

2. Major armed conflicts

SHARON WIHARTA and IAN ANTHONY*

I. Introduction

While the decline since 1999 in the number of major armed conflicts continued in 2002, several developments during the year called attention to armed conflicts in various locations.¹ Conflicts that were under way in 2002 underlined the continuous evolution in the methods of war fighting, in particular those in which major asymmetries exist either between states with widely divergent capabilities or between state and non-state forces.

Military means were used in 2002 in response to terrorist attacks. Fighting continued in Afghanistan, and President George W. Bush emphasized that the military operations of the US-led coalition forces would not be confined to that country or limited to action against the perpetrators of the terrorist attacks on the USA in September 2001.²

While the declared objective of military operations is the defeat of ‘global reach’ terrorism, the primary targets of measures taken after September 2001 have been armed Islamic fundamentalist organizations that have carried out or been implicated in terrorist activities. Apart from Afghanistan, such organizations were present in three locations where conflicts deteriorated during 2002—in Israel, the Philippines and the Russian republic of Chechnya. In all three cases, governments carried out aggressive anti-terrorist measures, including offensive military operations, to prevent, deter or otherwise respond to terrorism.

There is strong evidence of links between cells of the al-Qaeda network, responsible for the attacks of 11 September 2001, and Islamic fundamentalist organizations in Sudan as well as (somewhat less compelling) evidence of ties to groups in Somalia. The USA increased the level of attention it paid to these countries. Less aggressive counter-terrorist measures were applied in Somalia and Sudan, and US diplomatic support for the peace processes in East Africa was increased. In both Somalia and Sudan there was progress towards resolution of long-running conflicts, although the extent to which terrorist activities as such have been hampered is hard to assess.

¹ For the purposes of this chapter, a ‘major armed conflict’ is defined as the use of armed force between 2 or more organized armed groups, resulting in the battle-related deaths of at least 1000 people in any single calendar year and in which the incompatibility concerns control of government or territory. The overall pattern of major armed conflict is described in appendix 2A.

² The wider developments in US national security strategy are discussed in chapter 1 in this volume. The International Security Assistance Force in Afghanistan (ISAF) and the US-led military operations in Afghanistan are described in chapter 4 in this volume.

* SIPRI Intern Peter Holtsberg assisted with the preparation of several sections of this chapter.

While the five permanent members of the United Nations Security Council have tried to marginalize the role of nuclear weapons as an element in their relations with one another, the issue of whether and how nuclear weapons might be used in war was brought into focus by the actions of states in 2002.

The second half of 2002 was dominated by the prospective use of force to eliminate Iraq's nuclear, chemical and biological weapon capabilities and certain Iraqi missile programmes in a manner that was permanent, transparent and verifiable—initially through the reinforced application of UN Security Council resolutions.³ By March 2003 this crisis produced a new military conflict on Iraqi soil.

In South Asia, the nuclear-armed adversaries India and Pakistan confront one another on a continuous basis in various places along their common border, part of which is contested. Nuclear brinkmanship played a prominent role in the crises between them in December 2001 and May 2002.⁴ Another nuclear-armed state, Israel,⁵ is engaged in a highly asymmetrical conflict against Palestinian armed groups that seek to establish an independent state of Palestine. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea (North Korea), widely believed to be on the threshold of acquiring nuclear weapons, has carried out military action and repudiated non-proliferation obligations in an attempt to engage the United States in a bilateral dialogue about its alleged security concerns.⁶

A full account of the major armed conflicts continuing or arising in 2002 is presented in appendix 2A. A more selective and analytical approach is adopted in this chapter: section II examines four conflicts that escalated in 2002—Nepal, Colombia, Chechnya (Russia) and Israel–Palestinians—and section III four conflicts that came close to a settlement during the year—Sri Lanka, the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC), Sudan and Somalia. Section IV presents the conclusions.

II. Conflicts that escalated in 2002

A number of conflicts intensified substantially during 2002. This section discusses four of these conflicts in order to illustrate the impact of such factors as the tactics and strategies of the warring parties, the potential of spillover to neighbouring countries and the impact on international relations.

Nepal

The Communist Party of Nepal–Maoist (CPN(M)) was formed in 1996 and since then has been fighting to overthrow the constitutional monarchy and install a communist government in Nepal. The CPN(M) is the result of a

³ The crisis in Iraq is described and discussed in chapter 1 in this volume.

⁴ The impact of nuclear weapons on the Indo-Pakistan crisis of 2002 is discussed in chapter 5 in this volume. See also appendix 15A.

⁵ For the nuclear forces of Israel see appendix 15A in this volume.

⁶ On North Korea see section II of chapter 15 in this volume.

merger between two organizations—the more moderate Communist Party (Mashal) and the hardline Communist Party (Masal)—which are headed by Pushpa Kamal Dahal (also known as Prachanda) and Baburam Bhattarai, respectively.

The CPN(M) has approximately 3000–4000 regular fighters and 10 000–15 000 active militiamen.⁷ Its stronghold is primarily in western parts of Nepal, but it has launched successful attacks on nearly all of the 75 districts of the country. Dire poverty, the apparent failure of democracy to improve living standards and the caste system all contribute to the increasingly widespread support received by the rebels. Although the conflict has lasted six years, it was only in 2002 that the international community took notice of the gravity of the situation. Of the approximately 7000 fatalities reported in this conflict, at least half were suffered in 2002. Half of those deaths were civilians. A report issued by Amnesty International indicated that the warring parties were guilty of human rights abuses.⁸ On several occasions, civilians were targeted either on suspicion of collaboration with the CPN(M) or because they did not provide sufficient support to the rebels.

The year began with the Nepalese Government's renewed effort to fight the insurgency. The government announced an increase of more than \$40 million in the defence budget.⁹ Approximately 10 000 troops were added to the armed forces, and better training and equipment were provided to the police force to fight the rebels. A paramilitary force was created. The government sought the support of several key countries—China, India, the UK and the USA—and requested military and development assistance. The request for development assistance is an indication of the government's awareness that economic growth in rural areas is a central factor in the successful resolution of the conflict. All four countries agreed in principle to aid the government. The UK pledged £27 million (\$40 million) in development aid and agreed to provide military training and expertise along with two helicopters.¹⁰ The Bush Administration, in addition to military assistance for training in peacekeeping operations, promised a \$20 million military aid package and an unspecified amount of development aid.¹¹ Much-needed military hardware, such as utility vehicles, mine-proof combat vehicles and helicopters, was secured from India with

⁷ Lintner, B., 'Nepal's Maoists prepare for final offensive', *Jane's Intelligence Review*, vol. 14, no. 10 (Oct. 2002), pp. 36–39.

⁸ The suspension of the media and the inaccessibility of most towns and districts in Nepal made independent verification of the actual death toll in 2002 difficult. Amnesty International, 'Nepal: a deepening crisis', document no. ASA 31/072/2002, 19 Dec. 2002, available at URL <<http://www.amnesty.org/library/engindex>>.

⁹ Since the insurgency, the Nepalese Government has consistently raised its military expenditure, with 2002 showing the largest jump—25%. For a fuller discussion of military expenditure see chapter 10 in this volume; and Lintner (note 7).

¹⁰ Bhattarai, B., 'UK vows to help Nepal fight Maoist rebels', *Financial Times*, 21 Feb. 2002, p. 6; and Adams, C., 'Britain steps up aid for Nepal's terrorism fight', *Financial Times*, 20 June 2002, p. 7.

¹¹ 'Nepal PM seeks British help', BBC Online Network, 13 May 2002, URL <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/world/south_asia/1984305.stm>; and 'Nepal wins help to fight Maoists', *Financial Times*, 16 May 2002, p. 6.

special concessions.¹² China, for its part, denounced the CPN(M) as a terrorist group and agreed to provide some economic aid.¹³ This was the first time that the Nepalese Government received considerable direct assistance to fight the rebels.

The first major offensive by the rebels, in November 2001, was a turning point in the conflict. A ceasefire had been implemented in July, and peace talks between the government and the CPN(M) were under way in the latter part of the year. However, at the end of November negotiations were halted when rebels launched a series of coordinated, country-wide attacks on government forces. Forty-six separate government installations in the Mount Everest region were hit, and the fighting caused about 200 deaths on each side.¹⁴

In 2002, this pushed the government to declare a national state of emergency that was extended twice and finally ended at the end of August. The state of emergency gave the military and police forces greater leeway in dealing with the rebels and led to the suspension of freedom of expression, freedom of the press and freedom of assembly. The state of emergency prevented the local and international media from reaching the front lines and accurately reporting on the conflict.

In response to a major attack by Maoist rebels, government assaults on rebel strongholds in the Achham district were carried out in February 2002.¹⁵ The November offensive, coupled with the February attacks by the Maoist rebels, led to a change in the government's approach to the rebels. The Royal Nepal Army was called in to fight them. While before 2002 the conflict in Nepal had been treated as a law and order issue, the 28 000-strong police force was neither trained in counter-insurgency skills nor equipped to fight an insurgency.¹⁶ The Royal Nepal Army numbered around 45 000 but, despite the estimated 2:1 numerical advantage of the army and the infusion of external military assistance, it could not defeat the CPN(M).

The rebel attacks in February and April 2002 showed a changing strategy. Each of the 15 engagements during the year inflicted at least 100 fatalities. Tactically, the CPN(M) seems to operate in a manner similar to its Colombian counterparts: it attacks government institutions such as local council buildings and civil infrastructure, a tactic which has also drawn civilians into the conflict. In a bid to intimidate the Nepali people, the CPN(M) issued deadlines for registering support for the movement.

King Gyanendra's decision to dissolve the parliament, postpone elections scheduled for November 2002, and appoint an interim prime minister who was

¹² Bedi, R., 'India assures Nepal of continued support', *Jane's Defence Weekly*, vol. 38, no. 1 (3 July 2002), p. 13.

¹³ Bhattarai, B., 'China condemns Nepalese "terrorists"', *Financial Times*, 12 July 2002, p. 6.

¹⁴ Karniol, R., 'Nepal declares a state of emergency', *Jane's Defence Weekly*, vol. 36, no. 23 (5 Dec. 2001), p. 14.

¹⁵ 'Nepal army "kills 76 rebels"', BBC News Online, 25 Feb. 2002, URL<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/south_asia/1840160.stm>.

¹⁶ Lintner (note 7).

clearly a supporter of the monarchy may have contributed to much of the violence witnessed in October and November.¹⁷

On 29 January 2003 the CPN(M) announced a ceasefire and its willingness to enter into negotiations with the government. Nevertheless, the CPN(M) believed at this point that it had the upper hand, and this declaration—which was described as a ‘bolt from the blue’ by Nepalese commentators—has been seen by many as an effort by the CPN(M) to regroup and rearm.¹⁸ Hardliners within the CPN(M) leadership were expected to argue for a strategic offensive in 2003.¹⁹ The government had no strong reason to negotiate, and the conflict in Nepal did not appear ripe for negotiations.

Colombia

The conflict between the Colombian Government and two leftist rebel groups—the Fuerzas Armadas Revolucionarias de Colombia (FARC, Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia) and the Ejército de Liberación Nacional (ELN, National Liberation Army)—began in the late 1960s over the form of government in Colombia. The Autodefensas Unidas de Colombia (AUC, United Self-Defence Forces of Colombia) is a right-wing paramilitary group which claims that its objective is to fight the guerrillas. So far, the conflict has claimed at least 40 000 lives and caused the internal displacement of approximately 2 million Colombians. In 2002, more than 200 000 people were forced to leave their homes.²⁰

In the first half of 2002, the conflict in Colombia became more violent and deadly, and at the end of 2002 the prospects for peace in Colombia seemed more distant.

In January the government withdrew from peace talks with FARC and gave them 48 hours to pull out from all demilitarized zones.²¹ Prompted by pressure from UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan, the government and FARC resumed peace talks and agreed to implement a ceasefire on 7 April.²² In February FARC resumed operations and kidnapped presidential candidate Ingrid Betancour in a demilitarized zone.²³ In response, the government carried out

¹⁷ ‘Nepal’s king takes power and delays poll’, *Financial Times*, 5-6 Oct. 2002, p. 2.

¹⁸ ‘Cease fire declaration; bolt from the blue to the UML and Congress’ *Weekly Telegraph*, 5 Feb. 2002, URL <<http://www.nepalnews.com.np/contents/englishweekly/telegraph/2003/feb/feb05/>>.

¹⁹ Lintner (note 7).

²⁰ Bogota El Espectador, 28 Nov. 2002, in ‘[UN] High Commissioner for Refugees on official visit to Colombia’, Foreign Broadcast Information Service (FBIS), *Daily Report—The Americas (FBIS-LAT)*, FBIS-LAT-2002-1128, 29 Nov. 2002.

²¹ ‘Colombia’s peace process: End of the road?’, *The Economist*, vol. 362, no. 8255 (12 Jan. 2002), p. 52. The demilitarized zones had been established in 2001 by then President Andrés Pastrana.

²² United Nations, Statement from the Secretary General, UN document SG/SM/8092, 10 Jan. 2002; and ‘FARC agrees to talks on ceasefire to be implemented from early April’, *Latin American Weekly Report*, WR-02-04, 22 Jan. 2002, p. 37.

²³ Morris, R. and Bounds, A., ‘Conquering army brings fear to former rebel haven’, *Financial Times*, 25 Feb. 2002, p. 2.

raids on known FARC locations.²⁴ This effectively led to the collapse of three years of peace talks.

Attacks became more frequent and were brought closer to urban centres as FARC adopted a new strategy and began a series of bomb attacks on several cities, including Bogota, as well as kidnapping high-level political figures.²⁵ Peace talks between the government and the ELN in March did not fare any better. The government refused to pay for the release of 200 hostages held by the guerrillas.²⁶

The Bush Administration agreed to provide military aid to Colombia that would not be tied directly to efforts to combat the drug trade, for the first time since the end of the cold war. In March 2002 the Administration requested authorization from Congress to broaden the use of military assistance to combat terrorism. Aid will primarily fund military training and education, tactical operations and a new army unit to defend oil pipelines that are regularly attacked by the guerrillas.²⁷ This is in addition to the US regional aid programme, the Andean Initiative, in which Colombia will receive \$399 million in military and economic aid and a further \$275 million in 2003.²⁸

These events greatly influenced the presidential elections in May. As terrorist attacks by FARC in cities became more prevalent, civilian deaths as a result of fighting between the guerrilla groups and the AUC increased, and there was a general sense that peace talks would not succeed. The Colombian people chose to elect a hardline leader who pledged to be tougher on the rebels. Presidential candidate Alvaro Uribe promised to end the 40-year conflict with a military victory and to double the police force to 200 000, increase the armed forces to 100 000, and create a 1 million-strong network of civilian informants.²⁹ Uribe won the elections by a wide margin—53 per cent of the vote, compared to 31.8 per cent by Horacio Serpa, his closest contender.

In a direct bid to undermine Uribe's incoming government and undo the effective functioning of government institutions at all levels, FARC launched a campaign of personal attacks against government officials. The mayors of Caquetá, Huila, Cauca and Meta provinces were threatened with attack if they did not leave their posts. The FARC murdered the mayor of Solita and the

²⁴ Bogota Caracol Television, 8 Feb. 2002, in 'Colombia's DAS conducts 30 raids against FARC militias', FBIS-LAT-2002-0208, 11 Feb. 2002.

²⁵ 'The FARC turns the screws: Applying the IRA's lessons', *The Economist*, vol. 363, no. 8270 (27 Apr. 2002), pp. 54-55.

²⁶ 'Violence in Colombia puts ELN peace talks in the shade as US redefines aid', *Latin American Regional Report*, RA-02-03, 9 Apr. 2002, p. 1.

²⁷ Statement of Mr. Peter Rodman, Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs, to the House International Relations Committee Subcommittee for Western Hemisphere, in 'Pentagon official says US aid must foster basic security in Colombia', US Department of State, *Washington File*, 11 Apr. 2002, URL <<http://usinfo.state.gov/regional/ar/colombia/02041104.htm>>. The aid is still part of Plan Colombia and approximately 25% of the aid money will go to counter-narcotics activities. 'Non-drugs military aid spelt out', *Latin American Weekly Report*, WR-02-08, 19 Feb. 2002, p. 92.

²⁸ Colombia receives the largest proportion of the aid. The other recipients of Andean Initiative aid are Bolivia, Brazil, Ecuador, Panama, Peru and Venezuela. *Latin American Weekly Report* (note 27).

²⁹ 'Staying alive', *The Economist*, vol. 363, no. 8274 (25 May 2002), pp. 55-57.

others stepped down.³⁰ The rebels were also responsible for a mortar attack during the inauguration of President Uribe.

Responding to the growing wave of attacks, President Uribe placed Colombia under a state of emergency that lasted for three months. As part of this measure, the government proclaimed a one-off 1.2 per cent 'war' tax on high-income individuals and corporations; the intention was to raise 2000 billion pesos (about \$800 million) for enhanced military spending.³¹ The government recruited 20 000 'peasant soldiers' to guard villages that had no security-force presence and created Rehabilitation and Consolidation Zones in which the armed forces had greater flexibility and freedom to restrict civilian movement, impose curfews and arrest suspects without warrants.³²

An initial evaluation of Uribe's approach shows that it has been fairly successful. In November 2002 he had the backing of the population, with 74 per cent of the population approving his tactics.³³ In the latter part of the year the armed forces destroyed FARC enclaves in urban centres. Government forces have benefited from a small team of US elite soldiers who are helping to train a brigade of soldiers to become a rapid reaction force capable of defending oil pipelines.³⁴ However, whether the government is capable of sustaining its efforts depends on its ability to finance the ambitious campaign.

Chechnya (Russia)

While the issue of Islamic extremism played a limited role in the 1995–97 war in Chechnya, it appeared to be more prominent in the war that began in 1999. Issues such as the preservation of Russia's territorial integrity and influence over the regional oil economy have become less important. After September 2001, President Vladimir Putin emphasized that there were links between the war in Chechnya and the international activities of armed Islamic extremist organizations, and Russia promised support for the war on terrorism.

Nevertheless, in 2001–2002 the Chechnya conflict was widely seen to have reached a form of stalemate in which armed operations continued, although neither of the warring parties expected to achieve their primary objectives by this means. The continuation of the war was negative for Russia in many respects. Although neither the Russian Government nor the separatist rebels had a strong interest in modifying its position to seek a political accommodation, neither side appeared interested in escalating the fighting. However, the Chechen rebels did attempt to modify their form of attack—there was a departure from low-level guerrilla warfare to 'spectacular' attacks, which command the attention of the public, such as the August missile attack of an Mi-26

³⁰ Wilson, J., 'Colombian warfare lands on mayors' doorsteps', *Financial Times*, 11 June 2002, p. 4.

³¹ 'Colombia's President Uribe declares "state of internal disturbance"', *Latin American Regional Reports*, RA-02-07, 27 Aug. 2002, p.1.

³² 'Colombia creates security zones', BBC News Online, 22 Sep. 2002, URL <<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/americas/2273680.stm>>.

³³ 'Uribe's escalation proves highly popular', *Latin American Weekly Report*, 19 Nov. 2002, WR-02-46, p. 546.

³⁴ Wilson, J. 'US goes deeper into Colombia conflict', *Financial Times*, 30 Jan. 2003, p. 5.

transport helicopter that killed over 100 Russian soldiers, and the October bombing of the police headquarters in Grozny.³⁵

The most serious assault was the hostage crisis in October 2002. A group of approximately 50 armed Chechens attacked the Dubrovka Theatrical Centre in Moscow and held around 700 people hostage, demanding an immediate end to Russia's military campaign in Chechnya before Russian authorities recaptured the building.³⁶

While hostage taking was not a new element of the conflict in Chechnya (2000 people were held hostage in 1996), this was the first time that a direct assault was launched in Moscow.³⁷ Subsequently, the Russian Government took a much tougher and more uncompromising stance on the conflict and launched several retaliatory attacks on the rebels in Chechnya. It also further emphasized the parallels and links between the Chechen rebels and al-Qaeda.³⁸

During 2002 the potential for cross-border spillover between Chechnya and Georgia became a focus of attention after Russia alleged that Chechen fighters had concealed themselves among the large number of Chechen refugees in the Pankisi Gorge—an area of Georgia bordering on Chechnya and outside the control of the central government.³⁹ The area is populated mainly by Georgian citizens who are ethnically similar to the Chechens. Russia claimed a right to act in self-defence against armed groups in Georgia and drew a parallel between the Pankisi Gorge and the safe haven Afghanistan provided to al-Qaeda.⁴⁰ Russia and the USA both suspected that al-Qaeda operatives were hiding in the Pankisi Gorge and, in February 2002, 200 US special operations forces were sent to train and advise the Georgian military on counter-terrorism tactics.⁴¹ Russia expressed concern over these US military activities in Georgia.⁴² In August Russia was accused of bombing villages in the northern part of Georgia.⁴³ Russian pressure led the Georgian Army to launch several military operations in the Pankisi Gorge to gain control of the area.⁴⁴

³⁵ Galeotti, M., 'Chechen militants bring their war to Moscow', *Jane's Intelligence Review*, vol. 14, no. 12 (Dec. 2002), pp. 46–49.

³⁶ The hostage taking and the operation to recapture the theatre are described in chapter 17 in this volume.

³⁷ 'The Chechens strike', *The Economist*, vol. 365, no. 8296 (26 Oct.–1 Nov. 2002), p. 28.

³⁸ Stressing the impossibility of negotiation, Sergey Yastrzhembsky, the presidential aide responsible for Chechnya, is quoted as saying: 'we have to wipe out the commanders of the movement' in the aftermath of the Moscow theatre siege. Peterson, S., 'Chance for Chechen peace wanes', *Christian Science Monitor*, 1 Nov. 2002.

³⁹ ITAR-TASS, 26 Mar. 2002, in 'Russian minister points to Pankisi gorge as Chechen supply line', FBIS-SOV-2002-0326. Armed Islamic extremist groups are also thought to be taking refuge in the Kodori Gorge located in Abkhazia, a region of Georgia where the central government does not exercise control.

⁴⁰ Baker, P. and Glasser, S. B., 'Putin sees a parallel in warning to Georgia: In letter to the UN, he tries to justify attacking Chechens', *International Herald Tribune*, 13 Sep. 2002, p. 1.

⁴¹ Schmitt, E., 'U.S. may send G.I.'s to ex-Soviet area in training mission', *New York Times*, 27 Feb. 2002, p. A2..

⁴² Stern, D., 'Anti-terror war turns focus on criminal cottage industry', *Financial Times*, 28 Feb. 2002, p. 2.

⁴³ Cottrell, R., 'Russia denies its aircraft bombed villages in north Georgia', *Financial Times*, 27 Aug. 2002, p. 2.

⁴⁴ Kupatadze, G., 'Pankisi in uproar at bombing raids', Institute for War and Peace Reporting (IWPR), Caucasus Reporting Service (CRS), CRS no. 144 (30 Aug. 2002), URL <<http://www.iwpr.net/index>>.

Israel–Palestinians

In early 2003, the fighting that began in September 2000 (the ‘second Intifada’) continued, with few signs of any settlement. Between September 2000 and the end of 2002, rising violence caused the deaths of approximately 700 Israelis and 2000 Palestinians. The economic and social conditions of both Israelis and Palestinians continued to deteriorate in 2002.

The second Intifada has been far more lethal than the first, with a qualitative change in the methods used on the battlefield—although the struggle for political and media attention is common to both. The methods used by the main warring parties on the battlefield in the second Intifada have been highly asymmetrical.⁴⁵ While suicide bombings have accounted for a large number of Israeli deaths and injuries, the Israeli Defence Forces (IDF) have used a range of heavy weapons against Palestinian opponents. IDF operations have included extensive use of infantry forces in built-up areas to reduce casualties.

The Palestinian Authority (PA), which has stated its opposition to the use of suicide bombing and distanced itself from groups using this tactic, may have tried to develop military capacities of a more traditional kind. On 3 January 2002, the Israeli Navy seized control of the *Karine A*, a ship that was sailing in international waters on its way to the Suez Canal. The ship was carrying about 50 tonnes of arms, including 122-mm and 107-mm calibre Katyusha artillery rockets, 80-mm and 120-mm calibre mortar shells, various anti-tank missiles, anti-tank mines, sniper rifles, Kalashnikov rifles and ammunition.⁴⁶ Israel claimed that the arms were for the PA and accused Palestinian President Yasser Arafat of seeking to escalate the conflict. The PA launched its own investigation of the matter, arresting officials responsible for the shipment and stating that the smuggling operation was contrary to its policy.⁴⁷

In February, Israel launched its largest military operation since the start of the second Intifada, raiding three towns and a refugee camp in the Gaza Strip. In February there were also warnings from Israel and Western observers regarding the activities of Hezbollah, as there was mounting evidence that the militant organization was preparing a military build-up along the Lebanese border with northern Israel. The frequency of suicide bombings led to an Israeli decision to move ahead on the long-debated separation of Israel from parts of the occupied territories through the erection of physical barriers.

In April 2002 the violence on both sides escalated, as the IDF mounted an offensive (Operation Defensive Shield) in the West Bank following the attack on the Park Hotel in Netanya during Passover. Six cities were reoccupied and Arafat was held under house arrest in his headquarters until 2 May.

pl?caucasus_200208.html>; and Baker, P., ‘Russia sees trade-off with Bush on Georgia’, *International Herald Tribune*, 14–15 Sep. 2002, p. 1.

⁴⁵ Apart from the operations of the Israeli Defence Forces, organized groups of armed settlers defend properties located in the occupied territories. A number of separate Palestinian groups carry out violent attacks on Israeli targets.

⁴⁶ Usher, G. and Berger, J., ‘Israel halts Palestinian arms ship’, *Guardian Unlimited* (Internet edn), 5 Jan. 2002, URL <<http://www.guardian.co.uk/israel/Story/0,2763,628003,00.html>>.

⁴⁷ ‘Arrest of Palestinian smugglers “step in the right direction”’, US State Department Daily Briefing, 14 Jan. 2002, URL <<http://usinfo.state.gov/topical/pol/terror/02011406.htm>>.

The Israeli spring offensive was criticized internationally, and Israel refused access to a fact-finding team appointed by the United Nations to investigate fighting in the city of Jenin, during which 59 Palestinians and 23 Israelis were killed and 130 buildings were destroyed.⁴⁸ During Operation Defensive Shield, Israeli infantry mainly broke holes through the interior walls of adjacent houses so that troops could move into targeted buildings without being exposed to enemy fire. However, in Jenin the buildings did not permit such an approach and while moving in an exposed alley 13 Israeli soldiers were killed. Subsequently, the IDF used armoured bulldozers to destroy targeted buildings with minimum risk to its troops.⁴⁹

A subsequent UN report based on open sources after the blocking of an enquiry found that 'combatants on both sides conducted themselves in ways that, at times, placed civilians in harm's way. Much of the fighting during Operation Defensive Shield occurred in areas heavily populated by civilians and in many cases heavy weaponry was used. As a result of those practices, the populations of the cities covered in this report suffered severe hardships'.⁵⁰ The ability of the PA to function was seriously compromised by the loss of infrastructure and restrictions on movement and communication. Some concerned observers saw these developments as sounding the death-knell for the 1993 Declaration of Principles (DOP, or Oslo Accords).⁵¹

A number of new peace plans were put forward during 2002 by different parties, including Egypt, Germany, Saudi Arabia and the USA. Arab proposals contained offers to Israel of a normalization of relations. US President Bush recognized the creation of a Palestinian state as one goal of the peace process but emphasized the need for democratic change in the PA itself, including changes in its leadership, stating that 'peace requires a new and different Palestinian leadership, so that a Palestinian state can be born'.⁵²

The EU for its part recognizes the possibility that individuals within the Palestinian Authority support or participate in terrorist incidents. However, the EU has used its position as an economic aid donor to the PA to promote reform on the basis that creating a democratic and open Palestinian state would be the best security guarantee for Israel. Consequently, aid has been provided with 'clear, concrete and tangible conditions' attached, obliging the PA to carry out concrete reform measures, mainly in the area of transparency in budgeting and accounting.⁵³

⁴⁸ According to Israel, several dozen of these buildings were used for making or storing bombs.

⁴⁹ Haruvi, A., 'Jenin: the operational considerations', eds H. Goodman and J. Cummings, *The Battle of Jenin: A Case Study in Israel's Communication Strategy*, Memorandum no. 63 (Jaffee Center for Strategic Studies, Tel Aviv University: Tel Aviv Jan. 2003), URL <<http://www.tau.ac.il/jcss/memoranda/memo63.pdf>>.

⁵⁰ Report of the Secretary-General prepared pursuant to General Assembly Resolution ES-10/10, UN document A/ES-10/186, 30 July 2002, URL <<http://www.un.org/peace/jenin/index.html>>.

⁵¹ The Oslo Accords are available at URL <<http://www.us-israel.org/jsource/Peace/dop.html>>.

⁵² 'President Bush calls for new Palestinian leadership', Speech in the Rose Garden, 24 June 2002, URL <<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/06/20020624-3.html>>.

⁵³ For an overview of EU programmes see 'EU budgetary assistance to the Palestinian Authority, Statement by The Rt Hon Chris Patten, Foreign Affairs Committee of the European Parliament', Brussels, 19 June 2002, URL <http://europa.eu.int/comm/external_relations/news/patten/sp02_293.htm>.

During 2002 both the Israeli Government and the PA were subjected to internal political pressures.

In Israel, the coalition government fell at the end of 2002 and new elections took place in January 2003. Although Prime Minister Ariel Sharon won a significant victory when his Likud Party doubled its representation in the parliament and the main opposition party (the Labour Party) lost seven seats, the election did not seem to create conditions for a stable coalition government.

Internal pressures on the PA stemmed from increasing demands from the Palestinian public for greater accountability from its leadership, which was increasingly seen as being unable to provide either security or economic and social development.⁵⁴ Arafat was forced to dissolve his cabinet rather than face a vote of no-confidence by the Palestinian Legislative Council in September. New Palestinian elections were scheduled to take place in January 2003, but were postponed on the basis that conditions on the ground prevented holding elections.⁵⁵

During the year, enough common ground had been identified between the Russian, US, EU and UN policies to allow this 'quartet' to work together on developing a 'road map' for peace.⁵⁶ The document was not released until 2003. It consists of a phased plan intended to lead to a Israeli–Palestinian peace treaty by 2005.⁵⁷

In 2002 European leaders argued that addressing the Iraqi crisis would be at best a partial solution for regional security and might even undermine counter-terrorism objectives if no progress was made towards resolving the conflict between Israel and the Palestinians.⁵⁸

The USA for its part has emphasized that change in Iraq could have benefits for the Middle East dispute and the wider regional security building process. President Bush stated that 'success in Iraq could also begin a new stage for Middle Eastern peace, and set in motion progress towards a truly democratic Palestinian state. The passing of Saddam Hussein's regime will deprive terrorist networks of a wealthy patron that pays for terrorist training, and offers rewards to families of suicide bombers. And other regimes will be given a

⁵⁴ BenYishay, A., 'Palestinian economy, society and the second Intifada', *Middle East Review of International Affairs (MERIA) Journal*, vol. 6, no. 3 (Sep. 2002), available at URL <<http://meria.idc.ac.il/journal/2002/issue3/jv6n3a4.html>>.

⁵⁵ Everts, S., *The EU and the Middle East: A Call for Action*, Centre for European Reform Working Paper (Centre for European Reform: London, Jan. 2003), pp. 24–28.

⁵⁶ 'Joint statement by the quartet', US Department of State, Office of the Spokesman, Washington, DC, 20 Dec. 2002, URL <<http://www.usembassy-israel.org.il/publish/peace/archives/2002/december/122103.html>>. In addition, the EU, the USA, Russia, Norway, Japan, the Office of the UN Secretary-General, the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund all cooperate in the framework of the Task Force on Palestinian Reform, established to monitor and support Palestinian reform efforts.

⁵⁷ The road map document was released in Apr. 2003. See US Department of State, 'A performance-based roadmap to a permanent two-state solution to the Israeli–Palestinian conflict', Press Statement, 30 Apr. 2003, URL <<http://www.state.gov/r/pa/prs/ps/2003/20062pf.htm>>.

⁵⁸ See, e.g., 'Two simultaneous crises in the Middle East', joint article by Foreign Secretary Jack Straw, UK; and Foreign Minister Jan Petersen, Norway, for *Al Hayat*, 21 Feb. 2003, URL <<http://www.fco.gov.uk>>.

clear warning that support for terror will not be tolerated'.⁵⁹ Should the creation of a democratic Palestinian state become possible, Bush emphasized that the Israeli Government would be expected to support it, *inter alia* through ending Israeli settlement activities in the occupied territories.

III. Conflicts on the way towards settlement in 2002

There was sufficient evidence in 2002 to suggest that there had been a significant improvement in the prospects for resolution in four conflicts discussed below.

Sri Lanka

The Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE) has since 1983 been battling the Sri Lankan Government for independence in the Tamil majority areas in the north-eastern part of the country. It is estimated that over 65 000 people have been killed and a total of 1.8 million displaced over the course of the conflict.⁶⁰ However, a permanent ceasefire that was introduced on 24 February 2002 held throughout the year, with minor exceptions, and the conflict in Sri Lanka held out tangible hope of a viable and lasting peace.⁶¹

Several factors created an environment that was conducive to peace negotiations. The LTTE's willingness to negotiate with the government can be partly attributed to the aftermath of the September 2001 terrorist attacks on the USA. The LTTE has been designated a foreign terrorist organization by several countries, including the USA. After UN Security Council Resolution 1373 was adopted, on 28 September 2001, to help prevent and suppress any acts of terrorism, Tamil financial assets known to be used to support the LTTE were frozen in a number of countries.⁶²

Prime Minister Ranil Wickremesinghe was elected in December 2001 on a platform of ending the conflict. Moreover, Sri Lanka's negative economic growth (–1.3 per cent), its budget deficit of 14 per cent and its public debt of \$14 billion in 2001 hindered any effort to maintain a high rate of military spending.⁶³

⁵⁹ President George W. Bush, 'President discusses the future of Iraq', Speech to the American Enterprise Institute, 26 Feb. 2003, URL <<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2003/02/20030226-11.html>>.

⁶⁰ 'Peace deal in Sri Lanka', BBC News online, 21 Feb. 2002, URL <<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/South-Asia/1833230.stm>>; and 'Sri Lanka makes solid gains in peace process', Beijing Xinhua, 3 Nov. 2002, Foreign Broadcast Information Service, *Daily Report—Near East/South Asia (FBIS-NES)*, FBIS-NES-2002-1103, 4 Nov. 2002.

⁶¹ 'Sri Lanka—Samtaler i Thailand' [Sri Lanka—talks in Thailand], Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs press release, 29 Mar. 2002, URL <<http://odin.dep.no/odinarkiv/norsk/dep/ud/2002/pressem/032091-070145/index-dok000-b-n-a.html>>.

⁶² 'The wounded Tigers: a chance for peace', *The Economist*, vol. 362 no. 8255 (12 Jan. 2002), p. 55. It is estimated that the LTTE received c. \$250 million annually from such contributions. Mehta, K., 'Soothing the bruised lion in Lanka', *The Pioneer* (New Delhi), 16 Jan. 2002, FBIS-NES-2002-0116, 17 Jan. 2002.

⁶³ Asian Development Bank, 'Preferential trade agreements in Asia and the Pacific', *Asian Development Outlook 2002* (Oxford University Press: New York, 2002), p. 112; and Harris, P., 'Sri Lanka under-

Confidence-building measures undertaken in early 2002 facilitated the holding of peace talks. Wickremesinghe visited Jaffna in March.⁶⁴ The seven-year economic embargo on LTTE-controlled areas was lifted, allowing the free flow of non-military goods, and the Kandy–Jaffna road, the main thoroughfare linking the northern and southern parts of the country, was reopened.

At the end of February these measures and the permanent ceasefire were included in an agreement that also called for an international monitoring mechanism. A separate peace deal between the LTTE and the Sri Lanka Muslim Congress (SLMC) allowed Muslims who were displaced from their homes in LTTE strongholds to return.⁶⁵

Prompted by strong diplomatic pressure from the USA, and after the Sri Lankan Government lifted its ban on the LTTE on 4 September, peace talks brokered by Norway finally took place on 16–18 September in Thailand.⁶⁶ The negotiations achieved more than was expected. The sides agreed to hold additional talks and to work together to address the issues of returning refugees and rebuilding war-affected regions. However, the most important achievement was the suggestion that the LTTE could accept autonomy within a unified Sri Lanka. In a statement at the talks, the LTTE chief negotiator spoke of the need for the LTTE to play ‘a leading and pivotal role in administration as well as the economic development of the Northeast’ but made no reference to secession.⁶⁷

Three sub-committees were established to carry forward the peace talks in specific areas. They were to address: (a) the humanitarian and rehabilitation needs in the north and east of Sri Lanka; (b) the de-escalation of military activities and normalization in high-security zones and areas that were inaccessible to the public; and (c) political matters.⁶⁸ Subsequent negotiations focused on the humanitarian and economic issues. A donor conference held in Oslo in November provided Sri Lanka with \$70 million in immediate aid to finance re-construction projects.⁶⁹ By the end of 2002 approximately 100 000 displaced persons had voluntarily returned to their homes in the north-eastern

takes tentative peace steps’, *Jane’s Intelligence Review*, vol. 14, no. 3 (Mar. 2002), pp. 42–43. In previous years the government was estimated to have spent up to \$1 billion per year financing the war. Harrison, F., ‘Sri Lanka moves to revive economy’, BBC News Online, 4 July 2002, URL <<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/business/2095212.stm>>.

⁶⁴ ‘Sri Lanka PM visits troubled north’, BBC News Online, 14 Mar. 2002, URL <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/south_asia/1872010.stm>.

⁶⁵ Hong Kong AFP, 13 Apr. 2002, ‘Sri Lanka’s Tigers enter peace pact with muslims’, FBIS-NES-2002-0413, 15 Apr. 2002.

⁶⁶ Luce, E. and Jayasinghe, A., ‘Sri Lanka clears way for peace talks next month’, *Financial Times*, 29 Aug. 2002, p. 5; and Hong Kong AFP, 22 Aug. 2002, ‘Sri Lanka says Armitage visit to push peace bid’, FBIS-NES-2002-0822, 23 Aug. 2002.

⁶⁷ A Statement by the Chief Negotiator of the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam, Mr Anton Balasingham, at the Inaugural Conference of Sri Lanka Peace Talks in Thailand, 16 Sep. 2002, URL <http://203.115.21.154/news/Peace_Talks/AntonBalasingham.html>.

⁶⁸ ‘Sri Lanka peace talks’, URL <http://europa.eu.int/comm/external_relations/sri_lanka/peace/index.htm>.

⁶⁹ ‘Sri Lanka given cash for peace’, BBC News Online, 26 Nov. 2002, URL <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/south_asia/2511255.stm>.

regions, and reconstruction of some basic infrastructure such as water, sanitation and school buildings had commenced.⁷⁰

The most contentious issue—the potential political role of the LTTE in Sri Lanka—is being examined in the political sub-committee. As of early 2003 the parties had not reached agreement on the issue of disarming the LTTE. The LTTE has linked disarmament with finding a political solution, and the biggest challenge to peace in Sri Lanka remains that of incorporating the LTTE into the mainstream political framework. If this issue is not resolved while the momentum in the peace talks is still high, the opportunity for an end to a long and bloody civil war may be lost.

The Democratic Republic of the Congo

Since 1998 a multitude of warring parties have participated in the conflict in the DRC. The DRC Government has battled against a number of rebel groups, and these rebel groups have battled each other. Moreover, fighting has taken place between different factions within the rebel movements. The DRC Government has received military assistance from Angola, Namibia and Zimbabwe. A number of rebel groups in the DRC have also received military assistance from neighbouring countries. The Mouvement de Libération Congolais (MLC) has been active in the north-east of the DRC and has been supported by Uganda. The Rassemblement Congolais pour la Démocratie—Mouvement de Libération (RCD—ML) has been active in the central, eastern and south-eastern parts of the DRC and has been supported by Rwanda.

Since the outbreak of the conflict there have been a number of peace agreements, some of which were partly implemented before 2002. However, during 2002 significant progress was made in peace talks. An Inter-Congolese Dialogue took place in May in South Africa with the goal of discussing ways of integrating the DRC Government and opposition groups, possibly through a transitional government. These talks underlined the serious disagreements remaining between the warring parties.

Although a broad Inter-Congolese Dialogue has continued, it has increasingly been supplemented by a series of bilateral peace talks facilitated by the UN Secretary-General and conducted in South Africa. Through the course of 2002, the warring parties were able to narrow their differences on particularly contentious issues, notably power-sharing arrangements (in particular the arrangements for the Supreme Council of Defence) and procedures for designating the head of government.⁷¹

In addition, there have been separate talks aimed at providing settlements for conflicts in particular regions of the DRC. In September 2002, talks facili-

⁷⁰ 'Food follows peace in Sri Lanka', BBC News Online, 20 Sep. 2002, URL <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/south_asia/2271141.stm>.

⁷¹ Twelfth Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, UN document S/2002/1180, 18 Oct. 2002.

tated by the Angolan Government produced the Luanda Agreement, which established the basis for a settlement in the Ituri region of the DRC.⁷²

On 17 December, in Pretoria, the warring parties agreed on a Global and All-Inclusive Agreement on the Transition in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. The agreement established a structure in which all the main warring parties and political opposition groups would be represented either in the executive or in a bicameral parliament.⁷³ A new government is to be elected at the end of the transitional period of 18 months.

One element of the all-inclusive agreement was a ceasefire. However, fighting continued in practically all parts of DRC during 2002. Fighting was particularly intense in the north and north-east. While access to certain areas was heavily restricted by the dangerous security environment, UN observers found strong indications of massacres and systematic violations of international humanitarian law in various parts of the DRC. The UN Security Council identified the responsible parties as forces of the MLC, the Rassemblement Congolais pour la Démocratie-National (RCD/N) and the Union des Patriotes Congolais (UPC).

Throughout 2002 foreign troops continued to withdraw from the DRC and by the end of the year UN observers were able to verify the complete withdrawal of the forces of Angola, Burundi, Namibia and Zimbabwe. Forces from Uganda were still in the DRC.

In July the DRC and Rwanda reached an agreement on the withdrawal of Rwandan forces in exchange for the disarming of Hutu militias by the DRC Government along the border between the two countries and an end to support for Hutu groups in the DRC. However, it was not possible to verify this withdrawal during 2002, and towards the end of the year UN observers strongly suspected but could not confirm the continued presence of Rwandan forces in the DRC district of North Kivu.⁷⁴

Sudan

In Sudan, the National Islamic Front (NIF) Government has been battling against the National Democratic Alliance since 1983, when the imposition of Muslim (Sharia) law, and the abolition of the federal system which gave the southern states a high degree of autonomy, became the catalysts for the current conflict.⁷⁵ Within this loose alliance of opposition organizations from different

⁷² Agreement between the Governments of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the Republic of Uganda on Withdrawal of Ugandan Troops from the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Cooperation and Normalisation of Relations Between the Two Countries, 6 Sep. 2002, URL <http://www.usip.org/library/pa/drc_uganda/drc_uganda_09062002.html>.

⁷³ The arrangements are described in the Thirteenth Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, UN document S/2003/211, 21 Feb. 2003.

⁷⁴ Rwandan irregular forces were integrated with the forces commanded by the Governor of North Kivu. Distinguishing these soldiers from Rwandan armed forces is extremely difficult.

⁷⁵ In early 2002, 2 southern opposition movements (the SPLM and the Sudan People's Democratic Front, SPDF) merged after 11 years of bilateral conflict to form the SPLM/A. Nairobi KTN Television,

parts of Sudan, the Sudan People's Liberation Movement/Army (SPLM/A) is the strongest party and has been the negotiating counterpart for the Sudanese Government during peace talks. While the conflict reflects a complex mix of factors, northern Sudan is made up largely of Arab Muslims while the south consists mainly of Christian and animist Africans who are fighting to be excluded from the Sharia law imposed by Khartoum. The large oil deposits found in southern Sudan complicate agreement on an equitable political settlement. Prior to September 2001 the war, which has caused approximately 2 million deaths and displaced about 4.5 million people from their homes, was considered to be one of the world's most intractable conflicts.⁷⁶

After November 2001, high-ranking officials from the USA (Special Envoy John Danforth), the UK (Secretary of State for International Development Clare Short) and Norway (Minister for International Development and Human Rights Hilde Johnson) were involved in intensive shuttle diplomacy between the government and the opposition.⁷⁷

These efforts supplemented and supported the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD)-sponsored talks. In an effort to attain a more integrated approach, Kenyan President Daniel Arap Moi was mandated by IGAD to facilitate a merger of IGAD's own peace initiative with a joint Libyan–Egyptian initiative.⁷⁸

The first major breakthrough was the signing of the Nuba Mountains Cease-fire Agreement (also known as the Buergenstock Agreement), a US–Swiss-brokered deal that called for a six-month truce between the government and the SPLM/A in the Nuba Mountains region.⁷⁹ The agreement established a truce-monitoring commission comprising representatives from the warring parties and international monitors to oversee the area of approximately 80 000 square kilometres.⁸⁰ As a confidence building measure, the warring parties agreed to refrain from attacking civilians and civilian infrastructure and to open 'quiet zones' to permit humanitarian intervention during the spring.⁸¹

7 Jan. 2002, in 'Two Sudanese rebel groups announce merger', Foreign Broadcast Information Service, *Daily Report–Sub-Saharan Africa (FBIS-AFR)*, FBIS-AFR-2002-0107, 8 Jan. 2002.

⁷⁶ The figure is not limited to battle-related deaths and includes deaths that were the result of famine and disease which were by-products of the war. Mozersky, D., 'The Sudan peace process: hoping for the best', *Ploughshares Monitor*, winter 2002, pp. 5–6.

⁷⁷ Peel, Q., 'Hopes for renewed peace talks in Sudan', *Financial Times*, 14 Jan. 2002, p. 3.

⁷⁸ The IGAD initiative promotes the concept of self-determination for the south while the Libyan–Egyptian proposal calls for a transitional government of all the political parties, revision of the constitution, general elections, recognition of religious diversity, but emphasizes the political and territorial unity of Sudan. United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA), Integrated Regional Information Network for the Horn of Africa (IRIN-HOA, Nairobi, Kenya), 'Sudan: Moi mandated by IGAD to merge peace initiatives', IRIN weekly round-up 72, 12–18 Jan. 2002.

⁷⁹ 'Switzerland: Sudanese Government, SPLA sign six-month cease-fire agreement', Foreign Broadcast Information Service, *Daily Report–West Europe (FBIS-WEU)*, FBIS-WEU-2002-0119, 22 Jan. 2002. This region had previously been the location of heavy fighting.

⁸⁰ IRIN-HOA, 'Sudan: Nuba cease-fire now in place', IRIN weekly round-up 73, 19–25 Jan. 2002.

⁸¹ Naim, M., 'The United States as a catalyst for peace in Sudan', *Paris Le Monde*, in 'French daily discusses US role in facilitating peace in Sudan', 1 June 2002, FBIS-WEU-2002-0603, 5 June 2002.

The ceasefire was extended for two further six-month periods in July and December.⁸²

Building on the Nuba Mountains Ceasefire Agreement, the Sudanese Government and the SPLM/A signed the Machakos Protocol on 20 July 2002. The protocol included a commitment to find a peaceful resolution within the framework of a unified Sudan. However, after a six-year period an internationally monitored referendum will offer a choice to the people of South Sudan—between adopting the system of government established under the protocol, and thereby remaining within a unified Sudan; or secession.⁸³ During the interim period, the south will be exempt from Sharia law but non-Muslim minorities living in the north will not.

Talks continued in the latter half of the year, aimed at producing a final, comprehensive peace between the Sudanese Government and the SPLM/A.⁸⁴ In October, the government and the SPLM/A agreed to a country-wide ceasefire and signed a Memorandum of Understanding on the principles of power sharing that will apply during the interim period—a federal model in which there will be a shared national capital, with an upper and lower legislature operation at the national level, and state-level legislatures throughout the country. In addition, a southern regional government will act as an intermediary between the national government and the southern states.⁸⁵ The ceasefire was subsequently extended until March 2003.

Although by the end of 2002 the parties had reached a measure of understanding on the structure of government during the six-year interim period as well as on how to share the revenue generated by oil production and transport, they had not produced a final political settlement.⁸⁶ Moreover, potentially difficult problems remained unsolved. The truce in the Nuba Mountains region held, but fighting continued in other parts of Sudan. Of particular concern were the sporadic armed clashes in the western Upper Nile oil-producing areas. The fighting broke the ceasefire agreements and led to several temporary suspensions in the peace process.⁸⁷ The government reiterated the need to protect oil pipelines, which are frequent rebel targets. The bombing by the

⁸² IRIN-HOA, 'Sudan: Rebels agree to Nuba ceasefire extension', IRIN weekly round-up 96, 6–12 July 2002; and IRIN-HOA, 'Nuba ceasefire extended', IRIN weekly round-up 120, 21–27 Dec. 2002.

⁸³ 'The Machakos Protocol', IGAD press release/commentary, 23 July 2002, URL <<http://www.sudan.net/news/press/postedr/164.shtml>>.

⁸⁴ Agence France-Presse, Paris, 21 July 2002, in 'Southern part said obtains independence vote in historic peace deal', FBIS-AFR-2002-0721, 22 July 2002.

⁸⁵ Mozersky (note 76).

⁸⁶ The government was not willing to give 60% of the oil revenue to the south. The government offered approximately 20–25% of civil servant posts to the south, which is less than the 40% that the rebels sought. 'Sudan talks end without deal', BBC News Online, 18 Nov. 2002, URL <<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/africa/2488323.stm>>.

⁸⁷ IRIN-HOA, 'Sudan: Civilian suffering continues as war rages', IRIN weekly round-up 92, 1–7 June 2002; Agence France-Presse, Paris, 2 Sep. 2002, in 'Sudan's al-Bashir orders army to unleash "unrestraint" war to recapture Torit', FBIS-AFR-2002-0902, 3 Sep. 2002; and International Crisis Group (ICG), 'Sudan's oilfields burn again: brinkmanship endangers the peace process', *Africa Briefing*, 10 Feb. 2003, URL <http://www.intl-crisis-group.org/projects/africa/sudan/reports/A400888_10022003.pdf>.

Sudanese Government of a relief centre in southern Sudan killed 17 civilians and caused the USA to temporarily suspend peace talks with the government.⁸⁸

Talks have not yet addressed the thorny issues of demarcating the boundary between northern and southern Sudan and safeguarding the minority communities in the two parts of Sudan. The potential exists for other conflicts to emerge in Sudan. In December 2002, Nuba Mountains residents sought an agreement similar to that negotiated for southern Sudan, with a six-year period of autonomy, possibly leading to secession.

In October 2002 the Sudan Peace Act was passed by the US Congress, with support from a large majority in both the Senate and the House of Representatives, and signed into law by President Bush, reflecting the greater US interest in the Horn of Africa after the attacks of 11 September 2001. Under the act, every six months the US Government will notify Congress whether the Khartoum government and the SPLM/A are carrying out their commitments under the Machakos Protocol. If the Sudanese Government is not negotiating in good faith or is interfering with humanitarian efforts, the US Government may adopt a number of sanctions.⁸⁹ The Sudan Peace Act contains no specific sanctions on the SPLM/A but does authorize humanitarian relief and development assistance to the rebel-controlled parts of Sudan.⁹⁰

Although it is not the first peace process in Sudan, the current one has come the furthest and seems to be the most promising.

Somalia

Since the collapse of Mohamed Said Barre's regime in 1991, there has been no effective central authority in Somalia. Local political control in different regions of Somalia has been exercised by a number of clan-based armed groups that sometimes cooperate and at other times clash. The pattern of sporadic fighting between groups with shifting allegiances is made more complicated by the existence of a pool of young warriors, particularly in the capital Mogadishu, who are prepared to fight for any group that will pay for their services. These fighters give individual businessmen the capability to defend their commercial interests from clan-based groups.

The humanitarian suffering in Somalia has been phenomenal. It is estimated that, since 1991, over 350 000 Somalis have died as a result of the internal conflict and approximately 400 000 have been made refugees.⁹¹ Several thousand more are continuously displaced in the country and the food supply is

⁸⁸ IRIN-HOA, 'Sudan: Peace talks suspended after 'alarming' gunship attack', IRIN weekly round-up 77, 16–22 Feb. 2002.

⁸⁹ The Sudan Peace Act became law on 21 Oct 2002. US Department of State, 'Sudan Peace Act', Washington, DC, 21 Oct. 2002, URL <<http://www.state.gov/r/pa/prs/ps/2002/14531.htm>>.

⁹⁰ A total of \$300 million, over 3 years, will be used for projects promoting democratic governance, support for civil administration, communications infrastructure, education, health and agriculture. US Department of State (note 89).

⁹¹ UN Development Programme (UNDP), *Country Brief for Somalia*, July 2002; and United Nations, Report of the Secretary-General on the situation in Somalia, UN document S/2002/1201, 25 Oct. 2002.

often insecure.⁹² An indication of the dismal state of affairs in Somalia is the fact that it is listed among the five least developed countries in the world on the UN Development Programme's Human Development Index.⁹³

The Transitional National Government (TNG), which took the seat of Somalia at the United Nations after the May 2000 Arta Conference in Djibouti, did not help to quell the fighting in Somalia. The TNG is essentially a clan-based group that is unable to exercise authority beyond a small part of the city of Mogadishu.⁹⁴ The Somalia Reconciliation and Restoration Council (SSRC)—a loose alliance of clans—has rejected the legitimacy of the TNG's claim to be the Somali Government.⁹⁵ In the north-west, the most stable part of Somalia, Somaliland declared itself an independent state in 1991 but is not internationally recognized as such. In the north-east of Somalia, incidents of fighting are still reported in the semi-autonomous region of Puntland.⁹⁶

In September 2001 the USA identified Al-Itihaad al-Islamiya, a Somali organization, as having links with international terrorism. From early 2002 a modest naval and air force (comprising British, French, German and US forces) conducted surveillance along the Somali coast.⁹⁷

In January 2002, the summit meeting of heads of state and government of the IGAD member states stressed the need for a Somalia National Reconciliation Process. In February 2002 IGAD foreign ministers underlined the threat they felt to their own states' national security from the free operation of armed extremist groups in Somalia. They stressed the urgent need to create a broad-based, inclusive government that could re-establish central authority in Somalia. An IGAD Technical Committee was established to facilitate a National Reconciliation Conference on Somalia.⁹⁸

The UN Security Council began to examine how the peace process could be supported more effectively, *inter alia* by reinvigorating the arms embargo established by Security Council Resolution 733 of 1992. Implementation of the embargo had been largely unmonitored. In July a panel of experts was established to generate independent information on violations of the arms embargo. The panel began its work in September 2002.⁹⁹ At the same time, the Security Council extended the embargo to cover 'direct or indirect supply to Somalia of technical advice, financial and other assistance, and training

⁹² United Nations (note 91), p.14.

⁹³ UN Development Programme (note 91).

⁹⁴ IRIN-HOA, 'Somalia: At least 12 killed in Mogadishu fighting', IRIN weekly round-up 78, 23 Feb.–1 Mar. 2002; 'Somalia fighting "leaves 50 dead"', BBC News Online, 26 Jan. 2002, URL <<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/africa/1784156.stm>>; IRIN-HOA, 'Somalia: Over 60 killed in latest Mogadishu fighting', IRIN weekly round-up 91, 25–31 May 2002; and IRIN-HOA, 'Ethiopia: Over 30,000 Somali refugees to go home', IRIN weekly round-up 86, 20–26 Apr. 2002.

⁹⁵ The SSRC is a loose alliance of some 19 political factions and militia leaders who were left out of the Arta Conference; the Council has the support of Ethiopia.

⁹⁶ IRIN-HOA, 'Somalia: Puntland mediation efforts fail', IRIN weekly round-up 87, 27 Apr.–3 May 2002.

⁹⁷ 'Somalia: and the arms flow on', *Africa Confidential*, vol. 43 no. 12 (14 June 2002), p. 6.

⁹⁸ Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD), 'Communique of the IGAD Foreign Ministers Committee Meeting on Somalia', Nairobi, Kenya, 14 Feb. 2002, URL <<http://www.igad.org/pressroom/sompress01.html>>.

⁹⁹ UN Security Council Resolution 1425, 22 July 2002; and 'Somalia: and the arms flow on', (note 97).

related to military activities', thereby effectively discontinuing the tacit military assistance from Djibouti and Ethiopia to parties to the conflict.

The Somalia National Reconciliation Conference opened on 15 October 2002 at Eldoret, Kenya.¹⁰⁰ The Declaration on Cessation of Hostilities, Structures and Principles of the Somalia National Reconciliation Process was signed on 27 October 2002. The signatories committed themselves to a federal government for Somalia. The declaration established a ceasefire, and the signatories agreed to deploy their military forces to purely defensive positions. The signatories also agreed to cooperate with donors in granting access for humanitarian assistance, to cooperate in the fight against terrorism and to ensure that Somalia does not serve as a base for terrorist activities.¹⁰¹ They agreed to work in specialized committees to draft a constitution; address issues of economic recovery, reconciliation, human rights and ethics; and establish a framework for disarmament and demobilization.¹⁰² They also agreed to implement the recommendations of the committees and to inaugurate an all-inclusive government.¹⁰³

Separate talks were conducted during 2002 between the warring parties that have contested control of Mogadishu. On 2 December 2002, in the Mogadishu Declaration, these parties agreed on a ceasefire and the reopening of the international airport and the sea port in the city.

The success of the Eldoret process is not assured. One persistent problem which the IGAD Technical Committee had faced in convening the Somalia National Reconciliation Conference was developing the list of participants. Equitable representation among the factions was the most contentious issue. Although the Eldoret Declaration was signed by 22 representatives of different parts of Somali society, not all the armed groups were represented. Thus, some sub-clan leaders may refuse to accept the outcome of the process.¹⁰⁴ In this respect it is a negative sign that sporadic fighting continued in the cities of Mogadishu and Baidoa after the signing of the declaration.

Somaliland did not participate in the talks. Whether and how it will join a federal system and how other parties will react if it does not participate has yet to be addressed.

Despite the potential problems, the Eldoret conference has a wider base of support than earlier efforts (which were initiated by individual states).¹⁰⁵ Within Somalia itself, this particular round of negotiations has attracted more

¹⁰⁰ The TNG was set up for an interim 3-year period, with a president, prime minister, and Transitional National Assembly.

¹⁰¹ 'Declaration on Cessation of Hostilities, Structures and Principles of the Somalia National Reconciliation Process', Eldoret, Kenya, 27 Oct. 2002, URL <<http://www.igad.org/pressroom/sompress09.html>>.

¹⁰² IRIN-HOA, 'Somalia: Peace talks "on course" says Kenyan envoy', IRIN weekly round-up 114, 9–15 Nov. 2002.

¹⁰³ United Nations, Report of the Secretary-General on the situation in Somalia, UN document S/2002/1201, 25 Oct. 2002, p. 6.

¹⁰⁴ IRIN-HOA, 'Factions protest against representation at peace talks', IRIN weekly round-up 113, 2–8 Nov. 2002.

¹⁰⁵ Since 1991, at least 12 peace talks have been organized. Lacey, M., 'Despite chaos at Somalia peace talks, there is hope for a deal', *International Herald Tribune*, 20 Jan. 2003, p. I.

of the key players.¹⁰⁶ For the first time, the frontline states—Djibouti, Ethiopia and Kenya—have expressed unity in their support for peace.¹⁰⁷ The UN and the African Union have affirmed their commitment to the peace negotiations, and several external actors—the IGAD Partners Forum, the UN, the League of Arab States, the EU and the USA—are not only underwriting the cost of the process but are also involved in negotiations.¹⁰⁸ Their presence has created additional pressure for the warring parties to arrive at a genuine compromise.¹⁰⁹

IV. Conclusions

While the political rather than the military impact of nuclear weapons has been stressed since the end of the cold war, in 2002 specific events and crises in East and South Asia underlined the risk that nuclear weapons might be used as a result of one of the unresolved and intractable armed conflicts in the regions. Moreover, the linkage between the acquisition of weapons of mass destruction and armed conflict was further underlined when disarmament became the central issue in the deepening crisis over Iraq in the second half of 2002.

This was the first full year for which it might have been possible to make an assessment of how the war on global-impact terrorism has altered armed conflict, but no clear picture has emerged yet.

In the conflict between Israel and the Palestinians, the sharp escalation in the intensity of the conflict was not accompanied by developments that could have a global impact—widespread acts of terrorism outside the immediate conflict location, or efforts to acquire or use weapons of mass destruction—although Palestinian organizations have demonstrated at least the first tendency in the past. Nevertheless, although the policies applied had at least this measure of success, the effect would have to be defined as one of containment rather than any strong new momentum towards conflict resolution during 2002.

The revitalization of efforts to resolve long and highly destructive conflicts in Africa and Asia reflected the combined influence of several factors, in addition to a growing war-weariness among the combatants and the efforts of individual states like Norway acting primarily in altruistic fashion.

First, the war on terrorism had a direct impact on the level of attention paid to Africa by the United States. Although the presence of Osama bin Laden in Khartoum from 1991 until he was forced to leave by US pressure in 1996 and the bombing of US embassies in Kenya and Tanzania in 1998 certainly attracted attention, the attacks of 11 September 2001 raised the profile of the region within the overall war on terrorism.

¹⁰⁶ Lacey (note 105).

¹⁰⁷ Turner, M., 'Somali talks put diplomats' skills to test', *Financial Times*, 20 Nov. 2002, p. 7.

¹⁰⁸ IRIN-HOA, 'Somalia: Contact Group to hold first Nairobi meeting', IRIN weekly round-up 98, 20–26 July 2002; and United Nations (note 103), p. 7. For the members of these organizations see the glossary in this volume.

¹⁰⁹ Turner (note 104).

Second, African states themselves have increasingly tried to play a more positive role in peace initiatives, both individually and collectively. In the locations surveyed in this chapter, the efforts of the African Union and the sub-regional organization in East Africa, the IGAD, are particularly noteworthy.¹¹⁰

Third, independently of the war on terrorism, the European Union (EU) has emphasized conflict resolution within its external relations. The EU has tried to link its political and economic activities in Africa to provide coherent and sustained support to African conflict-resolution processes. In addition to positive measures, a failure by warring parties to engage in conflict resolution and peace building carries the risk that development aid will be lost or reduced. During 2002 the EU worked on the introduction of similar conditionality in its aid policies in relation to the anti-terrorist performance of recipients.

There was also evidence—for the conflicts surveyed and perhaps for some others, including cases within Europe—that concern about being designated as a terrorist group did have a significant impact on the behaviour of at least some non-state armed groups and political movements.

¹¹⁰ On the African Union see appendix 1A in this volume.