THE INFLUENCE OF KENYA'S NATIONAL INTEREST ON SOUTH SUDAN PEACE PROCESS (2011-2018)

BY

DORRIS CHEPKOECH

C50/87882/2016

A RESEARCH PROJECT SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE AWARD OF THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, UNIVERSITY OF NAIROBI

SEPTEMBER 2019

Declaration

I, Dorris Chepkoech hereby declare that this project is my original work and has not been presented for a degree in any other university.

Signature…………………………… Date……………………………………

This project has been submitted for examination with my approval as the University Supervisor.

Signature…………………………… Date……………………………………

Professor Fred Jonyo

Chair, Department of Political Science and Public Administration

Dedication

To my parents, David Cheruiyot and Lily Cheruiyot, thank you for your prayers, sacrifice, unwavering support and encouragement. You gave me the resilience to go on with this research.

Acknowledgement

I express my sincere gratitude to my supervisor Prof. Fred Jonyo for his technical guidance and support. His professional input and mastery of the subject area enabled me to summon the courage and understanding to complete this study.

Similarly, many thanks go to all the key respondents who sacrificed their time to be interviewed and provided key information that facilitated these research findings.

My family, friends and colleagues were instrumental in giving me moral and material support to soldier on. To them I say thank you so much.

Last but not least, the University of Nairobi, Department of Political Science and Public Administration, for providing the necessary support and guidance to complete this research.

Abstract

The study examined the influence of Kenya's national interest on South Sudan peace process. The study is guided by three main objectives: to identify Kenya's economic, political and national security interest in South Sudan and to explore ways in which these national interest shape Kenya's interventions in the South Sudan peace process. The study employed the following research hypotheses: Kenya's national interests has influenced its intervention in the South Sudan peace process and Kenya's national interests has not influenced its intervention in the South Sudan peace process. Realism theory guided the study in identifying national security, economic and political interests of Kenya in South Sudan. The research employed both primary and secondary data but relied mostly on secondary data. The secondary sources used were books and journals articles, print and electronic media and other relevant papers. The primary sources utilized were mainly oral interviews of the people identified. Sampling of respondents was through purposive and snowballing. The data collected was analyzed using qualitative approach. The study reveals regional peace and stability, economic ties and trade deals, influx of refugees and quest for hegemony are among the interests that influenced Kenya's intervention in the South Sudan peace process. These findings will build a deeper understanding of the influence of Kenya's national interest on South Sudan peace process for the purposes of informing other research.

List of Acronyms

AU- African Union

ARCSS- Agreement on the Resolution of the Conflict in South Sudan

AUPSC- African Union's Peace and Security Council

CPA- Comprehensive Peace Agreement

COMESA- Common Market for East and Southern Africa

EU- European Union

ECOWAS- Economic Community of West African States

ECOMOG- Economic Community of West African States Monitoring Group

FARC- Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia

GEMAP- Governance and Economic Management Assistance Program

GERD- Grand Ethiopian Renaissance Dam

ICC- International Criminal Court

IRRI- International Refugee Rights Initiative

IGAD- Intergovernmental Authority on Development

JMEC- Joint Monitoring and Evaluation Commission

KCB- Kenya Commercial Bank

KESSULO- Kenya South Sudan Liaison Office

LAPSSET- Lamu Port-South-Sudan-Ethiopia

PSCU- President's Strategic Communications Unit

SPLA- Sudanese People Liberation Army

SPLA-IO- Sudanese People's Liberation Army–In Opposition

TFG- Transitional Federal Government

UN- United Nations

UNICEF- United Nations Children's Fund

UNHCR- United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees

UNMISS- United Nations Mission in South Sudan

UNSC- United Nations Security Council

UPDF- Ugandan People's Defence Force

US- United States

Table of Contents

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Overview

This chapter delves into the background of the study area, the statement of the research problem, study objectives, hypotheses, literature review and theoretical framework. It also discusses the methodology used in collecting and analyzing data.

1.2. Background of the Study

Currently, South Sudan host the largest number of refugees in Africa with over 2.3 million refugees and asylum seekers (UNHCR, 2019). After the civil war and the independence, conflict and violence erupted again in South Sudan due to the fact that President Salva Kiir dismissed his then-deputy Riek Machar and accused him of plotting a coup. This enmity sparked fighting between forces loyal to Salva Kiir and rebels associated with Machar, which further created a rift between South Sudan's ethnic groups, Kiir's ethnic group Dinka and Machar's associated ethnic group, Nuer people. The Dinka are the majority comprising of 36 percent of the total population whereas the Nuer comprising of 16 percent of the total population (Winsor, 2018).

Regional considerations have continuously played a vital role in South Sudan's security situation. A case example is that South Sudan was established out of a Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) that was signed between the Sudan People's Liberation Movement (SPLA) and the Government of Sudan facilitated by Kenya and Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD) members. The conflict in South Sudan has been shaped and influenced by its neighboring States. External actors influence conflict resolution and peacebuilding efforts in a state. Thus, it is crucial for mediators to understand and navigate external influences, on both a bilateral and multilateral level during peace processes (Kuol, 2018).

For the case of South Sudan, external influences and competition among various external actors has complicated and prolonged the conflict in South Sudan. For instance, Uganda was an ally to SPLA which had a great influence during the 2013 civil war. Uganda's need for a peaceful transitional government for its economic gain motivated its intervention in South Sudan peace process. Uganda's interests include the need to engage in political rather than military solutions to ongoing conflicts; support nationwide negotiation to have a transitional government and encourage better cooperation and understanding between Sudan and South Sudan (Kabugi, 2017).

South Sudan have also had long term relations with Kenya on various aspects ranging from political, economic, socio-cultural and strategic importance. South Sudan is a landlocked country that borders Kenya to the south and plays a very vital strategic importance for transportation of goods and services. In terms of culture, the Kenyan nilotes traces its origin to South Sudan and share a long-term historical linkage including language with the South Sudanese. In addition, Kenya hosting the South Sudan refugees and asylum seekers further improved the relationship between the two countries. Kenya also facilitated South Sudan gaining its independence and the establishment of a new government in South Sudan (Obala, 2012).

South Sudan and Kenya's relationship was also enhanced through the peace negotiation processes that took place in Kenya as well as the signing of the CPA in 2005 in Nairobi. Based on the CPA, Kenya and South Sudan relations further improved as Kenyans moved to South Sudan for businesses, investments, to offer technical support and capacity building. Other indicators for the bilateral relations and close ties between the two countries included the recent agreement for construction of an oil infrastructure passing through Kenya from South Sudan (Obala, 2012).

Kenya continues to provide asylum and protection to refugee populations mainly from Somalia, Sudan and South Sudan. The influx of South Sudanese refugees into Kenya rapidly grew due to the continued hostilities in South Sudan that started in 2013. According to the (UNHCR, 2018), by the end of October 2018, Kenya hosted 114,432 South Sudanese refugees. Nevertheless, the refugee population could reduce due to signing and implementation of the Peace Agreement that was signed on 5 August 2018 in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

Additionally, Kenya provided an immense role in the Operation Lifeline Sudan (OLS) established in April 1989, that served as a model for distribution of humanitarian aid. OSL was a consortium between UNICEF, World Food Programme and other institutions that were based in southern Sudan. OSL provided humanitarian aid in war-torn areas as well as those areas affected by drought in southern Sudan regions. Kenya and Uganda reached a consensus to allow transboundary humanitarian aid across their territorial borders. Lokichoggio was the main operation center to assist the SPLA-administered areas of southern Sudan. Key humanitarian milestones of OSL during the period included delivery of relief items and food in the southern Sudan region by use of river, rail and air transport. Moreover, OSL improved the health facilities among the southern Sudan population (Akol, 2017).

1.3. Statement of the Research Problem

As the youngest nation, that attained its independence in July 2011, South Sudan encountered a myriad of challenges. In 2013, a civil war erupted and disrupted elections that were ongoing in South Sudan. 400,000 people were estimated to have been killed in the war and approximately 4 million people were displaced and an approximate of 2.5 million people flew to Uganda, Kenya, Sudan and other neighboring countries (UNHCR, 2019). A ceasefire was signed in January 2014 in Addis Ababa Ethiopia between the government of South Sudan and the rebels, however, the ceasefire was not implemented for weeks. Peace negotiations continued in February 2014, but this failed to end the conflict that had displaced and killed millions of people. The conflict continued while the peace talks took place in 2014 in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

The competing regional initiatives among various stakeholders such as IGAD and AU to end the civil war further complicated the mediations in South Sudan. The mediation efforts encountered various challenges due to inadequate commitment and participation of the mediators as well as lack of a clear mechanism for enforcement of the agreements and an integrated, clear action plan for attaining sustainable peace. Intergovernmental organizations including IGAD, the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) and the African Union (AU) are some of the key external mediators who started conflict resolution and peace processes in the country.

The economic interests of South Sudan's neighbors constituted a key prism through which to view not only these neighbors' evolving roles in South Sudan peace process but also the jockeying for alliances by parties to the conflict. Kenya, Ethiopia, Eritrea, Egypt and Uganda are among the countries that invested in South Sudan. The continued intervention by the South Sudan neighbors were motivated by the need to pursue their economic interests and investments which varied from state to state.

It is against this background that this study examined the influence of Kenya's national interests on the South Sudan peace process. The aim of the study was to identify Kenya's economic, political, and national security interests in South Sudan peace process and explore ways in which these national interest shape Kenya's interventions.

1.4. Research Questions

1. What are Kenya's economic interests in South Sudan peace process?
2. What are Kenya's political interests in South Sudan peace process?
3. What are Kenya's national security interests in South Sudan peace process?
4. In what ways does national interests shape Kenya's intervention in South Sudan peace process?

1.5. Objectives of the Study

1. To identify Kenya's economic interests in South Sudan peace process.
2. To identify Kenya's political interests in South Sudan peace process.
3. To identify Kenya's national security interests in South Sudan peace process.
4. To explore ways in which national interest shape Kenya's interventions.

1.6. Justification of the Study

The study is important that an account of the influence of Kenya's national interests on the South Sudan processes be well explained to provide a point reference for policy makers and practitioners of conflict management. This will enable the policy makers and mediation practitioners understand

and appreciate Kenya's motivating factors as a mediator in the peace process to draw useful lessons. This is critical in that it will serve as a point of reference by third parties who will be interested intervening in other conflicts on the African continent.

Academically, the outcome of the study will be useful to students of international relations in understanding the uniqueness of peacemaking process in an African setting. It is for the stated reasons that the study will be undertaken and the report of the same will serve as a reference for future scholars and academic work.

1.7. Scope and Limitations of the Study

The study focused on the influence of Kenya's national interest on South Sudan peace process. The period from the signing of the CPA in 2005 to the current ongoing peace efforts by Kenya in South Sudan. The study was carried out in Sudan, South Sudan and Kenya.

The study was constrained by time, geographical location and financial challenges. Therefore, the study largely depended on secondary sources of information and limited primary sources where key officials from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Kenya, Ministry of Trade in Kenya, the National Treasury, IGAD office in Kenya, Sudan and South Sudan embassies in Kenya, UN mission to South Sudan and Sudan, Kenya Commercial Bank, Equity Bank, AU mission in Kenya as well as citizens from South Sudan currently residing in Kenya were interviewed.

1.8. Definitions and Operationalization of Key Concepts

Armed conflict: A political combat between forces both possessing weapons of war involving at least one state or more seeking to gain control of all or part of the state, and in which at least 1,000 people have been killed due to fighting during the war (Ploughshares, 2013).

Foreign policy: A set of political goals that determines a state's behavior towards other states in the international system. These political goals aim at achieving a countries national interest, economic interests, military interest and national security interests, which can be achieved through aggression, war or cooperation with other states. A state's foreign policy entails core strategies prioritized and selected by the country to achieve its goals and protect its national interest within

the world of international politics. These strategies are used by one state to interact with other states (Hill, 2003).

National interest: State survival, the protection of physical, political and cultural identity against encroachments by another nation-state (Morgenthau, 1948). A state can achieve its national interests through partnership and collaboration with other states or through use of force and exploitation.

Peace agreement: This is an accord between two or more conflicting parties which assists in ending war or violence among the parties. Some of the key aspects normally included in a peace agreement includes; definition of territorial borders, refugee status, distribution of natural resources and prisoners of war among others (Sanaan, 2007).

Peace process: A political process where violence and war are settled through peaceful means. Peace process employs mediation, negotiation and use of diplomatic means to settle disputes (Saunders, 2001).

1.9. Literature Review

1.9.1. Peace Processes

Darby (2003) in his study on the background of peace processes, he traces the origin of peace process to the Westphalia Treaty. His focus is on peace processes that occurred in 1990's. He observes that peace processes are replacing peacekeeping efforts and predict that in future peace processes will be the norm in the international politics. He examines peace processes in Africa, Asia, Europe, south America and the Middle East. Darby investigated peace processes and outlines five components of peace processes: peace, negotiation, violence, peace accords and peace building. However, he observes that each process is unique and that certain components of peace process do not require classification and inclusion in particular phases of the process. Darby's argues that a mediator who decides to enter into peace process should be aware of the peculiarities that may obtain in each conflict in order to steer it to a successful resolution.

Morgenthau (1948) in his book "Politics Among Nations", posits that the survival and identity are the core components of the national interests and foreign policy of a state. Morgenthau classified identity into physical, political and ethnic identity. Physical identity refers to the territorial integrity of a state, political identity refers to political and economic system in a state while cultural identity entails historical values such as cultural values and heritage. These are core elements of national interest as they are key for state survival and a state could go into war to secure its core national interests.

The authors of national interest concept include Niccolò Machiavelli, Jean Bodin, Hugo Grotius and Thomas Hobbes, who believed that state's foreign policy is based on its national interests. A states' foreign policy is developed based on the country's national interests. Roles of national interests include safeguarding territorial borders and protecting its citizens both in the country and abroad (Riaz-Ud-Din, 2015).

Keohane (1969) in his study on small states in international politics posits that small powers may not be able to acquire security through its own abilities and powers and therefore majorly relying on assistance from greater powers to enhance its security capabilities. Naturally, small powers seek alliances to improve and intensify their security based on greater power support to protect its citizens and territorial integrity against military attacks (Krause and Singer, 2001).

Newman and Oliver (2006) took a pessimistic view about peace processes by noting many mediation efforts and peace building efforts are prolonged, lengthy and negotiations are nearly impossible and where a consensus is reached, the agreements are never implemented effectively and efficiently. The implementation phases are always not very successful. The issue that ought to be learned from this submission is that a peace process is a fragile venture that requires meticulous leadership and patience. This is what eventually enabled parties to painstakingly pull through and reached an agreement. Over the past decade, peace processes have become a critical concern both at the national and international levels in societies affected by conflict.

End of the Cold War era allowed a renewed interest for conflict resolution and the phases and processes of conflict termination. Mediation processes are influenced by broader human security agenda. A key stimulant for this was the realization that conflicts constitute an obstacle to the development aspirations of the Africa. In the wake of the multi-layered violent conflicts in the 1990s the international community, civil society and regional organizations became concerned about ending conflicts and peace making everywhere in Africa, with a particular emphasis on the Horn of Africa that have constituted a particular sense of urgency (Newman and Olivier, 2006).

1.9.2. National Interests

In their research, Cousens and Kumar (2001) posits that the reason states participate in other states affairs is to pursue their own foreign policies which entails national interests. States engage in other states affairs to satisfy its own economic, military and cultural interests. These authors further added that in the event where international politics drove the state to intervene, states were driven by their need for survival and territorial integrity.

Goodhand and Hulme (1999) in their article "From wars to complex political emergencies" noted that during the cold war peace processes has been subscribing to the role of international community in conflict and violence. But they further cautioned on how the international community may interfere and prolong the conflict in a state, as the international community will be supporting states to pursue their selfish interests. Perris (2002) noted that external actors are vital during peace processes however, they should be neutral in the process of peace building and not driven by their own foreign policies. Perris added that the international community activities during mediation should focus on humanitarian aid, capacity building and development as well as security assistance.

Doyle and Sambanis (2006) stated that majority of the external actors during peace processes are not driven by mediation initiatives but rather on selfish interests. These external actors do not fully support the negotiation initiatives with some actors abandoning the peace process when it's not yet complete after gaining its national interests. Doyle and Sambanis argued that the sovereignty

of a state should be maintained during peace processes and external actors should step in to provide further technical advice and assistance.

Tarekegn (2005) argued that during peace negotiations and agreements as part of the mediation efforts, all the conflicting parties should be present during the peace processes and they should all sign the peace agreements. Involving all the stakeholders will ensure a partial process and a lasting solution to conflicts, as all the parties will be able to air their grievances and agree on way forward.

Sriram and Herman (2009) argued that the challenges encountered during peace processes are similar to those that led to the violence and hostilities. In their views, the greatest obstacle to mediation and conflict resolution is the search for transitional impartiality. An example given by Elmi and Barise (2006) in their study, Ethiopia's intervention is the peace process in Somalia has not been successful due to Ethiopia's activities in the country such as supplying firearms to the conflict parties.

1.9.3. South Sudan Peace Process

Young (2007) in his study regarding a flawed peace process leading to a flawed peace in Sudan, he points out that Sudan's Peace Process was likely to fail and lead to persistent instability. Young further argued that political expediency of liberal peace-making elevated elites at the cost of stakeholders such as the civil society. Rather than addressing authoritarian roots of conflict and the nature of the Sudanese state, the CPAs architects remained fixated on forging any deal, following a one-size-fits-all, liberal internationalist checklist. As a result, the peace process actively side-lined multiple actors and reified the very elite-based power structures responsible for decades of civil war and political instability in Sudan.

Manning (2003) in his study on the impacts of external actors on the prospects of mediated settlement in South Sudan explained that small powers experience challenges during peace processes as they cannot challenge great powers positions and decisions. And as a result, the great powers sometimes take advantage of this and pursue their own foreign policies during mediation. The great powers end up pursuing their selfish interest and jeopardizes further the violence and conflict in state.

Pearson (1998) posits that geostrategic issues motivates third parties to intervene during conflict. Person argued that this was experienced during IGAD's peace processes in South Sudan. He noted that South Sudan neighboring countries were competing for the economic and political interests in South Sudan, which is a landlocked country. Pearson further added that external actors only intervene due to the spillover effects of the ongoing civil war in a state.

Nedelcheva (2011) in her research on southern Sudan on the road to independence and democracy, she posits that South Sudan referendum results were marked by possibility of a peaceful transition and support by its citizens. However, peace building efforts were way from over as the country needed a lot of initiatives and transition to promote a peaceful nation. Other issues that the newest country had to deal with included oil investments and revenue generation, the citizenship question as some of its nationality were both from the north and southern regions, the political multiplicity of South Sudan, distribution of debts between the north and the south and also the cultural diversity including religious beliefs. Nedelcheva also highlighted the contested Abyei region which remained unresolved and territorial borders with the North which were yet defined as well as the Cotonou Agreement which needed to be addressed and integrated into other international organizations.

Belloni (2011) in his article on state building in South Sudan and the challenges, he explored the challenges that South Sudan was facing after the referendum in January 2011 that divided the south from the north. The creation of South Sudan and its separation from Sudan sparked various challenges to South Sudan in terms of negotiations regarding the disputed border of Abyei region, definition of boundaries, sharing the oil revenues and formation of nationality regime. Additionally, Belloni argues that even if a consensus was reached between South Sudan and Sudan, South Sudan still had myriads of challenges to tackle ranging from security issues, development and political system. Further, the article evaluates the impacts of South Sudan independence on the continued conflict and the principle of self-determination.

Obonyo (2014) in his research on regional stability and peace in South Sudan, he argued that South Sudan played a key strategic role to the Eastern Africa region and therefore, peace and stability was crucial for development. The fact that South Sudan is a landlocked provided an opportunity

to its neighboring countries to explore for economic development such as transportation of goods. In addition, Obonyo argued that the continued conflict in South Sudan could spread across its borders to the neighboring states and so the neighbors including Kenya and Uganda sent its military troops to South Sudan to assist South Sudan government to end the conflict. Since South Sudan gained its independence in July 2011, its relations with the Republic of Sudan become worse and tensions increased. South Sudan conflict attracted a lot of external mediators from states such as Uganda, Kenya and Ethiopia as well as regional and international organizations such as IGAD, UN and AU among others.

An analysis of the above literature indicate that although various scholars have written on the peace processes and in particular South Sudan peace process, there is limited literature that examines the influence of Kenya's national interest in the South Sudan peace process. The study filled this gap by investigating the political, economic and security interests and how these national interests influenced Kenya's participation in the South Sudan peace process and thereby constructing the role that Kenya played in the South Sudan peace process.

1.10. Theoretical Framework

A school of thought that explains international relations in terms of power is the realism theory. Realism stresses the role of the state, national interest, and military power in world politics. The architects of realism include Thucydides, Niccolo Machiavelli and Thomas Hobbes. The main tenets of realism theory are statism, survival, and self-help (Dunne et al, 2013).

According to realism, states compete with other states for power, survival and to control other countries. Thus, the crucial component for a state is power. International politics is about power which every states fight to gain power (Morgenthau, 2006). This power entails economic power, military power as well as cultural power. Power encourages states to pursue greater power in order to become supreme and as a result enables them to pursue their national interests through their foreign policies in other states (Burchill, 2005).

Consequently, power creates competition, struggle and conflict among states resulting into international anarchy and world disorder. For states to preclude domination of other states, they pursue balance of power. An example of balance of power is a bipolar world system such as the

11

Cold War. Realists stresses human nature in international politics, where states exist in a Hobbesian state of nature and are selfish, cruel and brutal thus creating conflict (Sutch and Elias 2007).

According to realism there is lack of supreme authority and world government in international politics thus creating an anarchy (Dunne and Schmidt, 2001). As a result of anarchy, states live in a harsh and hostile environment which results into conflict. The primary national interest of nation states in an anarchy is survival and territorial integrity. The need for survival and to protect its territorial integrity encourages states to reinforce its military power for survival and to defend themselves from external attacks and war from other states.

Neighboring states influences military power, military preparations and measures of another state. Military competition among states creates arms race even when states are not clear on whether there will be a conflict or not. States prepare their military capacity to be ready to go to war. State survival is a driver to other national interests such as economic, military and humanitarian which may not be realized if the survival of a state is compromised. Survival is a key component for a state to achieve its foreign policy and goals (Dunne and Schmidt, 2005).

The following are assumptions of realism. Realisms stresses the limitations on politics created by human beings, where human beings are egoistic as a result of lack of a world government. The egoistic nature of human beings and the lack of world authority leads to conflict, the state being the main actor in the international system. Additionally, there is lack of morality thus power and security become the main issues. As advanced by Thucydides, the main aspects of the state are power, security, egoism and morality. The second assumption of realism is that, human beings are selfish which results into lack of moral principles. Realism view human beings as ego-centric in nature (Thucydides, 1972).

The third assumption is that the international system is anarchic, which determines the international politics. The lack of international law makes the international system a self-help system. States seeks to survive, thus determine its own interest and seeks to pursue power over other states. Anarchy results into competition for power which defines international politics. The fourth assumption of realism is that security is a key element in the international system. In order to achieve security, states seek to be more powerful than other states and engage in balance of

power to prevent potential competitors from attaining more power. States engage in war to proof their supremacy and prevent other states from attaining military power. According to Thucydides, Peloponnesian War was due to power competition between the Athens and the Sparta. The supremacy of power of the Athens threatened the Spartans security thus leading to war (Thucydides, 1972).

Realism remains relevant to today's world politics, though it has also been criticized for its weaknesses. Although states are the main actors in international politics, other actors such as international organizations, multinational corporations and transnational actors play an important role in the international system. Nation-state are the favored political system and no other actor can control the political loyalties of its citizens or intervene during war and conflict, as nation-state has exclusive power and authority to command the whole nation to international law. In addition, state survival is crucial and thus, military power is vital and essential to safeguard national security and to counter unforeseen external military attacks (Burchill, 2005).

Dunne and Schmidt (2005) in their study noted that there is an agreement among realists with regard to the three main tenets of realism which is states, survival and self-help. According to realists, states foreign policy is driven by national interest in international politics. Thus, states relations with other states are based on competition rather than cooperation. During conflict, states will only cooperate to form allies to become stronger against the common enemy (Jackson and Sørensen, 2003).

Realism ignores the importance of global human interests and international cooperation as it only focuses on foreign policy and national interests of a state. Realism argues that the behavior of a state is driven by self-interest rather than the interest of human beings. Realists ignores the possibility of international cooperation during war and conflict. In an international system, both conflict and international cooperation are essential.

Realism theory is relevant to the study as it useful in identifying national interests that motivated Kenya's participation in the Sudan peace process. Realism theory will guide the study in demonstrating and understanding Kenya's foreign policy in South Sudan and the link to its interventions in the South Sudan peace processes. This will also guide the study in identifying Kenya's national interest in South Sudan peace processes and whether these national interests

influenced its participation. Realism theory will assist the study in illustrating how Kenya's foreign policy in South Sudan is driven by its national interests.

1.11. Research Hypothesis

The study sought to test the following hypotheses;

H1 Kenya's national interests has influenced its intervention in the South Sudan peace process.

H0 Kenya's national interests has not influenced its intervention in the South Sudan peace process.

1.12. Research Methodology

1.12.1. Research Design

The study adopted descriptive research design. This is a basic research method that starts with examining a phenomenon as it exists in the current state. It also involves identifying attributes of a phenomenon based on observation and exploration of correlation in more than one phenomena (Leedy and Ormrod, 2001). Descriptive study aims to find out the what, where and how of a phenomenon (Cooper and Schindler, 2006). This descriptive study was used to generalize the findings.

1.12.2. Study Area

The study was undertaken in various areas to capture the opinions of the different actors that were very crucial in the peace process. The study focused on Sudan, South Sudan and Kenya.

1.12.3. Source of Information

The study obtained information from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Kenya, Ministry of Trade in Kenya, the National Treasury, IGAD office in Kenya, Sudan and South Sudan embassies in Kenya, UN mission to South Sudan and Sudan, Kenya Commercial Bank, Equity Bank, AU mission in Kenya as well as citizens from South Sudan currently residing in Kenya who have knowledge about Kenya's involvement in South Sudan peace process.

1.12.4 Sampling Technique and Sample Size

Purposive technique was used in the study as a suitable method as it allowed the researcher to select key respondents. In this study, officials from Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Ministry of Trade, personnel in South Sudan and Sudan embassies, IGAD, AU representatives to Kenya, staff representatives at the National Treasury, KCB and Equity foreign offices staff and the UN staff members of the UN mission for South Sudan were targeted. Snowballing technique was used to interview South Sudan communities living in Kenya, including refugees who are scattered across the country who have knowledge of the South Sudan peace process.

Table 1: Breakdown of the interviews conducted

Respondents	Sample
Ministry of Foreign Affairs officials	5
Ministry of Trade officials	4
South Sudan Embassy officials	3
Sudan Embassy officials	2
IGAD officials	3
AU officials	4
UNMISS personnel	7
Kenya National Treasury officials	4
KCB Bank officials	2
Equity Bank officials	3
South Sudanese communities living in Kenya	8
Total	**45**

1.12.5. Data Collection

Two data collection instruments were designed and used in the study, interviews and documentary research. Interviews and documentary research were developed and tested to obtain validity and reliability before data collection. The study obtained primary and secondary data for investigating

national interests Kenya had in South Sudan that may have motivated her involvement in the peace process and how these interests influenced her participation. The secondary sources used were books and journals articles, print and electronic media and other relevant papers.

To obtain primary data the study conducted interviews with key informants who were involved in the peace process from government departments such as Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Ministry of Trade, staff at the Embassies of Sudan and South Sudan, KCB and Equity Bank. The information provided by these officers were crucial in discovering Kenya's national interests in South Sudan and the way national interests shaped Kenya's intervention in the peace process.

1.12.6. Data Analysis

Data analysis techniques employed in the study was qualitative. Data was collected, sorted and categorized into thematic areas, tallied and processed. The study then authenticated data obtained by one method through cross-checking against the other data collection instrument. The data was then analyzed and interpreted in accordance with the set objectives. This formed the basis for conclusions and recommendations.

1.12.7. Ethical Issues

Before administering interviews, respondents were briefed regarding the purpose of the study and informed that respondent's participation was voluntary. Individuals who agreed to be interviewed were issued with letters seeking their approval to participate in the study. The study maintained confidentiality and data collected was only used for the purpose of the study and no other business.

CHAPTER TWO

THE PEACE PROCESS IN SOUTH SUDAN

2.1.Introduction

This chapter identified the various external actors involved in the South Sudan peace process and then assessed the mediation context. Drawing on the United Nations Guidance for Effective Mediation, the study identified the mediation values and principles and related these principles of mediation to the South Sudan peace process. This section then finally investigated and outlined into detail all the activities that transpired in the South Sudan peace process in phase I and II as well as the Khartoum Declaration.

2.2.External Actors in South Sudan Peace Process

The study examined the key external actors that shaped up the South Sudan peace process. The findings of the involvement and key roles played by these actors have been outlined below; the intervention by the military of Uganda, which was hugely backed by South Sudan government under leadership of Salva Kiir and the autonomous decisions were the source of constant strains on the peace process. Not only did Uganda's intervention undermined IGAD's neutrality, but also, the tension between Uganda, Ethiopia and Kenya intensified and challenged these states reaching an agreement in the mediation process. Ugandan People's Defence Force (UPDF) provided a significant military support in the Eastern African region where UPDF anticipated political and financial gains through their interventions. Thus, UPDF participation in South Sudan explained Uganda's national interests in the country. In addition, South Sudan was one of Uganda's market hub for its exports ranging from oil to production which was transported from South Sudan to Uganda (Tribune, 2014).

Uganda supported South Sudan through SPLM, where they allied with the guerillas in their battle against Khartoum. Uganda's president, His Excellency, Yoweri Museveni had a heavy support for SPLM and when the conflict started, he had a great influence on the multi-party power struggle. In spite of Museveni's great presence and activities in southern Sudan, Uganda did not contribute

much to the mediation efforts as compared to other IGAD member states. IGAD members repeatedly requested Uganda to withdraw its troops in South Sudan, however it ignored IGAD's requests (Baker and Santora, 2015).

In some cases, Uganda did not participate in the mediation talks that were being led by IGAD which further created a lot of tension among IGAD members. Also, during the inauguration ceremony of President Yoweri Museveni of the Republic of Uganda, President Al-Bashir travelled to Uganda to attend the inauguration ceremony showing support from Sudan to Uganda despite Al-Bashir' warrant of arrest by the International Criminal Court (ICC). The implications of Uganda and Sudan relations undermined peace process in South Sudan as their relationship created a lot of tension and suspicions among IGAD members (Tribune, 2014).

Kenya played a major role in the South Sudan peace initiatives. Kenya's support lead to the signing of the CPA as well as South Sudan independence. Kenya also became a key peace maker under the auspices of IGAD. Through IGAD, Kenya's General Lazarus Sumbeiywo was appointed as a mediator of IGAD to lead the peace negotiations. Kenya also supported South Sudan by sending its military personnel to enforce security in the country by joining UN mission in South Sudan (UNMISS). However, it is important to note that, despite these great contributions, Kenya was also interested in the economic developments in South Sudan. South Sudan had a large market potential for its neighboring countries to invest in. Kenya took advantage of the market and invested a lot of its businesses from banking, insurance, wholesale and retail trade to transport and communication networks (Tribune, 2014).

Sudan participated as an external actor in the South Sudan peace process through its capital city Khartoum. Sudan was also keen in pursuing its national interests in South Sudan by fueling conflict among southern Sudanese groups. This was achieved by its leaders who kept their feet in both sides of the warring camps. The Sudan leaders publicly supported the South Sudan government but privately allied with the opposition groups and supplied ammunition and weapons (Kuol, 2018). Uganda's presence in South Sudan and its interventions through UPDF also created an arms race between Uganda and Sudan. Uganda's intervention in South Sudan further attracted Sudan which created a platform of competition between the two countries. Uganda and Sudan differed in their ideologies where they sometimes participated in proxy wars to threaten each other.

Ethiopia's intervention is South Sudan was through its status as the IGAD chair. Ethiopia's foreign policy in the country was towards peacebuilding and conflict resolution in South Sudan. This was guided by the need for political stability among is neighboring countries and the quest for being the hegemony in the region through its leadership. Despite Ethiopia's presences and interventions in South Sudan peace process, Ethiopia encountered problems with her competing neighbors from Uganda and Kenya. Kenya and Uganda's competition and conflict hindered Ethiopia's intervention and mediation in South Sudan. Additionally, Ethiopia's role as the chair of IGAD and the need for prestige in the regional politics also overshadowed its role as mediators and fueled more conflict in South Sudan. Ethiopia also experienced internal disputes within its camp where wrangles sparked among its high-level government officials which derailed Ethiopia's role as a leader of IGAD and resulted into lack of teamwork, coordination and communication breakdown to IGAD members (Healy, 2011).

The United States and South Sudan relations traces back before signing the CPA. The US had been a key mediator supporting the peace talks and negotiations that were being led by the regional body, IGAD. The US supported the region to negotiate and reach an agreement that lead ending of civil war and the signing of CPA that resulted into South Sudan independence in 2011. Additionally, the support from the US contributed to the signing of the Agreement to Resolve the Conflict in South Sudan (ARCSS) in 2015, consequently, this agreement supported the formation of a transitional government. US also played a key role of being South Sudan main sponsor for financial aid, humanitarian and military assistance. It is estimated that in the year 2014, the US provided humanitarian relief worth 1.2 billion US dollars to support the emergency crisis in South Sudan (Micheni, 2017).

Nevertheless, continued hostilities in South Sudan weakened South Sudan's relationship with the US. The relationship deteriorated due to the fact that US supported for a comprehensive IGAD peace process with all its member states support and inclusivity. The US had a great influence where they provided technical advice on a regular basis which was adopted by the peacemakers. Some examples were President Barrack Obama and Secretary of State, John Kerry intervention and mediation advice which up-scaled and rejuvenated the peace process efforts in South Sudan whenever it stalled. United States also exerted influence in the process through sanctions at their

participation at the UN Security Council. Despite the US supporting the peace process in South Sudan, it failed to take the lead as a superpower and take ownership of the process. Other actors in the South Sudan peace process that worked closely with the United States included the European Union, United Kingdom and Norway. These special envoys worked in close collaboration and support to the US by providing financial support through funding various peace initiatives in South Sudan as well as provide humanitarian assistance to the refugees and asylum seekers (Micheni, 2017).

The US, Norway and United Kingdom collaborated and formed what was known as Troika to mediate in South Sudan peace process as a bloc as well as provide technical advice and support to IGAD. Troika spearheaded the peace talks in South Sudan and contributed to the signing of the CPA in 2005. The UK's foreign policy in South Sudan was align to that of the US and despite the UK having colonized South Sudan, its intervention was minimal. US provided a vital role in the implementation of the CPA and it also provided financial and humanitarian aid to the civilians who became victims of the civil war and those internally displaced (US Bureau of African Affairs, 2018).

Norway also took part in the mediation process in South Sudan. Norway pushed for development agenda in the north and peace initiatives in South Sudan. Additionally, Norwegian non-governmental organizations such as the Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC), Norwegian Church Aid (NCA) and the Norwegian People's Aid (NPA) provided emergency relief food and aid in both the north and South Sudan. The Norwegian government negotiated peace talks between the government of South Sudan and SPLM-O that lead to the peace agreements (Mackuei, 2014).

Troika negotiated for peaceful mediation talks in southern Sudan through financial and humanitarian aids. Troika also influenced military sanctions through the UNSC members, the US and the UK. Troika's core mandate in the peace process was to push for a peaceful transition, power sharing agreement as well as addressing the causes of violence and hostilities in South Sudan. The composition of Troika, which had UNSC members, i.e. US and UK and Norway contributed significantly to the mediation efforts as well as development, reconstruction of peace talks and reconciliations in South Sudan. Troika received international support from the UN and AU and other humanitarian agencies that were present in South Sudan (Mackuei, 2014).

The European Union (EU) provided an immense funding for the peace negotiations and talks that were spearheaded by IGAD. EU partnered with IGAD and formed an IGAD Partners Forum which was steered by Italy and played a significant role in providing technical advice for the peace agreements. The EU continues to provide financial aid to both the civilians and South Sudan government to assist with the humanitarian crisis as well as peace talks. EU's core mandate in the horn of Africa and particularly South Sudan is to assist in ending violence and support in formation of a transitional government. The EU have also used sanctions to individuals accused of crimes against humanity as well as individuals who have participated in obstructing peace and broke ceasefire agreements. The EU has also supported IGAD mediated talks by funding IGAD with over one million euros through the African Peace Facility to assist in the monitoring and implementation of peace agreements in South Sudan (Garang, 2015).

China also participated in the peace process efforts in South Sudan through its diplomatic and special envoy to Africa. The special envoy regularly met in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia to strategize on mediation efforts and peace plans in South Sudan. China contributed majorly by providing military troops to the UNMISS. China also provide financial support by funding some of the IGAD peace negotiations in Juba and Addis Ababa. China's participation in the peace process was also driven by the oil resources in South Sudan. The rich oil reserves in South Sudan attracted China's attention for economic advancements (Xinhua, 2016).

An example of China intervention in the South Sudan peace process was during the Foreign Ministers visit by Wang Yi to Khartoum, where the Foreign Minister invited the conflicting parties in South Sudan for peace talks and consultations and Wang Yi further reiterated China's continuous support to IGAD mediation process and its goal for peace in South Sudan. IGAD members welcomed China's participation in the peace process in South Sudan, however, China's participation lacked consistency and commitment (Xinhua, 2016).

In 2014, China delivered military weapons worth twenty million US dollars to South Sudan. China was later accused by IGAD members and other the US for fueling conflict by providing military arms in South Sudan, which was further derailing the mediation efforts. Moreover, China's involvement in South Sudan mediation was also partly contributed by the US participation, where

China needed to keep a close eye to its competitor's activities in the region. The tension and rivalry between the US and China further undermined the peace process by creating proxy wars in South Sudan (Xinhua, 2016).

The African Union (AU) participated as a regional organization in the South Sudan peace process. AU supported and endorsed IGAD's mediation role and leadership in South Sudan but in some instances AU Peace and Security Council (AUPSC) hugely disagreed with IGAD heads of states on their mediation decisions. A key initiative in the South Sudan peace process by AUPSC was in December 2013 where it established a commission of inquiry in South Sudan to investigate crime against humanity and other violations during the first stage of the war and provided its findings and recommendations to the transitional justice (Union, 2013). Additional, in June 2015, AU appointed Alpha Oumar Konaré, the former Malian president to steer the mediation process efforts as the AU special envoy to South Sudan. This was an initiative that demonstrated AU's commitment for peace negotiations and further enhanced is engagement in the peace process.

Another external actor that participated in the mediation efforts is the "IGAD Plus". IGAD Plus was created in June 2015, where IGAD chair, Ethiopia announce the enhancement of IGAD intervention. This announcement by IGAD chair was influenced by the US to expand IGAD's mediation process and include other actors present in South Sudan. The additional members that comprised IGAD Plus were the UN, Troika, EU, AU and China who were the official partners (Vertin, 2018).

IGAD Plus was established for mitigation of regional competition and conflicts by including other actors who were not necessarily from the region. The external non-regional actors assisted in neutralizing regional dynamics and ensuring inclusivity of all members in the peace process. In addition, IGAD plus promoted and improved global partnership with other international bodies such as the UN, increased African participation and ownership through the AU and further provided technical support, additional funding and capacity building to IGAD from the EU, China and Troika. Nevertheless, IGAD plus also encountered challenges from AU members' participation and also IGAD members did not welcome and fully supported the operational modalities to make IGAD plus successful in mediation efforts (Vertin, 2018).

The UN did not participate in the peace talks and negotiation process in South Sudan. However, the UN provide immense humanitarian aid and security in South Sudan through the UNMISS. UN camps in South Sudan hosted hundreds of thousands of civilians who were displaced as a result of the civil war and conflict in South Sudan. The Internally Displaced Persons (IDP) seeks shelter and food at the UN camps in South Sudan. Also, the World Food Programme of the UN continues to provide relief food assistance and humanitarian aid to the South Sudanese. Other UN agencies present in South Sudan includes United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) who provide emergency food and healthcare to children and mothers and UNHCR who continues to protect the rights of refugees and displaced communities and stateless people, and also support in voluntary repatriation and resettlement of asylum seekers and refugees (United Nations, 2016).

Civil Society Organizations such as the Catholic church has also played a vital role in the peace processes in South Sudan. In April 2019, Pope Francis of the Vatican, hosted a spiritual retreat with Salva Kiir and Riek Machar in Rome which took place hours after Sudan overthrew Omar al-Bashir, Sudan president who had ruled Sudan through dictatorship for thirty years. Pope Francis kissed the feet Salva Kiir and Riek Machar requesting the two leaders to stay in peace and maintain peace in South Sudan (Aquilino, 2019).

2.3. The Mediation Context

Peace processes are characterized by uncertainty, difficulties and complications among mediation parties involved. Few peace process initiatives meet the standard UN guidance for effective mediation process. These basic framework and guidelines are vital and important for defining mediation efforts by external actors and other stakeholders involved in peace processes as well as decisions taken and reaching a consensus to maintain warring parties and promote peace (United Nations, 2012).

Civil war in South Sudan intensified in December 2013, and this saw IGAD heads of states meet in Nairobi for a crisis meeting. The purpose of the Nairobi emergency meeting was to agree on way forward and possible mediation efforts to combat the widespread of ethnic conflict and killings as well as displacement and refugee problem. IGAD leaders called for an immediate

ceasefire and a comprehensive political discussion and dialogue. The mediators appointed included Seyoum Mesfin, former Ethiopian Foreign minister who served as a chief mediator while the deputy was General Lazaro Sumbeiywo from Kenya. These team was later joined by a representative from Sudan, General Muhammad Ahmed al-Dabi (International Crisis Group, 2019).

Despite the presence of international bodies such as the UN and the regional organizations such as AU, and other external states who could have taken the lead in the mediation process in South Sudan, IGAD was encouraged to take the lead in the peace processes. IGAD leadership would solve the issue of competition from South Sudan neighboring states by making the peace process inclusive for all member states. Among the IGAD members that took the forefront in the negotiations included Kenya, Ethiopia and Uganda who had a long-term relationship with South Sudan (International Crisis Group, 2019).

Kenya, Uganda and Ethiopia played a vital role in ending the civil war and enabling South Sudan to gain its independence in 2011. In addition, all these countries bordered South Sudan where the continued conflict in South Sudan would have had direct impact in their own countries due to the issue of refugee influx, asylum seekers as well as other spillover effects of the war including increased insecurity in the countries. Therefore, they had to take initiatives for their own national security interests. IGAD member states worked collaboratively together and supported South Sudan mediation efforts and peace processes. Diplomatic tools and methods were used by the international organizations, regional states and external states during negotiations and peace discussions in South Sudan. States leadership from presidents, prime ministers, ministers of foreign affairs provided technical support to the mediation initiatives (Knopf, 2016).

Salva Kiir's government continued with the peace process initiatives with hope to receive international support to assist South Sudan in ending the conflict. They received immense support from IGAD who coordinated the negotiations and peace talks and when there was a plot for a coup d'état, IGAD and other peace mediators condemned the plans. Lead by the IGAD chair, Seyoum and supported by the United States, IGAD campaigned for a political transition in South Sudan and involvement of all stakeholders in the peace processes. IGAD faced challenges mediating the process as the conflict continued to escalate and got more complex and negotiations and reaching a consensus between the warring parties become nearly impossible (Vertin, 2018).

In addition, Uganda's military interventions and other regional states interest in South Sudan complicated the process as these external mediators had hidden agendas and proven impartial in the mediation efforts. For example, earlier when the war started, Uganda was quick to send its troops and war planes to support the government forces and the quest for being the leader in the collective security strategy. Nevertheless, Uganda played a remarkable role in ending the January 2014 attacks by the opposition forces and preventing more conflict in South Sudan. The UN, AU and IGAD saluted the support from Uganda in preventing the occurrence of another war but were also concerned on the involvement of Uganda's army who had proven biased in some instances. Despite the end of the war, Uganda's army stayed back in South Sudan and continued with air and ground strikes which the opposition considered offensive and created more tension between the government and the opposition (Knopf, 2016).

2.4. Phases in the South Sudan Peace Process

South Sudan peace process that was led by IGAD started in January 2014 to August 2015 that saw the signing of the signing of the Agreement on the Resolution of the Conflict in South Sudan (ARCSS). Negotiations continued from August 2015 running into 2016, where IGAD members, Ethiopia, Kenya and Uganda were nominated to steer the peace process. Regular negotiations and peace talks took place in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia as the chair of IGAD. In 2018, the Khartoum Declaration of Agreement was signed in Sudan.

The first phase of the peace process started in January 2014 which aimed at ending the conflicts and releasing SPLM leaders who were in custody. The warring parties in the first phase were Salva Kiir government and the opposition, SPLM/A led by Riek Machar. IGAD leaders began the peace talks in Ethiopian capital, Addis Ababa where peace makers noted that there was a need to end the conflict in South Sudan to prevent the continued struggle and spillover effect to its neighboring countries. As the first step, the mediators agreed that it was urgent and crucial to stop the hostilities in South Sudan. The war in South Sudan had intensified as the national army split into two and it attracted a great number of South Sudanese who were keen in joining the war (Vertin, 2018).

The chair of IGAD, Seyoum noted that it was difficult to end the conflict because the political difference was not yet addressed and therefore the pressure between the warring parties was intense. Nevertheless, IGAD leaders pushed for a consensus between the conflicting parties for peace discussions and resolve the violence. The international community including the UN, EU and other states such as the US, China and United Kingdom supported IGAD's decision for pushing for peace in South Sudan (Vertin, 2018).

Two weeks into the peace talks in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, the warring parties, the government of South Sudan and the opposition lead by Riek Machar signed an agreement to end the hostilities. This was as a result of continued cooperation and support from IGAD members, peace discussions and negotiations as well as international support and funding from the UN, EU as well as the US. The cessation of hostilities agreement required the opposition and the South Sudan government to end the operations that were fueling violence, disband their armed groups in South Sudan and ensure protection of its citizens. The peace talks also established a monitoring and implementation plan with a clear composition, purpose, roles and reporting mechanism (Vertin, 2018).

IGAD's initiative received an international backing including support from the UN through its former UN Secretary General, Ban Ki-moon. Ban Ki-moon stated that it was crucial and important to continue with the mediation process to promote a national dialogue in order to achieve a peace agreement in South Sudan. Conversely, the monitoring mechanism delayed from starting and this saw hostilities erupting again and the two warring parties began the blame games and conflict (United Nations, 2014).

The second phase of the negotiation talks began in February 2014 to August 2015. The second phase focused on expanding its mediation agenda and the peace negotiations with an objective of an inclusive national dialogue and structural reforms. The second phase had additional stakeholders compared to the first phase. The mediators for the second phase included the government, opposition leaders, SPLM leaders, religious leaders, civil society organizations and also women groups (IGAD, 2014). The additional stakeholders were not allowed to participate fully in the negotiation processes but provided technical support and advice to the team. The

second phase took so long, and the negotiations and peace talks delayed which made the hostilities intensify and the killings in the country went up as the war escalated.

In 2015, IGAD added new additional members, UN, Troika, EU, AU and China and was named "IGAD Plus". IGAD Plus was established to ensure inclusivity with all stakeholders in the mediation talks. The attempt to increase IGAD's mandate to IGAD Plus did not do much to end the conflict in South Sudan as IGAD plus faced its own challenges and wrangles from IGAD members who did not welcome the concept to have additional new members (IGAD, 2014).

During the second phase of South Sudan peace talks, six IGAD summits were convened by the IGAD's heads of state. Additionally, the US lead by President Barack Obama convened an extra mediation meeting in July 2015. Consequently, IGAD prepared and distributed a draft peace agreement combining comprehensive inputs prepared over a year and six months by the South Sudanese constituencies on issues related to national security, national dialogue, economic transformation, transitional government and structural reforms among others. The following weeks, a peace agreement was signed by the government, the opposition and SPLM former detainees who agreed for a national dialogue (Knopf, 2016).

Notwithstanding the challenges that IGAD faced in the peace process in South Sudan, it contributed significantly in mediating the conflict and reaching an agreement between the warring parties as well as starting the peacebuilding efforts, conflict resolution and implementation of structural reforms. In October 2015, a Joint Monitoring and Evaluation Commission (JMEC) was established to coordinate and support the implementation of the peace accords that was signed by the government, the opposition and SPLM former detainees in July 2015. JMEC members comprised of AU, UN, IGAD member states as well as the IGAD plus members. The implementation of the July 2015 peace accord experienced challenges and delays due to internal wrangles and conflict between IGAD heads of states as each leader wanted to steer the implementation process (IGAD, 2014).

One of the key implementing partners in South Sudan that played a key role in supporting the peace agreement was the UN Mission in South Sudan (UNMISS). UNMISS provided South Sudan with over 12,000 troops who provided security, humanitarian aid as well as assisting the government transition process. UNMISS did not participate directly in the peace process,

nevertheless, it provided emergency humanitarian aid and protected over 200,000 refugees who were displaced and resided in the UN bases in South Sudan since the conflict began (United Nations, 2015).

In April 2016, the opposition leader of SPLM/A, Riek Machar, returned to Juba as per the terms of the peace agreement power sharing model which resulted into increased tension in South Sudan. The tension intensified and in three months' conflict broke again and the violence spread across the country. Consequently, the peace agreement was suspended and Riek Machar fled the country to exile. It took over 12 months for IGAD members and other international stakeholders to intervene and mediate in the conflict that started again in 2016 in South Sudan. The one-year delay lead to wide spread of violence and hostilities across South Sudan including some parts that initially did not experience violence (International Crisis Group, 2019).

Two years into the 2016 conflict, Salva Kiir, South Sudanese President and the opposition leader, Riek Machar met on 27 June 2018 and took a bold decision to sign a peace deal for the ongoing violence in South Sudan. Lead by Omar al-Bashir, the president of Sudan, he oversaw the signing of the Khartoum Declaration of Agreement by Salva Kiir, Riek Machar, representative of the South Sudan Opposition Alliance (SSOA), representative of Former Detainees and a representative of Other Political Parties (OPP) at the Presidential Palace in Khartoum Sudan (International Crisis Group, 2019).

The Khartoum Declaration of Agreement outlined five strategic mandates. In addition to supporting humanitarian relief and freeing the political detainees, the parties of the agreement agreed to declare a permanent cessation of hostilities in South Sudan, the Khartoum Declaration of Agreement be effective within 72 hours, institute a national military and other security forces that is free from ethnicity and tribal affiliations, strive to improve infrastructure and development in South Sudan that would benefit its civilians, improve the oil fields safety to foster oil exports and to effectively implement the peace agreement, through a pre-interim period of four months and later an interim period of three years leading to free and fair countrywide elections (IGAD, 2018).

The Khartoum Declaration Agreement provides for a transitional government with Salva Kiir as the head of state while Riek Machar to be reinstated as the first vice president of South Sudan. The second vice president as per the agreement would be a representative from Government of National Unity (TGoNU) party and the third vice president was proposed to be the held by a representative from the former detainees, SSOA and other political parties. The Khartoum Declaration of Agreement further proposed for a self-monitoring implementation mechanism of the peace agreement in order to end the violence and hostilities in South Sudan (IGAD, 2018).

Additionally, the fifty section of the Agreement regarding security of oil fields, provides for participation of Sudanese forces in southern Sudan's national activities in the oil fields, which is exceptional since the signing of the CPA and South Sudan independence in 2011. Lastly, the Khartoum Declaration of Agreement provided that after the three-year interim period, general elections should be conducted in South Sudan (IGAD, 2018).

In August 2018, another peace agreement was signed following the Khartoum Declaration of Agreement and later in September 2018, a comprehensive agreement was signed between Salva Kiir and Riek Machar. Peace negotiations have improved in South Sudan through the support of regional leaders of the neighboring states. Ethiopia, through its Prime Minister, Abiy Ahmed has contributed significantly to the mediation efforts. As the chair of IGAD, Ethiopia has taken center stage is support the warring parties of South Sudan implement the peace accords. Through its efforts, Ethiopia steered the first face to face meeting between Riek Machar and Salva Kiir in its capital, Addis Ababa. Ethiopian meeting was the first meeting ever since the 2016 agreement collapsed and the ratification of the comprehensive peace agreement in September 2018 (IGAD, 2018).

In conclusion, despite the immense initiatives by the external actors in the South Sudan peace processes, these regional and international actors have also undermined the peace mediation in South Sudan by fueling more conflict and creating tension and suspicion among the mediators. Some of these external actors have been beneficiaries of the civil war in South Sudan. The continued conflict and violence have enabled them to advance their economic and national security interests. Nevertheless, the continued conflict has had a consequence to its neighboring countries

such as Sudan, Uganda, Kenya and Ethiopia and thus the need to intervene in South Sudan to keep a close eye on the continued violence and hostilities in South Sudan.

Due to the conflicting interests among the external actors in the South Sudan peace process, these actors have failed to transform the mediation efforts and contribute to the peace negotiations as well as achieving peace in South Sudan. Reaching a consensus in the peace talks have been nearly impossible due to the different foreign policies and national interests of the external actors. Important to note, sustainable peace in South Sudan can only be achieved when the external actors unite and concentrate on the core mandate of the peace talk and negotiations.

CHAPTER THREE

KENYA'S NATIONAL INTERESTS IN THE SOUTH SUDAN PEACE PROCESS

3.1. Introduction

This chapter present research findings for the research objectives on investigating Kenya's economic, political and national security interest in the South Sudan peace process. Interview guides were administered to various respondents which assisted in determining Kenya's national interests in South Sudan peace process. The findings presented include economic interests, political interests and national security.

3.2 Kenya's Economic Interests in South Sudan

South Sudan's economic prospects, buoyed by expected developments in the budding oil industry, attracted hundreds of Kenyan firms, including banks and insurers raising the stakes for their owners. Kenya firms present in South Sudan include KCB, Equity bank, Cooperative bank, EABL, UAP holdings and Nakumatt Holdings. Despite its oil wealth, the country was still largely under-developed and renewed fighting pitting the government against rebels continued to dim its short-term economic outlook. And as a result, the neighboring states including Kenya saw an investment opportunity and ventured into the South Sudan market.

The continued conflict and violence in South Sudan had a spillover effect to Kenya economy. The impact of conflict in Kenya's investment was immense and this worried the Kenya investors in South Sudan as their businesses would be affected which was ranging from aviation, banking, construction, transportation, Information and Communication Technology (ICT), insurance, wholesale and retail trade among other investments. The continued conflict in South Sudan resulted into closure of Kenya's business and loss of valuables and property as the conflict resulted into looting. In addition, the human resources and personnel that were working in South Sudan lost their jobs as a result of the war. Before the conflict started, Kenyans in South Sudan were providing technical support and capacity building for the transition government while others were managing their businesses in the country. The continued conflict in South Sudan impacted

negatively on Kenya's investment and income in South Sudan through the various companies and personnel (Odhiambo and Muluvi 2014).

Regarding the banking industry, KCB has reopened 12 out of the 23 branches that were shut down during the civil war. Additionally, KCB plans to open new more branches in Juba to meet its customers' demands. KCB is targeting a customer population from the current 122,000 to 200,000 by the end of 2020. The Kenyan bank has also enrolled mobile banking in South Sudan called which aims to use technology to promote effective and efficient banking services to its customers. As at July 2019, KCB incomes is a total of 32 billion South Sudanese pounds. (Business Report, 2019). Equity banks on the other hand operates through its subsidiary bank headquartered in Juba, called Equity Group Holdings Limited (EGHL). Equity Bank have a total of nine branches in South Sudan serving customers spread all over the country. Kenya banking industry in South Sudan is huge and it have attracted a vast number of customers.

Kenya exported a lot of goods and services to South Sudan. Based on the economy survey in 2013, Kenya exported goods and services that contributed 10.2 percent of the total exports of the Common Market for East and Southern Africa (COMESA). With this export statistics, South Sudan was the fourth largest market for Kenya's export out of the eighteen COMESA members. Additionally, Kenya's concern was the security issue as most goods and services were exported through road transport. The insecurity in South Sudan also hindered Kenya business prospects of flow of goods and services. In 2018, Kenya exports to South Sudan is valued at 127,940,000 US dollars. Kenya tops other countries in exporting goods and services to South Sudan according to the statistics of International Trade Centre, with over exports from 852,065,000 US dollars from 2014 to 2018 (ITC, 2019).

Regarding South Sudan's exports to other countries, China tops as South Sudan leading export market with exports valued at 1,588,452,000 US dollars in 2018. Kenya is the fourth country receiving South Sudanese exports after China, United Arab Emirates and Pakistan with a value of 161,000 US dollars in 2018 (ITC, 2019). Thus, the above import and export statistics is a clear indication of the strong market for Kenya's goods and services in South Sudan and thus its strong economic interests in the country. Uganda, Sudan and Ethiopia have less trade relations as compared to Kenya's import and exports from South Sudan. An indication of Kenya's role leading

economic investments in South Sudan as well as the road transport system and Lamu port providing avenues to transfer goods to and from South Sudan.

Table 2: List of supplying markets for products imported by South Sudan
Product: TOTAL All products

Unit : US Dollar thousand

Exporters	Imported value in 2014	Imported value in 2015	Imported value in 2016	Imported value in 2017	Imported value in 2018
Total	800,221	872,975	564,638	565,966	467,643
Kenya	225,746	175,403	160,936	162,040	127,940
Uganda	0	0	239,560	299,883	0
United Arab Emirates	182	1,296	97	832	165,043
China	66,079	155,445	46,253	51,942	77,076
Netherlands	18,200	23,037	9,812	11,259	21,983
Thailand	1,118	2,944	1,085	3,295	20,527
Pakistan	45,820	39,224	38,360	0	16,623
Switzerland	465	699	585	616	10,400
Germany	6,346	10,321	5,663	5,109	5,852
Ethiopia	0	0	0	0	0
Sudan	0	0	0	1,372	0

Source: International Trade Center (ITC), 2019 statistics

Table 3: List of importing markets for products exported by South Sudan
Product: TOTAL All products

Unit: US Dollar thousand

Importers	Exported value in 2014	Exported value in 2015	Exported value in 2016	Exported value in 2017	Exported value in 2018
Total	4,414,812	2,339,188	1,479,684	1,278,946	1,661,729
China	4,329,242	2,326,887	1,459,751	1,270,050	1,588,452
United Arab Emirates	0	0	0	0	48,323

Pakistan	1,060	1,143	7,098	0	24,209
Kenya	14,021	90	61	244	161
Germany	42	94	267	97	145
Saudi Arabia	0	62	181	0	79
Hong Kong, China	16	1	15	77	61
Uganda	0	0	2,547	5,610	0
Ethiopia	0	0	0	0	0
Sudan	0	0	0	3	0

Source: International Trade Center (ITC), 2019 statistics

The violence and hostilities in South Sudan also had negative implications on the economic development in the Eastern African region. In March 2012, Kenya, Ethiopia and South Sudan joint efforts and launched the LAPSSET project that would improve transport and assist South Sudan and Ethiopia, who were landlocked to transport their goods from the port of Lamu in Kenya to South Sudan and Ethiopia. The LAPSSET project included railway construction, road connection and oil pipeline from Lamu in Kenya, through South Sudan to Ethiopia. LAPSSET project was envisioned to promote economic development especially in the northern Kenya through the trade corridors between Kenya, South Sudan and Ethiopia. However, the LAPSSET project and the railway construction encountered delay due to the civil war in South Sudan. The violence further hindered economic developments including businesses and exports to South Sudan, Ethiopia and the entire East Africa.

The high cost of transport of its crude had necessitated South Sudan to search for solutions in the immediate post-independence period. The options included building oil pipeline network traversing Kenya to the Indian Ocean, alternatively from Ethiopia to Djibouti's or from the Red Sea port of Eritrea. However, during the negotiations of the ARCSS, the GOSS effectively used the choice of the alternative pipeline to influence the positions of some IGAD states. Although the feasibility study indicated that the pipeline to the Red Sea through Ethiopia and Djibouti would be the best option, the GOSS reportedly indicated instead its preference for the Kenyan option. Kenya therefore had to be in the picture to push from these projects that would impact positively on the country's economy.

In July 2019, Kenya's President, Uhuru Kenyatta had a bilateral meeting with the South Sudanese president, Salva Kiir at Statehouse Nairobi. Key issued discussed between the two leaders included the enhancement of economic ties between Kenya and South Sudan. Kenya plans to build a dry port at Naivasha Special Economic Zone to act as a dry port and an extension of the Lamu port that will serve South Sudan imports and exports. At the meeting, the two leaders also agreed to establish a Joint Border Commission that will monitor and manage shared territorial borders between Kenya and South Sudan (PSCU, 2019).

During the joint press conference, President Kenyatta stated that, the Kenya Government set apart 10 acres of land at the Inland Container Depot in Naivasha that will be used to construct a dry port by the South Sudanese government. Additionally, President Kenyatta noted that the LAPSSET project is near completion and will further enhance the transport network between the two countries. Uhuru noted that the first phase of the Lamu port will be completed in August 2019 while the second phase of Lamu project will be completed by the end of 2020 (PSCU, 2019).

President Kenyatta further informed the South Sudanese envoy that it plans hold a trade expo in November 2019 in South Sudan capital, Juba where it will exhibit various Kenya's businesses and investment to the people of South Sudan. Also, South Sudan products will be exhibited and show cased to the Kenyan investors and thus further enhance trade links between the two countries. President Kenyatta and President Kiir also agreed to initiate talks that will solve possible disputes that will be created from the shared territorial borders between Kenya and South Sudan. They noted that a high-level team has completed a memorandum of understanding regarding delimitation and demarcation of shared territorial borders (PSCU, 2019).

Also, important to note, is the Kenya's human resources and personnel in South Sudan. Kenya's investors including the contractors and traders have been present throughout the conflict in South Sudan. After the signing of the CPA and South Sudan independence, Kenya's personnel rapidly grew. The high demand of economic development and infrastructure has attracted Kenyan economic personnel to South Sudanese towns and urban centers. These skilled personnel rangers from bankers, doctors, nurses and even teachers.

KESSULO estimates the number of workers in South Sudan at approximate number of 30,000 personnel. South Sudan and Kenyan government signed an agreement in….to have the Kenya's Ministry of Education to send its teachers to assist teaching in South Sudanese schools and to be paid the South Sudanese government. Also, the government of South Sudan sent its teachers and other personnel for capacity building initiatives in Kenya in order to equip its personnel with competitive skills and knowledge in the region and improve the performance of various ministries in South Sudan.

3.3. Kenya's Political Interests in South Sudan

3.3.1. Quest for Hegemony

Kenya's participation in the South Sudan peace process was also motivated by its desire to be regarded as a regional hegemon. Agnew (2004) stated that hegemony is exercising supremacy through coercing, persuading and convincing other states do what you want through use of power and force. He further cautioned that hegemony is not only using power for economic, military and political gain as power can continue to be the same over years despite the use of force.

Mowle (2007) traces the origin of the term hegemony to the Greek term 'hegemonia', meaning leadership and posits that hegemony is the use of force and coerciveness. He noted that hegemony is more significant in the international system rather that nationally. The most powerful states in the international system exercise hegemony over other less powerful and small states in the world of politics.

Agnew (2004) further argues that though the international system vouches or normative equality and sovereign states, however competition among them has led to status allocation which implies primacy of higher-order states as great powers. Regarding regional powers or states that seek leadership or dominance in a given region. Flames (2010) states that a regional power is a state actor whose power is, to a high degree, based on leadership in their world area and that the quest for regional powers does not constitute a sufficient condition for their emergence.

Flames (2010) observes that a regional power must have its power capabilities far outweigh those of other states in the region. What can be observed from the foregoing discussions by the above scholars is that the concept "hegemon" centers on power politics. It is about the centrality of leadership of a state in a global or regional arena. Preponderant states that have the attributes of a dominant state that control the levers of military, political and economic power capabilities can exert themselves in the international system and normally such powers project their capabilities within and beyond a given region.

An example of a hegemonic power in the international system is the United states which is a powerful state that project its power capabilities globally and other states look to the United States to offer leadership on a lot of world aspects and issues that have global attention and implications. For example, the Syrian crisis continues to linger on for a long time with its heavy toll on lives because the United States is reluctant to intervene to end the conflict in Syria. Therefore, in the unipolar world where the United States is the only undisputed power, it is regarded as a hegemon. The height of American power play was during George Bush Junior's administration when the US displayed sheer arrogance and lack of respect of international institutions. America invaded Iraq, deposed its leader and occupied the country against the will of the international community and without seeking authorization from the United Nations. It flagrantly violated international norms with impunity. The United States therefore is the unchallenged hyper power on earth and its influence is felt across the globe. The American leadership in cutting-edge technologies and military power is unrivalled by any other power (Flames, 2010).

As earlier noted, there are both global and regional hegemons in the international system. States such as China and India are regarded as regional hegemons. They offer leadership and are dominant powers in their backyard. States such as Russia, Brazil and to some extent South Africa and Nigeria can be regarded hegemons of the region, because of their military and economic power and the influence they wield in their respective regions. There has been debate regarding hegemonies in Africa. Whereas it is undisputed fact that Nigeria is a regional hegemon in West Africa where it dominates Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), the same can be said of South Africa in southern Africa, however the same argument may not be advanced in Kenya's case in East Africa.

Wanyama (2013) argues that Kenya has contributed significantly to regional political issues and taken the lead in regional mediation and peace processes including those in South Sudan, Sudan and Somalia. He also notes that the Kenya has attracted a lot of diplomatic missions and envoys that were established as a result of conflict and violence from its neighboring countries. For example, Kenya host the United Nations headquarters in Africa, United Nations Support Office of Somali as well as other UN Environment and UN Habitat global headquarters. By continues to play silent diplomacy and moderate profile in the world politics as well as regional peace processes.

Kenya's economy is relatively advanced as compared to its neighboring countries. It has a large industrial base, well educated workforce and good infrastructure. It has styled itself as a regional economic and communication hub. Its constitution is liberal with a predictable foreign policy. As Wanyama (2003) argues, Kenya has been a reluctant hegemon. It has offered leadership in a number of regional issues particularly in regional conflict management. Kenya has participated in peace keeping missions in Zimbabwe, Namibia and Sierra Leon among others. Such undertakings have served to enhance its profile internationally with some scholars terming it a regional hegemon.

However as alluded to earlier, Kenya's policy of non-interference in internal affairs of other states being the centerpiece of its foreign policy; does not augur well with a state that aspires to be a regional hegemon. The policy of avoiding adopting positions on issues it considers controversial was witnessed during the interstate war between Tanzania and Uganda in late 1970's. During this war, Kenya neither condemned Uganda's aggression against Tanzania nor did it seek to resolve the conflict pitting its closest neighbors. This posture goes against the tenets of a hegemonic power. Perhaps the argument that there is no dominant power in the Horn of Africa is well captured by Dehez, who posits that none of the member states in the Horn of Africa (IGAD) is rich enough to provide support in the sense that Nigeria supported the Economic Community of West African States Monitoring Group (ECOMOG) operations in both Nigeria and Sierra Leon (Dehez, 2013).

The above argument notwithstanding, Kenya's entry into the South Sudan peace talks and mediation was to some extent motivated by the quest for regional leadership. Whereas this argument may not have watertight evidence, however according to realist thinking, every state in

the international system seeks to accumulate and project power and to use that power to dominate other states. Given that this is the universal behavior of states in the international system, then it can be argued that Kenya's involvement in the South Sudan peace process was to some extent influenced by her desire to become a regional hegemon.

It is a known fact that there has been a quiet struggle for regional leadership between Tanzania and Kenya. Tanzania has always been suspicious of Kenya's intentions in the region. In 1977, the collapse of the East African Community was partly blamed on the rivalry between the two states. In this struggle, Kenya has never displayed desire for raw power, instead it has continued to use to a greater degree soft power to push its interests in the region. Therefore, Kenya's strategic decision of engaging in South Sudan peace process can be defined as a shrewd strategy of deploying soft power to protect and safeguard its vital national interests.

Kenya is considered as a major powerhouse among the Eastern African countries. Its economic development in the Eastern African sub-region over the years has made Kenya cosmopolitan in the region. Its rapidly growing economic development has created tension among the Eastern African countries such as Ethiopia.

3.3.2. Regional Stability

Continued conflict and violence in Somalia, Sudan and South Sudan have impacted negatively to peace and stability of its neighboring countries. A case example is Somalia, where the continued civil war based on ethnicity and religion has had a spillover effect to Kenya's security situation. Somalia has become a hub of international terrorism that has threatened Kenya's security as well as other neighboring states in the African region and globally. Additionally, the prolonged conflict in Sudan, South Sudan and Ethiopia has threatened national security of the Eastern African States and the entire continent. And as a result, States intervene in these regional conflicts to eliminate security threats posed by the violence and conflicts (Gilkes and Plaut, 2000).

The case of Sudan civil war, the violence's threatened regional security of the Eastern African countries. The conflict in Sudan created tension and enmity between Kenya and Ethiopia due to their competing interests in Sudan. Ethiopia's alignment to support SPLA in the Sudan conflict and provision of military weapons and personnel took a regional aspect and also threaten the

regional peace and stability as the alignment further heightened tension and enmity among its neighbors (Woodward, 1996).

Woodward noted that civil war impacted negatively on regional peace and stability. He further argued that the continued violence in Sudan created a home for international terrorism. A case example is that Sudan hosted Osama Bin Laden, before the bombing of the US embassies in Kenya and Tanzania in 1998. The US embassies bombing destabilized the regional peace in the Eastern African region.

The civil war in Sudan also threatened national security in Uganda. The emergence if Joseph Kony, a rebel leader had a network group in Sudan which further threatened the relationship between Sudan and Uganda. On several occasions, Uganda claimed that Sudan was providing military and financial support to the rebel leader, Joseph Kony who conducted violent activities in northern Uganda. As a form of retaliation, Sudan also claimed that Uganda was supporting SPLA and provided military support to the group. The tension and accusations between Uganda and Sudan created a lot of enmity and the two states nearly started a civil war in the 1990s (Woodland, 1996).

The above examples elaborate how civil war in a state threatens national security of its neighboring states and thus, the neighboring states intervene for their own national security interests. The possibility of the South Sudan conflict could spread across its neighboring countries attracted their attention to intervene in the violence in South Sudan. This was evident with the involvement of Uganda's troop intervening and supporting the South Sudanese government. The humanitarian disaster and refugee crisis created by the conflict in South Sudan influenced the regional intervention of Uganda, Kenya, Sudan and Ethiopia. These countries fear that the humanitarian crisis would spill over to the neighboring states which is already being experience in Kenya, Uganda and Sudan.

For the case of Kenya's intervention in the South Sudan peace process, it was partly motivated by the prolonged violence in South Sudan that posed a threat to regional stability of the Eastern African countries. Additionally, the civil war created a hub for proliferation of arms and weapons which were being sold in black markets and distributed to Kenya and Uganda, thus further undermining national security.

Additionally, regional integration and joint development of infrastructure is being challenged by the continued violence and conflict in South Sudan. East African Community (EAC), the regional economic bloc for the Eastern African is experiencing a lot of challenges due to the wrangles among its members in the peace initiatives in South Sudan. The ongoing conflict in South Sudan is derailing economic plans and prospects among the Eastern African countries through EAC mandate. Regional integration is successful when countries are stable and peaceful. Former EAC chair, reiterated that the continued conflict in South Sudan posed a series of challenge to regional cooperation among EAC member states and thus, the EAC members should take an initiative to assist the young nation achieve peace and stability. Continued violence in South Sudan destabilizes economic, political and socio-cultural cooperation in the Eastern African sub-region.

Refugees and asylum seekers from South Sudan were fleeing to Kenya and other neighboring countries. Proliferation of ammunitions and weapons in South Sudan also threatened the national security in Kenya and thus, Kenya's intervention to protect its national and territorial integrity in the South Sudan civil war. Kenya also seeks to be a regional hegemon and thus wanted to take the lead in the mediation talks in South Sudan. Lastly, South Sudan conflict posed a threat to regional stability due to its spillover effects and as a result, the civil war attracted its neighboring states intervention including Kenya.

3.4 Kenya's National Security Interests in South Sudan

According to Zolberg et al (1989) refugees are victims of persecution due to their status, religion, membership of a particular political persuasion among other causes. Zolberg et al further submits that Africa continues to be the continent that is burdened by the problem of refugees and that by 1987 they estimate that there were over three million recognized refugees in Africa. Security and territorial interests of IGAD member states played an important part in exacerbating civil war in South Sudan.

Due to unprecedented number of conflicts, Africa continues to be a source of refugees. Majority of refugees are produced by states such as Ethiopia, Chad, Angola, Liberia, Mozambique, Rwanda, Somalia, Sudan, South Sudan and Eritrea among others. Based on United Nations High

Commission for Refugees statistics in 2014, 170,000 South Sudanese refugees and asylum seekers had fled into Kenya, Uganda, Ethiopia and Sudan. 20,000 South Sudanese refugees and asylum seekers had fled to Kenya which become a threat Kenya's security and territorial integrity. Not only were the refugees threatening Kenya's security but also the service delivery and resources (UNHCR, 2014).

One of the sources of national security threats facing Kenya has always been the refugee problem. The influx of refugees in Kenya as a result of instability in neighboring states has created a big security challenge to Kenya. This observation is supported by Kirui and Mwaruvie (2012) who opine that the states that host refugees face security threats as a result of armed groups hiding as refugees and asylum seekers who further create violence and hostilities within the refugee camps as well as spreading violence in the country. In addition, armed groups hiding as refugees poses security threats to host states and its civilians and promote military retaliations as well as conflict among neighboring states (Kirui and Mwaruvie, 2012).

Kenya hosts refugees from states such as Somalia, Sudan, South Sudan, Uganda, Rwanda and the Democratic Republic of Congo among others. Problems of refugees in Kenya continues to be a source of concern given that Kenya's neighbors the Horn of Africa, a region that is synonymous with instability, insecurity and act as a nexus of international terrorism. It is in this light that Kenya has come to view refugees as a key national security threat. Issues of proliferation of weapons and arms into the country and the incessant conflict among the refugees and host communities around major camps like Dadaab and Ifo over resources has compounded the security situation in the country.

The southern Sudanese refugees who were internally displaced within South Sudan and those who fled to states such as Ethiopia and Chad underwent inhuman treatment at the hands of their hosts. Apart from dying as a result of the war, majority of the refugees succumbed to famine and diseases. They lived in squalid conditions and their rights were violated by marauding groups particularly state sponsored armed groups.

Kenyan government was sympathetic to the plight of South Sudanese refugees and felt the need for these refugees to be repatriated back home in a safe and secure environment. Therefore, when Kenya expressed its readiness to mediation efforts in South Sudan; it was partially influenced by

the plight of refugees who had suffered for over a half century. By offering to join the South Sudan peace process, Kenya hoped to use that opportunity to convince the warring parties to explore the possibilities of negotiating an end to their conflict so as to enable refugees settle back in South Sudan in a secure and peaceful environment.

Kakuma camp which was home to South Sudanese refugees is located in north western part of Kenya. This remote area is prone to insecurity particularly cross border raids, banditry and cattle rustling activities. Additionally, the area is located is semi-arid and prone to periodic famine and lawlessness. It can therefore be argued that by engaging in mediation of the southern Sudan conflict, Kenya aims to bring to an end the conflict so that refugees may be persuaded to go back to their country and by so doing, enable the government address insecurity and the associated economic burden.

Kenya's entry into the South Sudan mediation efforts was partly driven by humanitarian considerations. The plight of refugees was a major concern to Kenya's safety. The refugee problem has been at the heart of this conflict. Many South Sudanese lost their lives as casualties of starvation which was caused by the civil war. As Idris (2005) posits, the prolonged violence in Sudan and South Sudan had resulted into a huge number of refugees and internally displaced persons which have further increased humanitarian crisis in the region. Additionally, Bariagaber (2006) reiterated that refugees' population is a major threat to state's security, development and sovereignty.

The economic impact of hosting refugees in Kenya is a well-known fact. As it may be appreciated, Kenya is a developing state that is not well endowed with resources. Therefore, the economic burden of hosting refugees drains and stretches the economy developments and prosperity. This reality has placed Kenya in a dilemma; whereas it is committed to respecting international instruments that guarantee the protection and humane treatment of refugees, it is not able to continue offering sanctuary to refugees due to the economic burden. It is for this reason that Kenya continues to call for repatriation of South Sudan refugees back to South Sudan. It is hoped that by facilitating the return of South Sudanese refugees back to their country, Kenya would partially have resolved the issue of insecurity in the northern part of the country and also lessened the economic burden.

In conclusion, Kenya's intervention in the South Sudan peace process was influenced by a multiplicity of factors. The stability of South Sudan was in Kenya's interest to pursue its economic, political as well as national security issues. The spillover effect caused by the prolonged civil war in South Sudan had negative implications to Kenya and thus intervened to protect its national interests in South Sudan. Kenya's investments in South Sudan that ranged from banking, insurance, aviation, transport and communication as well as retail trade motivated Kenya's intervention and influenced its participation in the peace process. Additionally, the looming humanitarian crisis also attracted Kenya's attention to intervene in the South Sudan peace process.

CHAPTER FOUR

A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF HOW KENYA'S NATIONAL INTERESTS SHAPE ITS PARTICIPATION IN SOUTH SUDAN PEACE PROCESS

4.1. Introduction

This chapter analyzes how national interests shape Kenya's participation in the South Sudan peace process and the challenges that Kenya encountered during the peace process. Interview guides were administered to various respondents which aided in the analysis of how Kenya's national interests shape its intervention on South Sudan Peace Process.

4.2. How Kenya's National Interests Influenced its Participation in South Sudan Peace Process

According to the findings of the study, Kenya was motivated by its national interests to join other states and international organizations in establishing peace in the newest nation in Africa. Regional peace and stability, economic ties and trade deals, humanitarian issues, regional infrastructure and quest for hegemony are among the interests that influenced Kenya's intervention in South Sudan peace process.

As discussed in chapter three, Kenya's participation in regional peace efforts was motivated by security issues and economic interests; direct economic benefits of a peaceful neighbor; hegemonic pursuit and geo-strategic as factors in comprehensive peace process. To achieve this, Kenya used preventive diplomacy as a tool by sending political missions as preventive diplomacy strategy. In addition, Kenya used preventive military deployment to pursue its security interest.

Kenya's foreign policy in South Sudan was influenced by the need for regional stability in order to pursue its economic interests and development which would further enhance its diplomatic profile in the East African region as well as across Africa. Before the signing of the CPA, Kenya's foreign policy in Sudan and South Sudan was based on regional diplomacy where it sought a regional coalition on various political issues such as the International Criminal Court (ICC) against

the president of the republic of Kenya, Uhuru Kenyatta and the deputy preside, William Ruto. Kenya's wish was a regional cooperation against the criminal charges at the ICC. Additionally, Kenya's preventive diplomacy policy was also driven by Kenya's economic investments ranging from banking, insurance, aviation and retail trade. Notably, Kenya's role as a regional hegemon in the Eastern African region as well as mediation talks was the fact most of the mediation and peace talks were held in Kenya (Biel and Ojok, 2018).

Kenya presence and activities at the disputed Ilemi Triangle that is located at the border between Kenya and South Sudan is source of conflict between Kenya and South Sudan. The ownership of Ilemi triangle, a 14,000 square km piece of land, is contested between Uganda, South Sudan, Ethiopia and Kenya. The conflict is caused by the ethnic differences between Toposa tribal group in South Sudan, Nyang'atom in Ethiopia and the Turkana community in Kenya. The causes of conflict among these communities at Ilemi Triangle include water sources, land and pasture as well as boundary issues. Ilemi Triangle is a cause of security tension between Kenya and South Sudan as each of these countries wants to take control of the land. With the ongoing conflict in South Sudan, Kenya has played soft diplomacy towards the contested Ilemi Triangle (Collins, 2014).

The other national interest for Kenya in South Sudan peace process is the territorial integrity. Kakuma refugee camp that borders South Sudan whether there has been a rapid increase in the number of refugees in the camp. With the refugee increase, it also intensifies the proliferation of firearms and weapons as well as criminal groups. These territorial threats also directly impact on Kenya's economic development which includes the transport projects such as LAPSSET which interrupts trade flow between Kenya, South Sudan and Ethiopia. Territorial insecurity also affects the national security in Kenya and causes security fears among the Kenya citizens thus a need for Kenya to be part of the peace process to protect its national security interest (Odhiambo and Muluvi 2014).

The foreign policy of Kenya regarding non-interference on other state's affairs also influenced its participation in South Sudan peace talks. Kenya participated in rescue operations as well as deployment of Kenyan troops in South Sudan with an aim to protect Kenyan civilians and Kenyan investments in South Sudan. Another case example, Kenya supported Salva Kiir, South Sudan president to hold its prisoners in Kenya's custody. The political prisoners assisted Kenya to

negotiate with South Sudan for a ceasefire as well as preventing coups. After South Sudan gained its independence, Kenya also supported the young nation through capacity building and provision of technical support and advice to the formation of a functional government (ACODE, 2014).

Another dichotomy relates to member state's politics in particular as relates to the silent dispute between Ethiopia and Kenya over the control and management of the South Sudan mediation process as observed by many analysts. The historical fact that Sudan's previous peace agreement 2002 – 2005 which led to the formation of RSS was hosted by Kenya and facilitated via IGAD's Special Envoy efforts generated competing interests by some member states to lead at this opportunity to deliver peace. Despite the efforts by Kenya and Ethiopia to reach a consensus for the conflict in South Sudan through its regional body, IGAD, its opposition allies, Sudan and Uganda challenged these efforts and fueled more conflict through internal disagreement among IGAD members (Biel and Ojok, 2018).

Notwithstanding the challenges posed by its opposition, Uganda and Sudan, Kenya and Ethiopia could not unite against them. Ethiopia's national interests in the Grand Ethiopian Renaissance Dam (GERD) and the fight against terrorism for Kenya jeopardized its interventions. GERD a power generation dam located 40 kilometers from Sudan was expected to provide over 6,000 megawatts of power generation to the neighboring countries. Ethiopia could not accuse its neighbor Sudan as it had a bigger interest of power generation rather than the peace initiatives. In addition, Kenya on several occasions differed with UN Security Council sanctions as well as sanctions imposed by the AU against South Sudan as Kenya was aware that these sanctions had implications to Kenya's economic investments in South Sudan (International Crisis Group, 2019).

After the signing of the CPA and South Sudan independence, Kenya's took a neutral strategy towards its neighbors and in particular the continued conflict in South Sudan. This is due to the fact that Kenya's foreign policy was geared to achieving its national interest. In 2014, Kenya secured the release of former South Sudan detainees and secured them in the country hosting them in Nairobi. In June 2015, as the mediation and peace dialogues continued between the Government of South Sudan and SPLM, in collaboration with South African and Tanzania, Kenya used its political influence and leverage by taking the former detainees to South Sudan. Thus, Kenya's strategy to take the former detainees to Juba, a consensus was reached whereby Pagan Amum was reappointed as the secretary general of SPLM (Biel and Ojok, 2018).

Kenya's intervention in the South Sudan has also shifted to assisting the warring parties to reach an agreement on various contending issues in South Sudan. Kenya has supported several peace talks that are geared towards promoting peace and stability and avoiding criminal culpability. This had differed the IGAD's mandate that supports hybrid tribunal. Kenya's strategy towards its intervention has also implicated General Sumbeiywo's role as a special envoy from Kenya in the peace talks as well as bureaucracy at the mediation level. Kenya also played immense contribution toward the post-independence peace negotiations in southern Sudan. For instance, CPA was negotiated and signed in Kenya. Kenya has also maintained a neutral stand as it held a good relationship with the Sudan government while hosting rebels from the south of the country (Akol, 2018).

In October 2014, Kenya sent troops to South Sudan to take part in the UNMISS peacekeeping operations. However, in November 2016, the UN Secretary General Ban Ki-moon's dismissed Lt-Gen Johnson Mogoa Kimani Ondieki, the Kenyan commander of UNMISS and as a result, Kenya withdrew its forces from South Sudan. Since then, Kenya changed her policy towards South Sudan and in particular, its neutrality stands towards the warring parties (BBC, 2016).

An example is when Kenya started deporting senior members of the SPLM-IO who were seeking political asylum in the country. Cases in point are the January 2017 deportations to Juba of James Gatdet Dak, Dong Samuel Luak and Aggrey Idris all of whom are member of SPLM-IO. Upon arrival in Juba, this trio were imprisoned and only released shortly after the peace celebration in Juba which preceded the signing of the peace deal. The authority in Nairobi went as far as restricting activities of South Sudanese opposition in the country (Biel and Ojok, 2018).

Another key strategy employed by Kenya towards its foreign policy in South Sudan is the travel statements to South Sudan. Kenya has on many occasions differed with the US regarding the travel ban and economic sanctions to South Sudan. Kenya's resistance from the US travel bans was that this would have implications to the ongoing peace talks as well as Kenya's role in the region and the relations with South Sudan. Thus, remaining neutral in the international politics.

Kenya continues to support the South Sudan peace process and recently in August 2019, Kalonzo Musyoka, Kenya's special envoy to South Sudan travelled to Juba, South Sudan to follow up on the progress of the implementation of the peace agreement that was signed in September 2018. In his mission to Juba, Kalonzo Musyoka met with the President of South Sudan, Salva Kiir and other senior government officials to review the progress in implementing the 2018 September peace accord. Musyoka is also set to meet other parties to the peace agreement and negotiate further with them to establish a transitional government by November 2019. Kenya's further intervention is South Sudan is to promote regional stability and reconciliation in South Sudan (East African, 2019).

4.4 Challenges Kenya Encountered in South Sudan Peace Process

The study identified the key challenges Kenya faced in the South Sudan peace process: ensuring inclusivity of all key stakeholders in the peace process; lack of mutual trust between participants in the peace process; a weak mediation process; dealing with fragmentation of Southern Liberation Movements, tribal and political violence, repeat of a failed political settlement, lack of political legitimacy and inadequacy of enforcement mechanisms among others discussed below.

Lack of commitment efforts from the South Sudanese in the mediation process is one of the Kenya challenges that Kenya faced in the South Sudan peace process. Peace negotiation talks were being led by IGAD members, Kenya, Uganda and Ethiopia. In addition, the lead mediators selected to steer the process were from Kenya and Ethiopia and not South Sudan. This lack of commitment from South Sudan contributed to the continued violence and hostility in the country. External actors are the ones who took the lead in the peace processes and thus they further pursued their interests and did not priorities the peace talks.

In addition, existing wrangles among the IGAD members challenged the peace process. The competition between Uganda, Kenya and Ethiopia slowed down the peace process in South Sudan. Each member of IGAD wanted to take the lead in mediation and as a result, this shifted the focused from mediation to regional supremacy contest. The quest for hegemony challenged Kenya's intervention in South Sudan. Kenya's focus shifted to pursue its national interest of being the regional hegemon. Therefore, Kenya appeared not to be neutral in the process as it had hidden agenda. In addition, Kenya seemed to benefit from the prolonged conflict as it created market for

its businesses as well as employment for its citizens. Thus, benefiting from the continued hostilities which also slowed down Kenya's intervention and shifted its interests from mediation to pursing national interests.

Another challenge that Kenya experienced in the peace process was lack of credibility of member state because member states from IGAD lacked fairness and other such as Sudan had directly contributed to the violence and conflict. IGAD lacked full commitment and support to assist South Sudan in negotiating peace dialogues due to challenges that they experience in South Sudan including insecurity in the country, socio-economic development and infrastructure, lack of public support and lack of funds and resources. The strategy that IGAD used in the peace process of South Sudan was encountered by the failure of the delegated individuals of IGAD secretariat and peace ambassadors to implement all-inclusive peace building process approach which invites different political parties, civil society, religious or faith organizations, and community elders to peace building process of South Sudan and absence of regional power among the members of IGAD as to that of Nigeria in ECOWAS and South Africa of SADC, luck of enough finance, luck of IGAD enforcement capacity, and the limited capacity of the IGAD secretariat to enforce the decision on warring parties are the dominant one. Additionally, competition and distrust among IGAD members contributed to the prolonged conflict and violence in South Sudan. Mistrust among IGAD members contributed to miscommunication and lack of teamwork in the negotiation process which further hindered the mediation initiatives (Knopf, 2016).

Political interference and lack of peace personnel to assist in mediation are the dominants challenges of Kenya's peace process effort in South Sudan. Therefore, Kenya failed to find the lasting solution and ensure the peace process effort in South Sudan due aforementioned challenges such lack of strong commitment from the IGAD leaders, capacity constraints, advent of mistrust among and between member states, intervention of member state in South Sudan for their individual interest, inappropriate peace building process which didn't invited all stakeholders to participate peace building process in South Sudan.

While the parties, especially the government, received the most blame for the failure of the 2015 peace agreement, many also pointed to a lack of follow-up by regional and international actors, and a lack of pressure exerted on the parties, especially the government, to implement it. The 2015 agreement was mediated by IGAD, a regional bloc comprising Djibouti, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Kenya,

Somalia, South Sudan, Sudan and Uganda. While some valued the role of IGAD in brokering the deal, most accused it alongside the African Union (AU), of not defending the deal but instead siding with the government. A former teacher from Jonglei State, for example, said: If the AU and IGAD had been serious about the peace agreement, they would have forced the parties to continue the implementation. However, they all sided with the government. Why are they listening to Salva Kiir? They still cooperate with someone who has blood on his hands. Some mentioned the endorsement of the detention of Riek Machar in South Africa as a sign of evidence of IGAD's bias towards the government (IRRI, 2018).

A woman living in Juba told the International Refugee Rights Initiative (IRRI): "I blame IGAD [for the failure of the agreement] because it was their responsibility to maintain maximum pressure on the parties to ensure a smooth implementation of the deal. They were quite aware about the reservations issued by the government during the signing of the document. The regional body did not sufficiently follow up on these reservations. Former and current IGAD staff concurred that more could have been done to enforce the agreement and to hold parties accountable for not doing so but said that the body was limited due to a lack of consensus between its member states. Some particularly pointed to the relative silence displayed by IGAD and the monitoring bodies, particularly JMEC, related to two main events: the government's replacement of Riek Machar by Taban Deng Gai as vice-president, and the July 2016 clashes in Juba between forces loyal to Salva Kiir and to Riek Machar. JMEC did call for an international intervention after the July 2016 violence but its outcome, the Regional Protection Force (RPF), has still not fully materialized (IRRI, 2018).

Continuation of tribal and political violence also hindered Kenya's participation in peace negotiations. The conflict in South Sudan was tribal based on the Dinka and Nuer. The rivalry and contest were between the two leaders which lead to association and groupings by the South Sudanese. Dinka ethnic group support Salva Kiir while Nuer allied with Riek Machar. The ethnic division in South Sudan made it difficult for the mediators to negotiate peace agreements. Kenya encountered great challenges from the tribal background of South Sudan. Each tribe wanted to win the war which further increased the tension and pressure among the South Sudanese. Kenya faced challenges in trying to bring Dinka and Nuer to unit as one team and one country.

Another challenge that Kenya encountered in the peace process is that during the conflict South Sudan lacked the legitimate power. Lack of an authoritative government hindered mediation efforts as there were no clear structural policies and support from the government to assist in ending the war. The power vacuum that was created after the civil war was a great challenge as mediators could not bring the warring parties to negotiate an agreement. Lack of an authority government was a clear indication that the country did not have enough capacity and resources for peaceful negotiation. South Sudan lacked established institutions to mediate and handle conflict and violence that had prolonged across the country and affected millions of innocent civilians.

Inadequacy of enforcement mechanisms was also another challenge that Kenya encountered in the peace process. The role of UNMISS was to provide humanitarian aid in South Sudan and not to participate in mediation process. A lot of mediation support could have been provided by the UN, however, UN mandate and mission in the country was to solve the refugee crisis that had grown and spillover to the neighboring countries. An example, in July 2016, UNMISS stopped its humanitarian operations when violence broke across South Sudan. UNMISS also received less support from South Sudan and even in some cases UNMISS personnel were attacked during the mass violence due to the inadequate support provided despite UNMISS presence in the country. The inadequate support mechanisms and enforcement personnel hindered Kenya's intervention during the peace talks in South Sudan as the implementation of the peace agreements were nearly impossible due to lack of effective and efficient institutional structures (Knopf, 2016).

In conclusion, it is evident in the study that Kenya's strategies in South Sudan peace process has been driven by its national interests. Kenya's economic and security interests has influenced its intervention towards a soft diplomatic intervention due to its interests at stake. Kenya's foreign policy in South Sudan has been to promote peace and stability in order to enhance the trade ties between the two countries. Kenya's banking, insurance as well as retail trade has influenced its participation in South Sudan, where Kenya's mediations has been aligned to economic prosperity. Also, Kenya has supplied South Sudan with military troops to not only promote stability but also protection for its personnel and business investments in South Sudan.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

The study sought to examine the influence of Kenya's national interest on South Sudan peace process. To guide the study further, objectives were developed which aimed at determining economic interests, political interests and national security interests of Kenya in South Sudan and how these national interests influences its participation in South Sudan.

5.2 Summary

Arising from arguments and discussions advanced in chapter 3 and 4, the study has demonstrated that the entry of Kenya on the South Sudan peace process was motivated by its desire to pursue national security interest, quest for hegemonic stability, economic interest, regional stability as well as humanitarian interests. Kenya was concerned with the spillover effects of the war since neighboring states had openly taken sides in the war thus risking the stability of the region. By offering to mediate in that conflict, Kenya was genuinely addressing her own security interests, economic interests as well as the refugee problem.

Realism theory, which guide the study was helpful in focusing the study on the core issues of national interests as outlined in the objectives. The theory was useful in identifying interests that motivated Kenya's role in the South Sudan peace process and accounted for the unsuccessful peace process in South Sudan. It is important to note that Kenya's mediation approach followed the key elements as expounded by realism theory whose main tenets are statism, survival, and self-help. Kenya's intervention in South Sudan peace process was driven by its foreign policies of economic prosperity, territorial integrity and regional stability.

The study revealed important information regarding the role of a state in conflict management and its driving forces to intervene in a peace process. The peace process cannot be successful when states and other actors are selfish and are engaging in peace processes pursue their own national

interest. In the South Sudan's case, the desires by Kenya to achieve its economic, military and humanitarian interests complicated the process, slowed down and complicated the mediation process resulting to prolonged violence and hostilities in South Sudan.

From the study, it was established that successful mediation is achieved when parties are willing to recognize each other and their interests in the conflict, whether the warring parties of the mediators themselves. This therefore creates a driving force behind all those involved to achieve a successful mediation. The South Sudan peace process was not successful because the parties were pursuing their own national interest and ignoring the need to mediate and successfully deliver a fruitful peace process in South Sudan. Currently, South Sudan continues to face instability and political conflicts.

Additionally, Kenya encountered various challenges in South Sudan peace process. These challenges include history of mistrust and competition among member states of IGAD who were also pursuing their own national interest thus failing to be partial in the peace process. Continuation of tribal and political violence also hindered Kenya's participation in the South Sudan peace process. Inadequacy of enforcement mechanism from actors such as UNMISS and AU also hindered Kenya's participation as it lacked support from these intergovernmental organizations. Moreover, Kenya's quest to be a regional power shifted its focus from mediation to fulfilling its foreign policy of economic investment in the South Sudan.

The study has brought out challenges that mediators face when navigating through the peace process. The issue of mistrust and rigidity can derail the process if mediators do not have skills and the necessary acumen to steady the process. Similarly, mediators cannot succeed in their mission if they do not understand the structure and the undercurrents of the process of the conflict. In the South Sudan peace process, Kenya and her regional partners intervened in the peace process, however with hidden agendas of addressing their own national security interests, economic interest, political interest as well as humanitarian interests.

The study further established that Kenya's intervention in the South Sudan peace process was not unanimously supported by all states in Africa particularly those who felt that their interests were at stake. Issues raised in this study are critical in informing mediation practitioners and scholars and lessons drawn from this study should be subjected to further scrutiny with a view to

54

establishing a clear line of thought on conflict management in Africa and other parts of the third world.

5.3 Conclusion

In conclusion, the study concludes that Kenya's national interests influenced its participation and intervention in South Sudan. Kenya's economic interest including the banking sector, insurance, retail and wholesale trade, human resource, transport and communication network played a vital role in the peace process. Kenya's investments in South Sudan were at stake thus the need for Kenya to intervene and participate in the mediation efforts in South Sudan.

Kenya's political interests in South Sudan influenced its participation in the peace process. Kenya's quest for hegemony as an Eastern Africa powerhouse motivated its intervention in South Sudan. This was evident when Kenya took the lead in the signing of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement which lead to South Sudan independence in 2011. Additionally, the need for regional stability influenced Kenya's participation. For example, the need for regional integration among the East African Community, and with South Sudan being a new member. The ongoing conflict in South Sudan is derailing economic plans and prospects among the Eastern African countries through EAC mandate.

National security interest brought about by influx of refugees, humanitarian crisis as well as the territorial borders with South Sudan also influenced Kenya's intervention in South Sudan. Kenya was concerned of the insecurity brought by the refugees in Dadaab and Kakuma refugee camps. As a result of hosting South Sudanese refugees, it posed a security threat due to the armed groups hiding as refugees which has resulted to proliferation of arms and weapons in the refugee camps. Kenya's intervention in South Sudan is driven by the need for stability in South Sudan in order for the refugees in Kenya to go back to their country.

Finally, the role of external actors in peace processes is important, however, caution should be taken to ensure that mediators play their role of mediation and not driven by national interests. Additionally, state-owned initiative is key over an external actors enforcement for peace process including its implementation. Various external intervening actors in South Sudan have prolonged the reconciliation efforts due to their different foreign policies and national interests in the country.

5.4. Recommendations

Based on the findings of the study, peace and stability in South Sudan can only be achieved when all various issues are addressed such as tribal and ethnic differences, lack of ownership of the peace process by the South Sudanese, lack of strong institutional structures for implementation of peace agreements, inadequate international support as well as internal wrangles in IGAD. The following are the recommendations of the study to address the above challenges and obstacles in achieving sustainable peace in South Sudan.

For the conflict to end, it is important for the Government of South Sudan to acknowledge that not on the tribal and ethnic causes of conflict but also corruption is contributing to the prolonged violence in the country. Some South Sudanese continue to be beneficiaries of the war, as they continue to benefit directly and indirectly from the conflict in South Sudan. Therefore, strong institutional structures should be established to ensure that there is the rule of law as well as proper implementation of the peace negotiations in in South Sudan. In addition, the government should work on uniting the different tribes and ethnic groups in South Sudan to reduce the tension and continued violence caused by tribalism. South Sudan reforms for peace should incorporate a united country that is one despite the tribal and political differences.

South Sudan government should also own the peace process and take the lead in mediation. The government should bring on board all the key stakeholders and actors for peace negotiations in order to achieve an ever-lasting peace. Additionally, the Government should be at the forefront driving the peace process in South Sudan as well as the South Sudanese people to show the international community that they are committed to end the conflict. With South Sudan commitment, they will receive more support from the international organization and the neighboring states.

IGAD and AU should also take the lead as regional bodies to mediate in South Sudan and avoid overreliance of external actors such as the US, EU and other stakeholders. If IGAD and AU members' states unit and steer the peace processes, their commitment and support will contribute to ending the conflict as the internal wrangles among its member states is derailing the peace talks.

So, a united body and team with a strong mandate to end the violence and deliver an ever-lasting peace is required.

In particular, the AU Peace and Security Council as per the AU Constitutive Act with partnership and collaboration with IGAD, impose sanctions against any party derailing peace process in South Sudan, either by use of arms embargo or freezing of assets.

REFERENCES

Akerlund, A. (2005). Transforming Conflicts and Building Peace, Experience and Ideas of

Swedish Civil   Society Organizations: SIDA Studies, Sweden.

Akol, L. (2016). South Sudan Rearranging the Chess Board. International crisis Group.

Allison et. al. (2011). Russia and US National Interests. Washington DC: Centre for the National

Interest

Aquilino, G. (2019). Spiritual retreat with South Sudan leaders in Vatican: time to choose life.

The Vatican News

Bariagaber, A. (2006). Conflict and the Refugee Experience: Flight Exile and Repatriation in the

Horn of Africa. *Ashagate Publishing Group*, United Kingdom.

BBC. (2016). UN sacks South Sudan peacekeeping chief over damning report. Retrieved from

https://www.bbc.com/news/world-africa-37840961 (Accessed on June 20, 2019)

Biel, M and Ojok, D. (2018). IGAD, Political Settlements and Peace building in South Sudan:

Lessons from the 2018 Peace Negotiation Processes

Business Report. (2019). Kenyan bank stepping up investment in South Sudan. Retrieved from

https://www.iol.co.za/business-report/international/kenyan-bank-stepping-up-investment-

in-south-sudan-30697245 (Accessed on August 30, 2019)

Churton, M and Brown, A. (2010). Theory and Method. *Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan*

Collins, O. (2004). The Ilemi Triangle: *Annales d'Éthiopie*. Vol. 20. pp. 5–12.

Cousens, M. and Kumar, C. (2001). Peacebuilding as politics: cultivating peace in fragile

societies. Lynne Rienner, London

Darby, J and MacGinty, R, (eds). (2000). Management of Peace Processes. *Palgrave Macmillan*,

NY, USA.

Destradi, S. (2010) German Institute of Global and Area Studies (Gian) Working Papers-Giga

    Research Programme: *Violence and Security: India and the Civil war in Sri Lanka on the*

    Failures of Regional Conflict Management in South Asia, No. 154, Germany.

Deutsch, M. (1991) Subjective Features of Conflict Resolution: Psychological. Social and

    Cultural Influences; in New Directions in Conflict Theory: *Conflict Resolution and*

    Transformation ed., Vayrynen, (Sage Publications), London.

Doyle, M. and Sambanis, N. (2006). Making War and Building Peace United Nations Peace

    Operations

East African. (2019). Kenya envoy in South Sudan to push for peace implementation. Retrieved

    from https://www.theeastafrican.co.ke/news/ea/Kenya-envoy-in-south-sudan-to-push-for-

    peace-implementation/4552908-5229112-ej11elz/index.html (Accessed on August 30,

    2019)

Frankel, J. (1968). The Making of Foreign Policy, London: Oxford University Press

Friedman, T L. (1999). A Manifesto for the Fast World. New York Times Magazine: p 42

Garang, A. (2015). The Impact of External Actors on the Prospects of a Mediated Settlement in

    South Sudan, Pretoria

Gathecha, A. (2007). Critical Analysis of the Role of IGAD in Mediation: A Case Study of the

    Sudan Peace Process-, Masters Dissertation, University of Nairobi.

Gener, D. J. and Schrodt, P.A. (2001). Analyzing the Dynamics of International Process in the

    Middle East and the Former Yugoslavia, paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the

    International Studies Association, Chicago and University of Kansas

Gilkes, P. and Plaut, M. (2000). The War Between Ethiopia and Eritrea, In Foreign Policy Focus,

    Vol 5, No. 25, USA

Gomez, M. and Christensen, A. (2011). N Impacts of Refugees on Neighbouring Countries: A
Development Challenge

Goodhand, J. and Hulme, D. (1999). From Wars to Complex Political Emergencies:
Understanding Conflict and Peacebuilding in the New World Order. Third World
Quarterly, 20,1.

Grawert, E. (2010)., After the Comprehensive Peace Agreement in Sudan. *Suffolk: Boydell and
Brewer Limited.*

Healy, S. (2011). Seeking peace and security in the Horn of Africa: the contribution of the Inter-
Governmental Authority on Development. *International Affairs*, Vol. 87, No. 1, pp. 105-
120

Hey, J. (2003). Small States in World Politics: Explaining Foreign Policy Behaviour. Colorado:
Lynne Rienner.

Hill, C. (2003). The Changing Politics of Foreign Policy, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan

Hussain, Z. (2011). The Effects of Domestic Politics on Foreign Policy Decision Making. In
Rajaratnam, School of International Studies

IGAD. (2014). Communiqué of the 24th Extra-ordinary IGAD Summit on South Sudan. Addis
Ababa

IGAD. (2018). Khartoum Declaration of Agreement Between Parties of the Conflict In South
Sudan. Retrieved from https://igad.int/programs/115-south-sudan-office/1874-khartoum-
declaration-of-agreement-between-parties-of-the-conflict-in-south-sudan (Accessed on
July 15, 2019)

International Crisis Group. (2019). Salvaging South Sudan's Fragile Peace Deal. Retrieved from
https://www.crisisgroup.org/africa/horn-africa/south-sudan/270-salvaging-south-sudans-
fragile-peace-deal (Accessed on August 30, 2019)

International Crisis Group. (2019). Bridging the Gap in the Nile Waters Dispute. Vol. 271.

Retrieved from https://www.crisisgroup.org/africa/horn-africa/ethiopia/271-bridging-gap-
nile-waters-dispute (Accessed on August 30, 2019)

Kabugi, G. (2017). How Regional Competing Interests are Suffocating the Peace Process in
South Sudan.

Keohane, R. (1969). Lilliputians Dilemma: Small States in International Politics. Vol 32, No 2,
International Organizations, pp. 291-310

Knopf, K. (2016). Ending South Sudan s Civil War. *Council Special Report* No. 77 Nov.

Krause, V. and Singer, D. (2001). Minor Powers, Alliance, and Armed Conflict: Some
Preliminary Patterns. in Reiter, E. and Gartner, H. (Eds.), Small States and Alliances. (pp.
15-25). New York: Physica-Verlag Heidelberg

Kuol, L. (2018). Navigating the Competing Interests of Regional Actors in South Sudan. *Africa
Centre for Strategic Studies*

Lerche, C and Said A. (1963). Concepts of International Politics. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall

Lucey, A. and Kumalo, L. (2017). Democratise or Disintegrate: *How the African Union can help
South Sudan*

Manning, A. (2003). The Impact of External Actors on the Prospects of a Mediated Settlement in
South Sudan

Marleku, A. (2013). National Interest and Foreign Policy: The Case of Kosovo. Mediterranean
Journal of Social Sciences. Vol 4, No. 3, pp 415-419

Mc Evoy, C. (2013)., Shifting Priorities: Kenya's Changing Approach to Peacebuilding and
Peacemaking. Norwegian Peace Building Resource Centre.

Morgenthau, Hans J. (1948). Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace. 2d ed. New York: Knopf.

Neuchterlein, D. (1976). National Interest and Foreign Policy: A Conceptual Framework for Analysis and Decision-Making, Vol. 2, No. 3, British Journal of International Studies. p. 246

Newman, E. and Oliver, P. (2006). Challenges to Peace Building: Managing Spoilers During Conflict Resolution. United Nations University Press

Obegi, F. and Nyamboga, C. (2013). Use of Information and Knowledge Management in Conflict Resolution Paper. Retrieved from www.goethe.de/ins/ke/nai/pro/conflictresolution (Accessed on August 2, 2019)

Odhiambo, P. and Muluvi, A. (2014). Impact of Prolonged South Sudan Crisis on Kenya's Economic and Security Interests. Retrieved from https://www.brookings.edu/blog/africa-in-focus/2014/03/12/impact-of-prolonged-south-sudan-crisis-on-kenyas-economic-and-security-interests/ (Accessed on July 10, 2019)

Oloo, O, M. (2006). Core States in Regional Conflicts Resolution: A Critical Analysis of Kenya's Role in the Southern Sudan Peace, Political Science Thesis, Master Thesis, University of Nairobi.

Ploughshares. *(2003).* Armed Conflict. Retrieved from http://ploughshares.ca/programs/armed-conflict/defining-armed-conflict/ (Accessed on August 30, 2019).

PSCU. (2019). Kenya, South Sudan to deepen trade ties, set up joint border commission. *President's Strategic Communications Unit*

Reychler, L. and Langer, A. (2006). Researching Peace Building Architecture. Cahiers of the Center of Peace Research and Strategic Studies, Leuven, 75

Riaz, U. (2015). The National Interest. World Times. Retrieved from

http://jworldtimes.com/jwt2015/cssexclusive/css-special/the-national-interest (Accessed

on 10 March 2016)

Richard, S. (1972). The 1972 Addis Ababa Agreement and the Sudan The Journal of Modern

African Studies ,247-274

Sanan, N. (2007). Peace Negotiations and Agreements. Inclusive Security.

Saunders, H. (2001). Pre-negotiation and Circum-negotiation: Arenas of the Multilevel Peace

Process". *Turbulent Peace.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Institute of Peace. p. 483.

Sharma, U. and Sharma, S. K (2000). Principles and Theory in Political Science. New Delhi:

Atlantic Publishers and Distributors (P) Ltd

Simmons, M. and Dixon, P. (2006). Sumbeiywo, Gen: 'The Mediator's Perspective in Piece by

Piece'. Conciliation Resources, Accord 18 London: Conciliation Resources

Sriram, L. and Herman, J. (2009). DDR and Transitional Justice. *Conflict, Security and*

Development, 9(4), p10-11

Stolberg, G. (2010). US Library of Congress. Foreign Relations. Retrieved from

http://countrystudies.us/nigeria/80.htm (Accessed on June 18, 2019)

Tarekegn, A. (2005). Post Conflict Peace Building and Prospects for Democracy a with

Reference to Africa, Uppsala, Sweden, Life and Peace Institute

Thucydides. (1972). History of the Peloponnesian War, *trans. Rex Warner*, Harmondsworth:

Penguin Books.

UN High Commission for Refugees Report. (2019). Kenya Refugee Response Plan for South

Sudanese

US Bureau of African Affairs. (2018). U.S. Relations With South Sudan: Bilateral Relations Fact

      Sheet

Van Dyke, V. (1962). Values and Interests. American Political Science Review 56:567–576

Vertin, Z. (2018). A poisoned Well: Lessons in Mediation from South Sudan's Troubled Peace

      Process. *International Peace Institute (IPI)*, p 23

Waihenya, W. (2006). The Mediator: Lazaro Sumbeiywo and the Southern Sudan Peace

      Process. Kenways Publications: Nairobi

Wanyama, L. (2013). The Economic Diplomacy of Kenya's Regional Interests, South African

      Institute of International Affairs African Perspectives, Global Insights, South African

      Foreign policy and African Drivers Programme-

Whitefield, T. (2010) External Actors in Mediation, Dilemmas and Options for Mediators,

      Center for Humanitarian Dialogue

Williams, J. (2017). The conflict in South Sudan explained. Updated Jan 9, 2017, 10:25am

Winsor, M. (2018). South Sudan marks 5 years of vicious civil war.

      https://abcnews.go.com/International/south-sudan-marks-years-vicious-civil-

      war/story?id=59797433

Young, J. (2007). Sudan: a flawed peace process leading to a flawed peace. *African Political*

      Economy :Vol, 32, - Issue 103. P 99-113

Annex 1: Interview Schedule

Section A

Demographic information of the respondents

1. Gender: Male [   ]   Female [   ]

2. Age:

   18-24 years [   ] 25-34 years [   ] 35-44 years [   ] 45-54 years [   ] Over 55 years [   ]

3. Education Level: Undergraduate and below [   ] Postgraduate [   ]

4. Designation……………………………………………………………………………

5. Organization……………………………………………………………………......

6. How many years have you worked in the region?

   1-10 years [   ] 10-20 years [   ] Over 20 years [   ]

Section B

Objective 1: What were Kenya's economic interest in South Sudan?

1. What economic interests did Kenya have in South Sudan that motivated its participation in the peace process?
2. Did Kenya have ongoing projects with South Sudan during the Peace Process?
3. Were there trade deals between Kenya and South Sudan before or during the peace process?
4. How were the trade relations between Kenya and South Sudan before the start of the peace process?

5. How were the conflicts affecting the trade between the two countries?
6. What Kenya investments are you aware of that exist in South Sudan?
7. Do these investments influence Kenya's intervention?

Objective 2: What were Kenya's political interest in South Sudan?

1. What are Kenya's political interests in South Sudan?
2. What is Kenya's regional stability interests in East Africa?
3. Do Kenya's regional stability interests influence its participation in South Sudan?

Objective 3: What were Kenya's national security interest in South Sudan?

1. What is Kenya's national security interests in South Sudan?
2. What are the territorial relations between Kenya and South Sudan?
3. Do these territorial issues influence Kenya's intervention in South Sudan?
4. Do the South Sudanese refugee population in Kenya threatens its Security?

Objective 4: How Kenya's national interests shape its participation in the South Sudan peace process

1. How did Kenya's trading interests in South Sudan influence its participation in the peace process?
2. How did the presence of Kenyan nationals South Sudan influence Kenya's participation in the peace process?
3. To what extent did Kenya's economic interests in South Sudan influence its involvement in the peace process?
4. To what extend did Kenya's political interests influence her participation and intervention in the peace process?
5. To what extend did Kenya's national security interests influence her participation and intervention in the peace process?
6. What strategies did Kenya use during the peace process?
7. Were the strategies adopted by Kenya in the peace process successful?
8. How were the strategies significant in protecting and enhancing Kenya's trading relationship with South Sudan?
9. What challenges did Kenya encounter during the peace process?
10. How did the challenges affect Kenya's participation and the peace process in general?

Annex 2: Conflict Fatalities (2011-2018)

2013 - 2018
Conflict fatalities

27   400

Source: ACLED