



South Sudan and Sudan Back to War?

A View from Juba

Amanda Hsiao May 2012



enough

The project to end genocide and crimes against humanity

South Sudan and Sudan Back to War?

A View from Juba

Amanda Hsiao May 2012

COVER: Re-enforcement troops headed to the frontline in Panakuach shortly after the attack by Sudan Armed Forces

Introduction

The recent volatility of the Sudan-South Sudan relationship raises important questions about why peace and stability between the two countries is so tenuous. From interviews conducted in Juba, South Sudan's leaders appear open to continued talks and to the establishment of improved relations with Khartoum, especially in response to international pressure to do so. But there is a perceptible shift within the leadership in Juba toward disengagement with Sudan.

The dominance of hardliners in Khartoum politics, a long history of broken agreements with Khartoum, Juba's doubts about the international community's ability to fairly mediate between South Sudan and Sudan, and a post-independence sentiment that South Sudan must assert its sovereignty in response to continued Northern aggression have all contributed to a growing feeling that negotiations with Khartoum may not be the best means of achieving Juba's strategic interests. But Juba's reactions to Khartoum remain sensitive to cues from the international community, a legacy of international actors' deep involvement in the negotiation of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement and support for the successful independence of South Sudan. Maintaining a positive image before the international community is still critically important to South Sudan's leaders.

Negotiations remain the best means for the two parties to settle their differences and for South Sudan to resolve its priority concerns—territorial- and security-related—with Sudan. To rebuild Juba's confidence in the negotiation process, international actors with the leverage to move the parties toward an agreement and the resources to help implement it must throw their weight in a concerted manner behind the African Union High-Level Implementation Panel, or AUHIP. The coordinated influence of the United States and China, possibly within a forum of key international stakeholders, coupled with continued attention by the U.N. Security Council and the African Union Peace and Security Council, is crucial to this end.



NENAD MARINKOVIC / ENOUGH PROJECT

SPLA soldiers in Panakuach, only minutes before the attack by Sudan Armed Forces

Peace between the Sudans depends on two parallel peace processes. First, a process that leads to a comprehensive North-South agreement on issues related to the border, Abyei, and a transitional financial package that includes an oil arrangement. Second, a broad-based, inclusive process that addresses the center-periphery issues that underlie conflicts within Sudan. Without progress on this second front, any agreements made between Sudan and South Sudan will be untenable.

Recent developments

In mid-March, Sudanese and South Sudanese negotiators concluded a round of talks in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, that brought the countries to the verge of a breakthrough in their stalled peace process. The negotiators initialed two agreements—one on citizenship and the other on border demarcation—and made commitments to hold a presidential summit. In addition, new energy was generated over discussions into how South Sudan might assist Sudan with its economic gap, which includes the two states' oil relationship.¹

This diplomatic shift, though, was contradicted by movements on the ground, where the Sudan People's Liberation Army-North, or SPLA-N—the military wing of the rebel Sudan People's Liberation Movement-North, or SPLM-N—had made significant gains.

The SPLA-N had a major presence in South Kordofan, Sudan—capturing Tess, Buram, Dar, Taroge, and Jau by late February—in coordination with the Darfuri group Justice and Equality Movement, or JEM, and possibly with the Sudan People’s Liberation Army, or SPLA—South Sudan’s army.² Since independence, South Sudan has provided material and logistical support to the SPLA-N, although it is unclear at what scale.³ Among Khartoum’s leadership, these gains likely helped to propel security concerns to the forefront of other unresolved issues with South Sudan. To add to the frailty of the renewed commitment to cooperate, Northern negotiators came under intense political fire on their return to Khartoum for initialing an agreement that would extend considerable rights to Southerners residing in Sudan.⁴

In South Sudan the move toward cooperation was supported by the leadership, and a high-level delegation was dispatched to Khartoum to formally invite Sudanese President Omar al-Bashir to attend a summit with South Sudanese President Salva Kiir in Juba in early April.⁵ Members of the delegation returned to Juba optimistic after receiving a positive response and warm reception in Khartoum, including a meeting with President Bashir. According to Southern officials, the meeting centered on Khartoum’s security concerns, particularly the South Sudan’s support of the SPLA-N and JEM. In the meeting, Southern officials say, Bashir hinted at potential concessions that could be made in talks going forward should Khartoum’s security concerns be addressed. Notably, the Southern delegation was also asked to speak with the heads of Sudan’s security organs to promote the shift toward cooperation among the more hardline elements in Khartoum.⁶ Upon the delegation’s return preparations for the summit began in earnest, and a “general feeling that things were now improving” pervaded among Southern leaders.⁷

The political commitments made by both sides, however, were undermined by military movements on the ground. According to Southern officials, a Sudan army—or SAF—attack on SPLA positions at Tishwin on March 26 provoked a spontaneous decision by Southern commanders in the field to retaliate in self-defense. The counterattack, Southern officials say, was never intended to go as far north as Heglig, and the SPLA quickly withdrew from the disputed area to their original positions.⁸

The implications were significant. Politicians in Sudan quickly pivoted away from reconciliation, announcing that the presidential summit in Juba would not take place as planned. The following day, Southern officials reported Sudanese bombings of Southern oil fields.⁹ Despite the shift in Khartoum, according to South Sudanese Vice President Riek Machar, the Southern leadership still hoped at that juncture that the summit could take place. As such, Juba acted with restraint to “strengthen” and give “space” to those in Khartoum leaning in favor of a return to talks, he said.¹⁰

Security talks between the parties in April in Addis Ababa became the main forum for the international community to press for a ceasefire. Throughout the talks, fighting

continued in South Kordofan between the SPLA-N and the SAF in the strategic town of Talodi. At the same time, Juba and Khartoum accused the other of initiating fighting along other parts of the border, bolstering feelings on both sides that the other was not negotiating in good faith or interested in peace.

For Khartoum, the embarrassment of the South's incursion into Heglig and the deep divisions over the move toward cooperation in the first place meant that it was necessary for the negotiators to make few concessions in the security negotiations. Their goal was to neutralize the threat of the SPLA-N and JEM, which would require an unambiguous statement by South Sudan that it was supporting those rebel groups and that it would disarm them.¹¹

For its part, the South Sudanese delegation would not, publicly or privately, admit to providing any support to the SPLA-N and JEM, nor did it agree to disarm the two rebel groups. According to Southern officials, Sudan's negotiators offered to disarm the militias Khartoum supports in South Sudan in exchange, including militias under the command of Johnson Olonyi, Bapiny Monituel, and David Yauryau.¹² These militias have not recently posed a significant security challenge to South Sudan. From the perspective of the South, Khartoum's disarmament request was unrealistic in that it would require the SPLA to forcibly disarm—or fight—the SPLA-N and JEM. More important, the South was not ready to end assistance for the SPLA-N until Khartoum began to address the unimplemented pieces of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement aimed at resolving the political grievances of populations in South Kordofan and Blue Nile.¹³

The full range of reasons for South Sudan's continued support of the SPLA-N in South Kordofan and Blue Nile can only be left to conjecture, but those reasons appear to be deeper than a convenient alliance of interests to weaken the Khartoum regime. These factors include years of fighting together during the civil war, the personal ties of SPLM-N leaders Abdelaziz al-Hilu and Malik Agar to the Juba leadership, the SPLM's political solidarity with the SPLM-N, the moral imperative to protect civilians against indiscriminate attacks, and security concerns over the South's longest and most vulnerable border. As a result, Juba will likely continue to resist international pressure to end support to the SPLA-N until negotiations between the SPLM-N and Khartoum resume. It is unclear what level of support the South is providing to JEM—sightings of the Darfuri group in Unity state are frequent, and the support provided is likely an extension of support for the SPLA-N, which has allied with JEM in the rebel coalition known as the Sudan Revolutionary Front, or SRF.¹⁴

The South's negotiators ultimately agreed to the draft proposal tabled by the AUHIP that did not explicitly commit the South to stop supporting the SPLA-N and JEM.¹⁵ The North's negotiators returned to Sudan, without agreeing to the proposal, to consult with decision makers in the capital.



NENAD MARINKOVIC / ENOUGH PROJECT

SPLA soldiers in Panakuach, only minutes before the attack by Sudan Armed Forces

For the South, the initial delay in Khartoum’s deployment of its lead representatives to the talks, followed by the abrupt departure of the negotiators before signing the agreement, were indications that Sudan did not want the talks to succeed. A second SAF attack on the Southern positions of Panakuac, Tishwin, and Hofra took place on April 4, shortly after the conclusion of the Addis Ababa talks. The SPLA retaliated, advancing to a site between Heglig and Tishwin before withdrawing back to its original positions.¹⁶ The Sudanese hardliners were “determined to start fires and create problems,” said one Southern official.¹⁷

On April 10, at which point Sudan still had not committed to the ceasefire proposal put down by the AUHIP, a third SAF attack on Southern positions at Tishwin prompted the leadership in Juba to order the SPLA’s advance into Heglig. This time the SPLA advanced to a point slightly further north than the disputed area.¹⁸ During the SPLA’s hold on Heglig, the army shut down the oil fields’ production, worth about half of Sudan’s total oil output. The decision to stay in Heglig was made within the South Sudanese National Security Council, generally comprising the president, vice president, defense minister, interior minister, foreign affairs minister, finance minister, army chief, head of military intelligence, and inspector general of the police.¹⁹

The international community strongly condemned South Sudan’s actions. Juba’s narrative for staying in Heglig swung between self-defense and the argument that the South had

a right to take back its territory. Days later, President Kiir announced that South Sudan would stay in the area as a means of ensuring that the SAF could not continue to use the area as a rear base for attacking Southern territory and until an international force was put into place. His speech underscored a new level of Southern frustration with the international community—comparing the now-muted international response to the SAF’s continued presence in Abyei to the uproar over the SPLA’s presence in Heglig.

A U.N. Security Council meeting that convened about the crisis concluded with the message that sanctions on both parties were under consideration. The level of condemnation was “incomprehensible” and “unbelievable” to the leadership in Juba, who are used to being considered the better-behaved party in North-South relations. In addition, South Sudan’s claim on Heglig has been made clear since the Permanent Court of Arbitration ruling in 2009 that decided Abyei’s boundaries and has been restated in the North-South talks.²⁰ While the Southern leadership knew what to expect from Khartoum in response to their decision, the international community’s response came as a surprise.

During the 10 days when the SPLA held Heglig, Khartoum intensely bombed the disputed area and strategic sites in the South with the aim of cutting off supply lines. Fighting between the two armies spread along the entire border, in and around at least three other disputed border sites. The flashpoint border region of Abyei experienced an influx of both SPLA soldiers and militias that have historically been supported by the Sudanese government. Diplomatic action by the U.N. peacekeeping mission there led to the withdrawal of both parties.²¹ Mobilization of the population began on both sides, and bellicose rhetoric—especially from Khartoum—heightened.

The unified international response, including considerable pressures from the U.S., was significant for the calculations of the Juba government, for which South Sudan’s image on the international stage and continued international assistance and support remain important. The leadership could not afford for South Sudan to become isolated.²² Further, many officials were of the belief that South Sudan had more to lose if both states were sanctioned, given that Khartoum is already under U.S. and U.N. sanctions. In conversations with U.S. diplomats, South Sudanese officials made clear that should they withdraw from Heglig, they would expect the U.S. and others in the international community to pressure Khartoum to end its aggression.²³

Conversations over a withdrawal took place quietly over a number of days in Juba among members of the National Security Council until a consensus was built behind an unconditional withdrawal.²⁴ On April 20 the decision was announced to the Council of Ministers and the public after withdrawal had already begun, prompting significant debate. Some ministers expressed concern that an unconditional withdrawal would be a demonstration of weakness. Others argued that certain conditions should be met in return for a withdrawal, while others argued that staying in the Southern territory was

legitimate.²⁵ On the front lines, members of the military questioned the loss of lives resulting from the decision to stay, only to pull out days later.²⁶

Following the SPLA's withdrawal from Heglig, Sudan's attacks on South Sudan did not automatically abate, with Unity state continuing to be bombed.²⁷ As a means of intensifying pressure on Khartoum to end its bombings and of strengthening the negotiation process, the African Union Peace and Security Council issued a robust communiqué on April 24 imposing deadlines on a ceasefire, a return to talks, and an agreement between the two parties on all remaining unresolved issues, among other decisions. A U.N. Security Council resolution passed on May 2 backed the African Union deadlines with the potential threat of sanctions in the event of noncompliance. The resolution specifically calls for a comprehensive agreement to be reached, for the Intergovernmental Authority on Development, or IGAD, to support AUHIP facilitation efforts going forward, and for the U.N. secretary general, in consultation with the chair of IGAD, the chair of the African Union Commission, and the AUHIP, to table proposals on outstanding issues that remain unresolved in three months.

South Sudan's leaders have since moved to rebuild its standing with the international community, responding positively to the African Union communiqué and the Security Council resolution, and withdrawing Southern police from Abyei.

Motivating factors

Since independence, the Juba leadership has increasingly moved away from the premise that a special relationship with Khartoum—as a result of the two countries' unique shared history, cultural linkages, long border, and economic symbiosis—is in South Sudan's long-term interests. The extent to which South Sudan's leaders tilt toward disengagement with Sudan and the attractiveness of continued negotiations with Khartoum depend on a number of key factors. One difficult-to-quantify factor is the economic consequence of South Sudan's oil shutdown. Many in the leadership appear confident that South Sudan's economic situation will be temporary and politically manageable, and that their population will prevail despite alarming predictions by international institutions of the impending collapse in currency and the subsequent humanitarian impact—in particular, widespread food insecurity. International donors have coupled these gloomy predictions with the warning that aid programs currently in place may not be sustained. The extent to which these warnings shift the leadership's thinking and whether external financial assistance is found will play into Juba's positioning toward Khartoum going forward. As of now, oil and economic talks with Sudan appear to be of secondary importance for South Sudan, as compared with the priority issues of border demarcation, border disputes, and security.



NENAD MARINKOVIC / ENOUGH PROJECT

SPLA soldiers in
Northern Unity state

It's time to flex our muscles: Hardline sentiments on the rise

For the South, independence should have ended the colonial dynamic that has dominated South Sudan and Sudan's long history. But as one member of South Sudan's negotiating team put it, "Khartoum still sees us as inferior to them"—a perception exacerbated by Khartoum's negotiating positions and consistent aerial bombardment of South Sudanese territory since independence. The exorbitant oil transit fees proposed by Sudan's negotiators and Khartoum's confiscation of Southern oil in late 2011, for example, are seen by many Southerners as proof of Khartoum's continued sense of entitlement to Southern resources. Said one Southern official, "If someone takes your purse, will you just stand there and do nothing?"

But July 9, 2011—South Sudan's independence day—did shift the balance of power between the two parties, if only because the attainment of independence meant Khartoum lost its main piece of leverage over Juba. Throughout the peace implementation period, Southern leaders saw more to gain from appeasing Khartoum and the international community for the sake of holding its referendum and achieving independence. The shift in dynamic post-independence has resulted in increased resistance on the part of the South to compromise with the North, which is evident in some of the positions taken by Southern negotiators in Addis Ababa. At negotiating

rounds in November 2011 and January 2012, South Sudanese negotiators rejected AUHIP proposals that offered temporary solutions to the brewing oil crisis. At both meetings, South Sudan's leaders walked away on the grounds that agreement to the proposals would require that the South offer concessions without guarantees of good faith from Khartoum or the possibility of a fair, permanent solution going forward. The question Southern negotiators often asked was, "Why are we always asked to give for the sake of peace, when Khartoum won't?" Following independence, Juba's patience with Khartoum has finally run out.

The Sudanese army's attacks in March and April on South Sudanese positions, in the wake of opportunities to resolve issues through dialogue, were partially seen in Juba as the latest provocation by elements in the Sudanese regime continuing to presume that Juba will bow to its strong-arm tactics. The decision by South Sudan to hold the disputed territory and to shut down its oil output was in part to "make a point ... to convince [Khartoum] that we can match them," said one official, adding, "If you continue to aggress (sic) us, we can beat you back." The ability to take and hold Heglig in the face of SAF attacks was a concrete affirmation to Southern leaders of Juba's equal footing with Khartoum.

In the aftermath of the decision to occupy Heglig, the national mood in South Sudan grew increasingly intransigent. "It is our right to retake territories along the border that belong to us," was a commonly heard argument. The reflexive desire to assert South Sudan's equality and rights vis-à-vis Khartoum—given South Sudan's long, painful history with Sudan—has the potential to encourage the Southern leadership to take more aggressive stances in the future, especially if Khartoum continues to act in a provocative manner and the international community is seen as ineffective at defending South Sudan's sovereignty.

Negotiating with a volatile Khartoum regime

The unreliability of Khartoum's signature on recent and past agreements has made the regime at best an unpredictable negotiation and implementation partner for Juba and at worst a completely disingenuous one. Most recently, the Sudanese government's refusal to implement the security elements of the Abyei agreement signed in June 2011, the rejection of the Two Areas agreement signed in June 2011, and the political turnabout following the first clashes in Heglig on March 26 all raise legitimate questions in the minds of South Sudanese officials of whether any negotiations or agreement signed with Khartoum will be honored—and whether those making decisions in Khartoum have calculated that the best means of their political survival is through continued warfare.

The outbreak of fighting in Heglig, following high expectations for a presidential summit and security talks in Addis Ababa, "renewed our conviction that the North will never

deal with us in an honest way,” said one Southern official. The fractured nature of the Khartoum regime is understood well by Southern officials, who distinguish between those camps leaning toward dialogue and those leaning toward continued war.²⁸ When actions taken by Khartoum suggest that those pushing for military confrontation with the South have prevailed, the opinion in Juba also tilts toward the use of force vis-à-vis Khartoum. Following the first clashes in Heglig, it appeared Southern leaders had calculated that moderate voices in Khartoum still had a chance to prevail. But following the failed Addis Ababa talks in April and two other SAF attacks on South Sudan, the domestic political cost of nonresponse became too high. “You cannot continue to take casualties to strengthen the hands of the so-called moderates [in Khartoum],” said Deputy Defense Minister Majak D’Agoot of the decision to advance back to and hold Heglig. After three attacks on Southern positions, he said, it was clear that Bashir had tilted toward the hardliners.

The monopoly that hardliners appear to have over decision-making in Khartoum have created deep doubts among South Sudan’s leaders about whether continued talks will deliver a solution that will hold between the two sides and whether improved relations between the two current regimes is a feasible goal. This analysis of Khartoum is in part why Southern negotiators have held the position that border disputes between the two states should be arbitrated, rather than negotiated; binding international arbitration provides a timely solution backed by international legal guarantees that negotiations and a signed piece of paper with the Khartoum would not. The decision to shut down oil in January is another example that South Sudan’s pledge of cooperation with Khartoum, already fraught with skepticism, ends when Juba’s domestic interests are harmed and no redress is in sight. Steps can be taken by the international community—see below—to help address these concerns. The current political fray in Khartoum, though, suggests that a summit between Presidents Kiir and Bashir—one that can momentarily isolate both leaders from the political pressures in each capital—may ultimately be necessary to arrive at a North-South agreement that is sustainable.

Inability of the international community to hold Khartoum accountable

South Sudan’s calculations are highly sensitive to the responses of the international community to Juba and Khartoum, respectively, in any given Sudan-South Sudan incident. Some of the bolder decisions taken by the Juba leadership, including the shutdown of oil and the decision to stay in Heglig, are partially in response to the absence of—as the Juba leadership sees it—an effective international mechanism to end Khartoum’s transgressions, to push Sudan’s negotiators toward compromise at the table, or to guarantee the implementation of agreements.

Part of Juba’s frustration with the international community is aimed at the AUHIP-facilitated negotiations between the Sudans. The negotiations, which have produced few

agreements—none of which have been fully implemented—are increasingly viewed by Southern officials as an endless series of meetings that will never yield a sustained, comprehensive resolution to North-South issues. The South’s negotiators believe that the facilitation has allowed Khartoum to continue to assume extreme positions, walk away from talks, and even pressure the facilitation itself to change its approach to the negotiations.²⁹ The declining confidence in the facilitation is also a result of the perception among some Southern officials that the Thabo Mbeki-led African Union panel is biased in favor of Sudan.³⁰

The belief that the international community is not doing enough to support the peace process underscores the fact that South Sudan is still learning how to engage with the international community as an independent state, including fielding an effective diplomatic corps. The expectation on the part of the leadership in Juba that the international community will consistently police Khartoum’s behavior or mandate another peace-keeping mission, for example, is detached from the politics of the Security Council and overestimates the level of international attention on the Sudan-South Sudan conflict. The criticism also does not go far enough in acknowledging the South’s role in fueling international ambivalence—such as supporting proxies in Sudan—or the fact that Mbeki’s panel has been incapable of compelling either Khartoum or Juba to accept compromise when opportunities arise.

The core of the Southern argument, though, is true: The international community has largely been unable to stem Khartoum’s aggressions with its rhetorical condemnations or to guarantee any agreements Sudan has signed. This underscores the limitations, in general, of international influence over Sudan. In the lead-up to the latest crisis in Heglig, Juba might not have responded as it did had international intervention been able to prevent continued attacks by Khartoum, to compel the regime in Sudan to stay on the path to cooperation, or to press the regime to sign a ceasefire deal.

The pervasive belief among Southerners that the international community will not—or cannot—act to check Khartoum’s behavior has at times bolstered the conviction among South Sudan’s leadership that the government cannot afford to wait for international support or mediation but must instead take matters into its own hands. In the absence of a negotiation structure that can produce results, South Sudan’s leaders will at various junctures see less reason to return to the table and will instead negotiate via other means.

In the absence of effective international influence over Khartoum, so the Southern argument goes, the onus has consistently been placed on South Sudan to make the necessary compromises for peace. In this latest crisis, this trend has continued: Juba made the first move to reconcile against overwhelming domestic opinion. Between Khartoum and Juba, the latter has consistently been the easier party to sway with international opinion, but this dynamic cannot be taken for granted.



NENAD MARINKOVIC / ENOUGH PROJECT

SPLA soldiers in Huffra standing over the body of a Sudan Armed Forces officer

Whether the international community is able to deliver a sustained cessation of hostilities, full Sudanese withdrawal from disputed areas—including Abyei—and a viable negotiation process will be a key test of Juba’s reading of the world’s effectiveness in fairly mediating North-South issues going forward. Clearly, disenchantment with the international community does not yet match South Sudan’s concern with maintaining a favorable image on the world stage. But just as Juba is working to rebuild its standing before the international community, harmed by South Sudan’s advance into Heglig, the international community needs to rebuild its credibility with Juba. The decisions issued by the African Union Peace and Security Council on April 24 and the United Nations Security Council on May 2 were large strides to that end.

Going forward

The international community, especially key allies of South Sudan, can—and must—play an important role in helping to change the Southern leadership’s calculus going forward. A stronger facilitation model is necessary to rebuild Southern confidence in talks on security, border issues, oil, citizenship, and Abyei and to create space for moderates in Juba to argue for staying at the table and continuing to engage with Khartoum. The African Union Peace and Security Council communiqué and U.N. Security Council

resolution 2046 are robust steps that create some of the necessary leverage that the A.U. panel currently lacks, including bringing in the IGAD as a supporting partner to the AUHIP and imposing deadlines backed by credible pressures. But the panel must also be bolstered by the sustained diplomatic efforts of a coordinated “Friends of Sudans” body comprising key international actors in the vein of the model behind the successful negotiation of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement, during which IGAD’s mediation was supported by the Troika and Friends of IGAD. The “Friends of Sudans” body should be led by the coordinated influence and leverage of China and the U.S. and should comprise other actors who can 1) apply the necessary leverage to push both sides toward an agreement and 2) guarantee the implementation of any eventual agreement. This group would also need to include those actors who can provide Sudan with economic assistance.³¹

A comprehensive North-South agreement is needed, one that addresses the priority issues for both sides—Sudan’s security and economic needs and South Sudan’s territorial and security concerns. Key to such an agreement is a parallel North-North political process that holistically addresses the grievances of marginalized populations, including those from Blue Nile, South Kordofan, and Darfur. Without at least some progress on an inclusive, broad-based Northern process, support to proxies by both Sudan and South Sudan will likely continue, poisoning the atmosphere around future negotiations and jeopardizing any North-South deal that is struck. For the South, a deal would have to include security guarantees, demarcation of the agreed-upon areas of the border, a clear process for—or decision on—the disputed border areas, and a process for deciding the final status of Abyei. For Khartoum, security guarantees, including an end to Southern assistance to rebel groups in the North, and a transitional financial package that would help fill Sudan’s financial gap, are paramount.

Endnotes

- 1 In a one-on-one meeting, the lead negotiators, Pagan Amum and Idris Mohamed Abd al-Gadir, agreed on two key assumptions: that Sudan would be the one to determine the size of the financial gap they experienced after Southern secession, and that South Sudan could only fill a portion of the gap and would not be expected to shoulder the whole bill. Prior to this tacit agreement, South Sudan was using the IMF-calculated figure of 7.6 billion, while Sudan CITED both a 10 billion and 15 billion figure, the latter being the IMF-calculated figure for Sudan's balance-of-payments gap. Agreeing to these assumptions ensured that South Sudan would not be economically exploited for the viability of Sudan but also provided assurances to Sudan that the South Sudan would politically cooperate to resolve their economic troubles.
- 2 Both the SPLA and the SRF issued statements claiming the defeat of SAF at Jau on February 26, 2012, suggesting there was some level of coordination. See: Bonifacio Taban Kuich, "South Sudan Army in Full Control of Jau after Heavy Fighting with SAF – Official," *Sudan Tribune*, February 26, 2012, available at <http://www.sudantribune.com/South-Sudan-army-in-full-control,41728>; Sudan Revolutionary Forces, "The first Victory of the SRF Forces against the National Congress Party (NCP) Forces and Militias in the battle of Jau The Destruction of Two NCP brigades and the seizure of 140 Vehicles and 300 Dushkas," Press statement, February 26, 2012.
- 3 Phone interviews and meetings with international diplomats, international advisors, and South Sudanese officials, November 2011 through April 2012; Small Arms Survey, "Reaching for the gun: Arms flows and holdings in South Sudan" (2012), available at <http://www.smallarmsurvey-sudan.org/pdfs/HSBA-SIB-19-Arms-flows-and-holdings-South-Sudan.pdf>.
- 4 Magdi El Gizouli, "The NCP's sobbing negotiators," Still Sudan blog, March 18, 2012, available at <http://stillsudan.blogspot.de/2012/03/npcs-sobbing-negotiators.html>.
- 5 Interviews with South Sudan officials, April 2012, Juba, South Sudan.
- 6 South Sudanese Vice President Riek Machar, interview with the author, April 2012, Juba, South Sudan.
- 7 Interview with South Sudan official, April 2012, Juba, South Sudan.
- 8 Interview with South Sudan government and military officials, April 2012, Juba, South Sudan.
- 9 Hereward Holland and Ulf Laessing, "S. Sudan oil field 'bombed'; Sudan says hopes to avert war," Reuters, March 27, 2012, available at <http://af.reuters.com/article/sudanNews/idAFL6E8ER2EP20120327?sp=true>.
- 10 South Sudanese Vice President Riek Machar, April 2012.
- 11 Interviews with international diplomats, April 2012, Juba, South Sudan.
- 12 Interviews with South Sudan officials, April 2012, Juba, South Sudan.
- 13 Ibid.
- 14 Interviews with international diplomats, April 2012, Juba, South Sudan.
- 15 According to an African Union High Level Implementation Panel press statement, the draft proposal included six items: immediate implementation of all previous JPSM agreements and decisions; an end to negative media propaganda by both sides; immediate cessation of hostilities between the two states; the withdrawal of the armed forces of each state that may be in the territory of the other state; the establishment of verification mechanisms, including the Joint Border Verification and Monitoring Mission, which is to be supported by the U.N. Interim Security Force for Abyei (UN-ISFA); and preparations for the planned presidential summit meeting. See: African Union High Level Implementation Panel, "Negotiations on Reducing Tensions between Sudan and South Sudan," Press statement, April 4, 2012.
- 16 Deputy Defense Minister Majak D'Agoot, interview with the author, May 2012, Juba, South Sudan.
- 17 Ibid.
- 18 During the SPLA occupation of Heglig, SPLA Major General Mac Paul told media that the army was 30 miles north of Heglig. See: Tristan McConnell, "Sudan's return to war?," *Global Post*, April 20, 2012, available at http://www.salon.com/2012/04/20/sudans_return_to_war/.
- 19 Interviews with South Sudan officials, April 2012, Juba, South Sudan.
- 20 For more on the history of Heglig's status, see: Douglas Johnson, "Note on Panthou/Heglig," *Sudan Tribune*, May 2, 2012, available at <http://www.sudantribune.com/Note-on-Panthou-Heglig-by-Douglas,42490>; Eric Reeves, "Where is Heglig? International confusion and ignorance in answering this question about Sudanese geography has become one of the greatest threats to peace, and the negotiations required for peace to be sustained," Sudanreeves.org, April 14, 2012, available at <http://www.sudanreeves.org/2012/04/14/where-is-heglig/>.
- 21 U.N. reports seen by the Enough Project.
- 22 Interviews with South Sudan officials, April 2012, Juba, South Sudan.
- 23 Interview with U.S. diplomat, April 2012, Juba, South Sudan.
- 24 Deputy Defense Minister Majak D'Agoot, May 2012.
- 25 Interviews with South Sudan officials and international advisor, April 2012, Juba, South Sudan.
- 26 Interviews with South Sudan officials, April 2012, Juba, South Sudan.
- 27 Nenad Marinkovic, "From the Frontline: Fighting between the Two Sudans Continue as SAF Launches attack against SPLA in Unity State," Enough Project blog, April 30, 2012, available at <http://www.enoughproject.org/blogs/frontline-fighting-between-two-sudans-continues-saf-launches-attack-against-spla-unity-state>.
- 28 Interviews with South Sudan officials, April 2012, Juba, South Sudan.
- 29 Ibid.
- 30 Ibid.
- 31 Previous talks have centered on the concept of the international community filling a portion of Khartoum's economic gap following South Sudan's independence.

Enough is a project of the Center for American Progress to end genocide and crimes against humanity. Founded in 2007, Enough focuses on the crises in Sudan, South Sudan, eastern Congo, and areas affected by the Lord's Resistance Army. Enough conducts intensive field research, develops practical policies to address these crises, and shares sensible tools to empower citizens and groups working for change. To learn more about Enough and what you can do to help, go to www.enoughproject.org.

