignty of the State of Sudan, not to mention the identity of the Sudanese people. This is consistent with Alex De Waal's (2007a) contention that States survive by preserving their sovereignty, and societies survive by preserving their identity. As a result, it is imperative to state that when a State is threatened in the manner in which Sudan has been threatened, both identity and sovereignty can be lost. As a result, societal groups, like the State, may defend their identity by militarizing their members, according to Alex De Waal (2007). In other words, societal clashes undermine political security and undermine the legitimacy of the State.

In support of this, Wæver et al. (1993) argued that societal security threats can diminish and jeopardize the operation of a government's institutions, as well as undeniably encumber its associated system, which provides sovereigns and States with their acceptability (Wæver et al., 1993). The confusion about societal security appears to have stemmed from the disrupted State formation process that can be traced back to Turko-Egyptian rule, then Anglo-Egyptian rule, which not only disrupted national integration or identity foundation, but also disrupted the economic security of Sudanese people, particularly those in Southern Sudan who were hunted for slave trade and the slave trade. As a result, it can be argued that the type of State that Sudan was could not fulfill what Young and Turner (1985) discussed when they identified at least six descriptions associated with the concept of the State, which include territoriality, nation, sovereignty, a legal structure, institutions of rule,

and a sketch. All of the features they discuss have been undermined by the Turko-Egyptian and Anglo-Egyptian

regional sectarianism; and wars are all threats to Sudan's national security.

Direct Res. Social Sci. Edu. Studies 52

rule, which has undermined the population of Southern Sudan, particularly when human beings were turned into a commodity. This also lends credence to the argument that the social contract theory could not be applied here because no protection was provided to the people of Southern Sudan. As a result, societal security threats have been uniquely linked to Sudan's national security threats. It is no surprise that authors such as Azarya have argued that the State is an organization in a specific society that can be distinguished from several other organizations in achieving control over them with the goal of instituting mandatory policies and systems regarding human actions of other organizations or structures (Azarya & Chazan, 1987). Azarya believes that this is an accurate description of several African countries, including Sudan. This explains why some other African State scholars, such as (Bratton, 1989) and (and) (Villalón, 1995), agree with Azarya's description.

The uniqueness of Sudan's threats can also be found in what Peter Ekeh describes as the fact that the current post-colonial era in Sudan was shaped by the colonial history in Sudan, which emphasized the African "uniqueness," specifically the "Africanness" offered by the alien colonial episode (Ekeh, 1975), which in Sudan covers the Turko-Egyptian and the Anglo-Egyptian condominium.

Weakness of national integration as a security threat to the State of Sudan

The participating respondents were asked about the weakness of national integration and they gave their opinions as shown below.

While conducting an interview with one of the participating respondents in Khartoum (R15), it was found that the same line of reasoning held by authors like Katerina and Lobban about national integration was held when the official said that:

"The weakness of the national unity and due to the policies of Jellaba by exporting officials to the marginalized regions of the centre and the extreme opportunism of the Jellaba, high corruption, and mismanagement of the resources, outside intervention, regional sectarianism, and wars are all threats to the national security of Sudan" (Interview, 7th December 2019).

The Jellaba's policies of exporting officials to the marginalized regions of the center, such as Darfur, the Nuba Mountains, and the Eastern region; and the Jellaba's extreme opportunism; high corruption and mismanagement of resources; outside intervention;

According to Richard Lobban, efforts toward national integration in the vast and economically struggling Sudan have frequently been very difficult due to the numerous ethnic groups and geographic issues that have weighed heavily on every regime that has led Sudan (Lobban, 1971). The issue of national integration has frequently been complicated by the abysmal cores of national disunion sowed by British colonial rule and fostered by subsequent regimes in Sudan, as well as by international powers that have manipulated Sudan for their own selfish interests. It is argued that the description of the conflicts in Sudan has been relevant given Sudan's social fabric throughout the period of the Turks and British in the area. Numerous causes can be traced back to foreign rule and colonial exploitation. In reality, the armed conflicts in Sudan, particularly in the south, were qualitatively different from the initial efforts because it characterized the primary effort by the leaders to unite the various ethnicities.

Rudincova Katerina supported Richard Lobban's viewpoint when she argued that by investigating Sudan's socio-historical progress, one can identify the issues that shaped the Sudanese people's national identity (Katerina, 2015). The issues take into account the shared effort to counter the Islamization and Arabization of the people, primarily in the south, resistance to political and economic exclusion of some people, primarily in the south, a shared colonial history, and the shared territory occupied by the Turks and Anglo-Egyptian rule.

The assertions above demonstrate how national integration in Sudan has eluded the State of Sudan, and how the absence of national integration has resulted in armed conflicts and insecurity, undermining Sudan's unity and national security. While conducting an interview with one of the participating respondents in Khartoum (R11), it was found that the same line of reasoning held by authors like Katerina and Lobban about national integration was held when the official said that:

"The weakness of the national unity and due to the policies of Jellaba by exporting officials to the marginalized regions of the centre and the extreme opportunism of the Jellaba, high corruption, and mismanagement of the resources, outside intervention, regional sectarianism, and wars are all threats to the national security of Sudan" (Interview, 7th December 2019).

While it is true that there were several ethnic groups in Sudan prior to the arrival of aliens such as the Turks and the British, it can be argued that this was a time when the process of State formation was thought to be progressing. One of Africa's most famous civilizations (Africa) flourished in the region bounded by modern-day Egypt and Sudan (Intisar, 2019). It can also be asserted

that several polities had emerged in this area, but with the arrival of the aliens, the process of State formation Mansour et al. 53

that had begun was disrupted, and with what (what (Chuei, 2009), and (and (Alex, 2007a) have Stated about British rule and ethnic group divisions, there was little chance for national integration.

The colonialists used a variety of strategies to separate the southern and northern parts of Sudan, including the establishment of an education and language system that could be used to separate the south from the north (Abdel-Ghaffar, 2008). To make their division policy work, English was designated as the language of direction and the recognized language in the south, while Arabic was not permitted. Not only did British colonialists use language, but they also gave Christian missionaries a monopoly in the education structure, but what was interesting was that former students of this system in southern Sudan could not continue their education at higher education institutes in the same country's north. They couldn't even work in the north, so their only options were Uganda and Kenya, both of which had ties to southern Sudan (Katerina, 2015). This revelation reveals societal security threats to be extremely lethal in terms of national security destruction. It is here that one can see how the colonialists used language and education to drive a wedge between the north and south, denying Sudanese people identity and national integration. This is further supported by (Katerina, 2015), who writes: "The historical factors... culminated in two different economic and political structures prior to independence." As a result, after achieving independence in 1956, it was extremely difficult to re-unite both parts into a single State. During the colonial era, their culture, including the use of Arabic, but also their dress code, housing, and gender relations, had become the norm for Sudanese identity (Katerina, 2015, p. 101).

Attempts at national integration have been made in the past, but it can be argued that the seeds of antagonism and antipathy are not easily washed away, as the Arab and Islamic cream of the crop from northern Sudan discovered when attempting to unite the north and south. This line of thought was shared by Francis Deng (2007) when describing the activities of northern Sudanese elites attempting to establish a power center through Arabization and Islamization. He called their efforts "internal Arab colonialism."

Attempts to eliminate the effects of the British colonial structure and integrate the entire State of Sudan on the basis of one religion-Islam and culture extending from northern Sudan through the method of Islamization proved extremely difficult. It can be argued that this was difficult because the constituents of the Arab-Islamic culture of the northern part of Sudan considered themselves superior to the people of southern Sudan who were still fond of their traditional African beliefs and practices and were also living in traditional tribal lives, making cultural integration of the State of Sudan difficult.

This has been the core of the national security threats that eventually led to the secession of the southern part

of Sudan and the formation of the Republic of South Sudan as the world's newest State.

The loss of territory and the subsequent emergence of a new State of South Sudan explain many people's fear that as Sudan faces other insurgencies in Darfur, the Blue Nile, and the Nuba Mountains, other areas may secede. This is a national security threat that arises from within rather than from outside sources. This explains how the process of State formation has had a far-reaching effect on Sudan's national security, as evidenced by what the Turks and Anglo-Egyptian interruption did to the State's national integration and national security.

Military, social, economic, justice, political and environmental needs of Sudan

Ratzel Friedrich argued that States, like humans, have needs. These needs can be related to the aspects that secure the State, and it is important to note that if those needs are not met, the State becomes insecure (Fredrich, 1969). These requirements can take the form of resources or spaces required for the State's survival. It is also necessary to argue that States, as security referents, may not have desires similar to citizens who live in a given State (Clove and Johnston, 2005). The distinction is that needs are associated with rights, whereas desires are associated with requests that are unfamiliar to States. As a result, one can acknowledge that States have needs without which they will collapse and new ones will emerge, such as the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Russia's emergence after 1989. This is a situation similar to Sudan, which has already lost territory and population since South Sudan seceded from Sudan. This was correlated in an interview with one of the participating respondents (R7) who Stated that:

"Sudan's economic needs are the great need to revive the State's economy, and from the social side, Sudan needs to build the social integration, and on the judicial sector, Sudan needs to establish a just judiciary system; preservation of the environment and helping the herders and farmers, and open paths and cultivate lands to face drought and desertification are environmental concerns; and on Political side Sudan needs distinct international relations externally and a rational political practice internally" (Interview in Khartoum, on 22nd November 2019).

In his discussion of security and needs, (Zieba, 2004) describes how security in relation to the entire nation encompasses sustaining: the needs, life, survival, dependability, uniqueness and self-government, ownership, tranquillity, and certainty in development. It

continues to be the most important human needs and societal sets or groups, as well as the basic necessity of

the institutions were not built to protect the societies in Sudan, but to protect the interests of the Turks, Egyptians, Direct Res. Social Sci. Edu. Studies 54

States and the international system. When viewed as a specific perception satisfying the security need, it is a situation for human existence, but it can also be a motivation to attainment of what is needed and desired and progress.

The issue of needs cannot be considered in isolation from the citizens who live in that State, because the State and the citizens come to an agreement even in the face of force, where the subjugated people are expected to contribute through taxes in exchange for security. When viewed through the lens of State security, one can argue that what is being examined is the unavoidable goal of its interactions with other States. However, it is nearly impossible to discuss this and pursue its objectives when the State's survival is threatened. As a result, the main intention and goal of the State in international relations is to maintain its security. This must also be seen in relation to the needs of the citizens as expressed in their social contract, in which the citizens request protection and, if that protection is not provided, other States will become involved in what is going on within that State. Issues of sovereignty will now be jeopardized if the responsibility to protect is not properly handled (handled) (Magnuson, 2010). In many cases, protection associated with security implies physical safety; however, the need to have the impression of being safe or secure is at the very least a psychological thing that is pleasurable (George, 2005). This is a constant need that arises when States have citizens, whether they are subjugated through force or through a social contract.

When the States achieve the necessary security, they clamor for belonging, in this case to the international system into which the colonial masters integrated the African States that had not yet attained the necessary security (Harold, 1954). These needs ensure the capacities of the States in the form of institutions that serve as the protection seeking apparatus (Maslow, 1943). The institutions that were established were not formed to meet the needs of indigenous people, but rather to serve colonial interests. In practice, the institutions inherited from the colonialists were unable to meet the needs of post-independent States such as Sudan, jeopardizing their national security.

Conclusion

The study concluded that the process of establishing social, economic, military, and political institutions in the area that was disrupted had an impact on national security. While it is true that the forces put in place by the Turks, Egyptians, and British merged the various societies. It is also true that there were divisions made to make it easier for the Turks, Egyptians, and British to build a system that would serve their interests, and thus

and British in Sudan. South Sudan's secession was an example of the insecurity created by the bungled process of State formation. The study also concluded that the process of State formation in the area known as Sudan today was not owned by the people of the polity of Sudan, and thus all institutions built did not have the input of Sudan's indigenous people, and thus could not protect the interests of these Sudanese people. If the process of State formation had been built by the indigenous people of Sudan, the institutions that were built like economic institutions could not look at the indigenous people as a commodity.

REFERENCES

- Abdal-Rahim M (1968). *The Development of British Policy in the Southern Sudan 1899 –1947*. Khartoum, Sudan: Khartoum University Press.
- Abdel-Ghaffar MA (2008). *Sudan: Roots and dimensions of the crisis*, (in Arabic). Cairo: Medaric Publishers.
- Adams JK (2004). *History of the Conflict in Sudan and Role of the United Nation*. 3.
- Alex (2007a). *Sudan: patterns of violence and imperfect endings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Alex (2007b). *Sudan: What kind of crisis?* London: crisis States research centre.
- Asiwaju AI (1984). *Portioned African ethnic nations across Africa's international boundaries*. Lagos: University of Lagos Press.
- Ayoob. (1995). *The third World security predicament: State making, regional conflict, and the international system*. Cambridge: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Azarya V, Chazan N (1987). *Disengagement from the State in Africa: Reflections on the experience of Ghana and Guinea, comparative studies in society and history*. Paris: Fayard.
- Baldwin, DA (1997). *The concept of security*. In D. A. Baldwin, *Review of international studies* (p. 22). Washington DC: British International Studies Association.
- Beckley M (2010). *Economic development and military effectiveness*. online: *The Journal of Strategic Studies*.
- Bratton M (1989). *Beyond the State: civil society and associational life in Africa*. World Politics.
- Breidlid A, Said AA, Kristine A. (2014). *A concise history of South Sudan*. Kampala: Fountain Publisher.
- Buzan B, Ole W, Waever O, Wilde J (1998). *Security: A new framework for analysis*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Carl JJ, McElreath DH, Graves M (2017). *Introduction to intelligence studies*. Milton Park, Abingdon: Routledge.
- Carroll P (2009). *Provide the paper before the journal name: Journal of historical sociology*. Oxford UK: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Charlotte (2008). *How Does the Process of State Formation in Most Developing Countries Differ from the Process Experienced in Europe and with what Consequences for their Developmental Potential?* London: E-International Relations.
- Christianson M (2004). *Säkerhetspolitisk teori*. Stockholm: Military Academy Karlberg.
- Chuei MD (2009). *Sudan: Ethnic's vs Religion's Relationship*. In C. D. Mareng, *The Sudan's dimensions: A country divided by ethnicity and religion* (pp. 532 -538). Edmonton: African Journal of Political Science and International Relations.
- Cloke P, Johnston, RJ (2005). *Space of geographical thought*. New Delhi: SAGE Publication LTD.
- Copson RW (2001). *Africa backgrounder: History, U.S. policy, principal congressional actions*. Washington: CRS Report for Congress.

Czaputowicz J (2012). Theory or Practice? The State of International Relations in Poland.
Deng VA (2007). What is the What. California: The VAD Foundation.
Dispatch L (1955). Sudan Lower House Votes Independence
Mansour et al. 55

- Declaration. New York: The New York Times.
- Ekeh P (1975). Colonialism and the two publics in Africa: A theoretical Statement, comparative studies in society and history. Nigeria: University of Ibadan.
- Ellett RL (2008). Public and international affairs dissertations, paper emerging judicial power in transitional democracies: Malawi, Tanzania and Uganda. Boston: North-western University.
- El-Sadany MO (2012). Sudan: From Conflict to Conflict. Washington, D.C: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.
- Elzahra J (2019). The dark side of Sudan's oil. Earth Journalism Network.
- Farah N (2011). A naked needle. New York: Riverhead.
- Garbert L (2012). The challenges of securing the virtualized environment.
- Garnner JW (2008). Introduction to political science - treaties on the origin, nature, functions, and organizations of the State. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: American Book Company.
- George N (2005). Maslow's hierarchy of needs. <http://www.deepermind.com/20maslow.htm>.
- Harold MA (1954). Motivation and personality. New York: Harper.
- Intisar SE (2019). Meroe, the city State, the Kingdom, the Empire why Meroe. Setbacks to the recognition of Meroe as a major ancient civilization, Pp. 40 -42.
- James O, Nakimuli-Mpungu E, Klasen F, Musisi S, Broekaert E, Derluyn AI (2015). The impact of attachment and depression symptoms on multiple risk behaviors in post-war adolescents in northern Uganda. *Journal of Affective Disorders*.
- Jervis R (1978). Cooperation under the security dilemma. In R. Jervis, *World politics* (pp. 167-214). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kaspar BJ (2000). The theory of the State. Ontario: Batoche Book.
- Katerina R (2015). When colonial borders still matter: The emergence of South Sudan. The colonial administration and the de facto separation of Southern Sudan, Pp. 98 - 100.
- KitlerW (2011). National security of the Republic of Poland. Basic categories, conditions, system. Warszawa: Basic categories, conditions, system.
- Lancaster, C. (2008). Foreign aid: Diplomacy, development, domestic politics. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Laski HJ (1935). The State in theory and practice. London.
- Lobban RA (1971). The historical role of the Mahas in the urbanization of the Sudan's three Towns. Boston: Boston University African Studies Cente.
- MacMichael H (1954). The Sudan. London: Ernest Benn.
- Magnuson W (2010). The responsibility to protect and the decline of sovereignty: Free speech protection underInternational law. Texas: Texas A&M University School of Law.
- Makinda, S. (1998). Sovereignty and Global Security. *Sovereignty and Global Security*, Pp. 281-292.
- Maslow AH (1943). A theory of human motivation. Toronto, Ontario: <http://www.yorku.ca/dept/psych/classics/author.htm>.
- McNamara R (1968). Fog of War . Harvard: Harvard Business School.
- Mcnamara RS (1968). The fiscal Year 1979-73 defense program and and the 1969 defense budget. Washigton: Department of Defense the United States of America.
- Metz HC (1991). Sudan A country History. Washington: ibrary of Congress.
- Nesadurai HE (2005). Conceptualising economic security in an era of globalisation: what does the East Asian experience. In H. E. Nesadurai, *Globalisation and economic security in East Asia: Governance and institutions* (p. 20). London: Taylor& Francis Group.
- Nganje F (2014). South Africa and SADC: Options for constructive regional leadership. *Global insights issue*. Midrand: Institute for Global dialogue.
- Omeje KA (2013). Conflict and peacebuilding in the African Great Lakes Region. Indiana University Press,, 3.
- Qysten R, Cherry L (2015). History of Sudan (1956–1969) and First Sudanese Civil War. Durham University: Research Online, 25.
- Ratzel F (1882). *Anthropo-Geographie oder Grundzüge der Anwendung der Erdkunde auf die Geschichte*. Stuttgart: Verlag von J. Engelhorn.
- Rogers J (2016). Civil War and State Formation: Exploring Linkages and potential causality. Bernoullistrasse : swisspeace.
- Romm JJ (1993). Defining national security: The nonmilitary aspects. New York: Council on Foreign Relation Press.
- Ryle J, Willis J, Baldo S, Jok JM (2011). The Sudan handbook. Woodbridge, Suffolk: Creative Commons license Attribution.
- Samuel M (1996). Sovereignty and international security: Challenges for the United Nations. Jstor, 20.
- Sheehan M (2005). International security: An analytical survey. Boulder, CO, and London: Lynne Rienner.
- Smith D (2001). Trends and causes of armed conflict. Berghof Research Center for Constructive Conflict Management.
- Spencer, CS (2004). Primary State formation in mesoamerica. ResearchGate, 28.
- Thouthal, A (1974). State formation in Afric. Madison: Department of Anthropology, University of Wisconsin.
- Tilly (1975). The formation of national States in Western Europe. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Villalón L (1995). Islamic society and State power in Senegal: Disciplines and citizens in fatick,. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wæver O, Barry B, Kelstrup M, Lemaitre AP (1993). Identity, migration and the new security agenda in Europe. London: Pinter Publishers.
- Williams C (2007). Research methods. *Jornal of Business and Economic Research*.
- Wyk JAV (2007). Political leaders in Africa: presidents, patrons or profiteers. Durban, South Africa: The African Centre for the Constructive Resolution of Disputes.
- Zięba R (2004). *Instytucjonalizacja bezpieczeństwa europejskiego*. Warszawa: koncepcje–struk-tury–funkcjonowanie.