

Humanitarian Crisis in South Kordofan and Blue Nile states of Sudan

Hannibal Travis

14 November 2012

There is a humanitarian crisis affecting at least 650,000 at-risk people in South Kordofan and Blue Nile states of Sudan, and refugees across the border in South Sudan. Contrary to recent suggestions that the emergency has been managed to some kind of chronic or normal condition, USAID's Famine Early Warning Systems Network (FEWS Net) reported this July that South Kordofan was an emergency and that conditions were expected to fall below the "stressed" condition.

"There are now at least 200,000 internally displaced people within these two states and more than 200,000 refugees from Blue Nile and South Kordofan in South Sudan and Ethiopia. In areas of Blue Nile and South Kordofan that are controlled by the SPLM-N, poor crop production has been exacerbated by ongoing limitations on trade, movement, and humanitarian access, which severely hinder access to other sources of food (wild foods, market purchases) and income (agricultural labor opportunities, sales of wild foods) as well as limit market supplies, pushing food prices well above average. As a result, the host population in SPLM-N areas of South Kordofan (about 50,000 people) faces food consumption gaps with high or above usual levels of acute malnutrition. IDPs in SPLM-N controlled areas of South Kordofan (150,000 – 200,000 people) are worse off. They face heavy asset losses, large food consumption gaps, very high levels of acute malnutrition, and excess mortality. Therefore, these areas of South Kordofan are classified as Emergency (IPC Phase 4). Those in SPLM-N-controlled areas of Blue Nile have less limitation on movement and better access to food than in South Kordofan and face Crisis levels of food insecurity. In both states, displaced households in Government of Sudan (GoS) controlled areas have better access to markets, labor opportunities, and humanitarian assistance and therefore these areas are classified as Stressed (IPC Phase 2). Between now and August, food security is expected to deteriorate as food prices peak, food stocks are exhausted or drawn to a minimum among both IDPs and the host population, and limitations on trade, movement, and humanitarian assistance continue. "

http://www.fews.net/docs/Publications/Sudan_South_Sudan_Alert_2012_07_final.pdf

In October, the Enough Project reported that 81.5 percent of families survive on one meal a day (as compared to 9.5% last year and 0% the year before), with 73% of households having no income at all. <http://www.enoughproject.org/reports/rapid-food-security-and-nutrition-assessment-south-kordofan>

Also in October, McClatchy reported that "the U.S. rolled out a clandestine plan to send thousands of tons of food from South Sudan by road, until rains made the sole dirt track north impassable in July." On Sept 25, 120 NGOs sent a letter to the UNSC stating that "To date, the government has ignored the deadlines laid out in the memorandum and exhibited no indication that it intends to allow the full and unhindered delivery of aid throughout South Kordofan and Blue Nile." On Nov. 6, AFP reported that "an international plan to get aid into the area expired without any food reaching the hungry".

http://www.sudantribune.com/spip.php?iframe&page=imprimable&id_article=44516

Sudan has pointed the way to how the Security Council can contribute to the solution of such a situation. On November 1, 1994, it signed on to draft resolution A/49/L.14 on Bosnia, which reaffirmed the UN's "determination to prevent acts of genocide and crimes against humanity and other violations of international humanitarian law," "Demand[ed] that all concerned facilitate the unhindered flow of humanitarian assistance, including the provision of water, electricity, fuel and communication, in particular to the 'safe areas' in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and in this context urges the Security Council to... ensure the free flow of humanitarian assistance, particularly to the 'safe areas'," "Demand[ed] that the Bosnian

Serb party lift forthwith the siege of Sarajevo ... as well as other besieged Bosnian towns, and urges the Secretary-General to direct the United Nations Protection Force to take necessary measures, in accordance with relevant Security Council resolutions, for the protection of the 'safe areas'," "Strongly condemn[ed] the Serbian self-proclaimed authorities in the Serbian-controlled territories of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina [sic] for their actions in pursuit of the 'ethnic cleansing' of those areas as a matter of policy", "Reaffirm[ed] that the consequences of 'ethnic cleansing' shall not be accepted by the international community and that those who have seized land and other property by 'ethnic cleansing' ... must relinquish those lands, in conformity with norms of international law," and "Reaffirm[ed] once again the right of refugees and displaced persons from the areas of conflict in the territory of the former Yugoslavia to return voluntarily to their homes in safety and dignity".

In stark contrast to Bosnia and Herzegovina, where the UN's response to claims of oppression was to recognize a rebel movement controlling part of a province's territory, weaken the state fighting it with an arms embargo, and demand that the state allow humanitarian aid to be delivered, the UNSC has called upon South Sudan to "cease the harbouring of, or support to, rebel groups against the other State". Resolution 2046.

So, contrary to the Bosnian precedent, the UN is tightening the siege of South Kordofan from the south, while members of the Security Council train and equip the Sudanese army.

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/politics/2012/sep/25/uk-millions-training-oppressive-regimes>

The reaction to Sudan is also contrary to other precedents alleged to represent a commitment to or doctrine of a "Responsibility to Protect" arising in part out of Article 1 of the Genocide Convention.