

The Challenges of United Nations Mission in South Sudan and Its Impact on Peace and Security of South Sudan

Samuel Ogbonna Edeh, Ph.D¹ | Odo Christopher Uba, Ph.D²

¹Department of Political Science, University of Jos, Plateau State Nigeria.

²Department of Political Science, University of Jos, Plateau state, Nigeria.

Received 27-11-2025

Revised 24-12-2025

Accepted 26-12-2025

Published 01-01-2026



Copyright: ©2025 The Authors. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

Abstract:

This study examined the challenges of United Nations Missions in South Sudan and its impact on peace and Security of South Sudan. The study was motivated as a result of destruction of lives and property, gross abuse of human rights, proliferations of Small Arms and Light Weapons that take place in South Sudan on daily basis. The study adopted primary and secondary methods of data collection which includes books, internet sources, newspapers, magazines, and field interviews among others. The major finding of this study revealed that despite several security approaches adopted by the United Nations to nip to the bud the insecurity in South Sudan, the issues of insecurity still persist. The study recommends that the root causes of insecurity in South Sudan should be addressed by the United Nations.

Keyword: Regional Security

Background to the Study:

The security challenges experienced by nations-states globally have become a source of concern in the international system. As a result of insecurity such as insurgency, internal or external wars, arms proliferations in terms of Small Arms and Lights, gross human right abuses, militancy, and undemocratic practices, countries like Somalia, Syria, Democratic Republic of Congo, Sudan, and South Sudan have become ungovernable, as they face one form of these security challenge or the other, to the extent that most of these states are on the brinks of collapsing (Odo, 2021). The root causes of these security challenges can be traced to bad governance, sit tight leaders, poverty, marginalization of one ethnic group over the other, struggle for the

control of scarce resources by one group over the other, induced conflicts such as use of religion to cause anarchy leading to killings and mass displacement of people both internally and in form of refugee. Insecurity arises also inform of natural disasters, access or struggle over political power among others. Security as a term can be seen in so many ways such as food security, environmental security, health security, security of lives and property, and economic security, most of them tagged as “human security”. The international community over the years has made concerted efforts to make the globe a secured place of living by putting up so many institutions and approaches to mitigate insecurity. These approaches include use of United Nations Organizations, regional and sub-regional organizations, and non-governmental

organizations to bring about security globally. However, it seems as the more these bodies try, is the more emerging insecurity trends.

South Sudan, a newly independent country, presents such multiple security challenges like perennial wars, ethnocentric crimes, poverty, internally displaced persons (IDPs), refugee problems, gross abuse of human rights, unemployment, kidnapping, terrorism, natural environmental challenges among others, within the country and its environs. The young South Sudan got its independence from Sudan in 2011 after four decades of brutal civil war that left two and a half million people dead, and over five million externally displaced (Momodu, 2018). The hangover of the long year wars of struggle for independence of South Sudan had multiple effects on the current security challenges confronting the country in terms of insecurity. It is against this background that this study attempts to examine the security challenges, and its impact on peace and security of South Sudan.

Conceptual clarifications:

Security:

Security for this study is viewed from the lenses of the new face of security: Human Security. The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), a UN agency believed to have popularized the concept, see Human Security as firstly, “safety from such chronic threats as hunger, disease and repression”, and secondly, “protection from sudden and hurtful disruptions in the patterns of daily life – whether in homes, in jobs or in communities” (UNDP 1990, cited in McRae & Hubert, 2001, p.3). Security does not only mean the physical protection of lives and property, but also means safety from such threats as disease, hunger, repression and possibility for all citizens to live in peace and security within their own borders; it encompasses other elements of human security such as economic development, social justice, environmental protection, democratization, disarmament, respect for human rights, equal rights for all and the rule of law. It also implies the capacity of states and citizens to

prevent and resolve conflicts through peaceful and nonviolent means and, after the conflict is over, the ability to effectively carry out reconciliation efforts (UNDP 1990, cited in McRae & Hubert, 2001).

Traditional definition of security: between realism and liberalism:

Traditionally, the State has been the model of security. The State assumes the responsibility to protect its citizens and demands their loyalty. This way, the security of citizens in a country is guaranteed when the State own security is also guaranteed. This traditional security model is reflected on the term national security which according to Kennan (1948) cited in IEEE Framework Document (2011, p.2), is "the continued ability of the country to it's pursue of the development of internal life without serious interference, or threat of interference, from foreign powers". Under the anarchical international system, states compete for their own national interests. In this context, States rely on military power in order to guarantee those interests, counteracting the threats that arise from other States armed forces.

However, Sachs' (2003) view on traditional security slightly differs as he sees the term security as an instrument of violence in the hands of a state. He asserts that:

A traditional definition of the state, often attributed to Max Weber, required as a necessary condition the effective monopoly on the use or licensing of violence within a given territory. The security of states was therefore threatened by any change that might threaten that monopoly of violence--whether through external invasion or internal rebellion (p.2).

Sachs (2003) further explained how in the Westphalian world of (internally) strong states, there is less danger of internal conflict, and how the international system is marked by conflicts among states rather than within them. This view by Sachs however conforms to the views of some group of observers of the situation in South Sudan where the state is seen as an

instrument of violence and threat to security. We will examine some of these views in the next paragraph.

Between the expositions on traditional security presented in the Instituto Espanol De Estudios Estrategicos Framework Document, (2011) and Sachs (2003), the study notes a consensus on the focus on state or national security, but there is a notable disparity on emphasis. The IEEF document (2011) emphasizes on the continuous ability of state to pursue development of internal life without serious interference, or threat of interference from foreign powers, while Sachs' definition for traditional security emphasizes that security is a weapon of violence in the hands of the state. The issue of state sovereignty silently raised in the IEEF (2011) definition when it emphasized 'interference', is one major issue contending against the liberal ideology on security which sees security beyond state borders. This study however postulates Sachs' exposition on security which sees state as having the monopoly of violence; explaining the violent use of government apparatus to internally 'secure' their territories, especially in most developing democracies in Africa, including South Sudan.

Important to consider in this review also is the traditional concept of security from a realist versus liberal points of view. There are two kinds of people when it comes to explaining world social order: those who think of how the world ought to be and those who deal with it the way it is. The latter group is commonly referred to as "realists". Realism is diametrically opposed to idealism, and liberalism. These two approaches are postulated as the main schools in International Relations theory (McGlinchey and Gold, 2017). Realism is the first and main school of thought in security studies which take nation-states as the primary units in international relations (Ormeci, 2010).

For realism, its root can be traced back to ancient Greece and Thucydides -460 BC-395 BC (Ormeci, 2010), some other notable realist and scholars of traditional security are Machiavelli (1469-1527) in his book the "Prince", tried to

prepare a handbook for a successful Prince that would provide the security of his state and citizens. Machiavelli not only focused on internal security but also on the security against other princedoms; Hobbes (1588-1679) with his book "Leviathan", based all his theory of social contract and state formation upon the concept of security since he thought that human beings are naturally selfish creatures that could do all kinds of bad actions without a strong central authority; Ormeci (2010) further asserts that the modern founding father of realism (also called neo-realism) is Kenneth Waltz-1924-2013 (Ormeci, 2010; Hall, 2013). Waltz's greatest legacy to International Relations was his revival, or indeed, his resurrection of realism through his contribution to the neorealist argument (Hall, 2013).

Since the mid-twentieth century 'security studies' has been largely synonymous with the theoretical paradigm of realism (Classical/Neorealism). Ken Booth (1991) asserts in Robinson (2010) that:

Traditional security thinking, which has dominated the subject for half a century, has been associated with the intellectual hegemony of realism...emphasizing military threats and the need for strong counters; it has been status quo orientated; and it has centered on states (p. 318).

The above quote by Booth (1991) clearly postulates the state-centric concept of security as the realist's design for the protection of their territory and authority, using military structures. However, there is none of the International Relations theory that emphasizes security more than neorealism, yet David Baldwin (1997) observes that neorealist analysts have rarely critically-analysed what security means. During the Cold War, security studies was dominated by interest in military statecraft, and security was uncritically tried to strategic issues. Thus military force, not security itself, was the focus of security studies and the realist school (Baldwin, 1997).

The security reality within states like South Sudan, presents an arguably negative effect of a militarized society, which philosophical or ideological base are formed on the 'crude' realist

traditional security belief, that narrows' its lens of security to the protection of sovereignty and territorial integrity. Realists see states as preoccupied with their own physical safety and autonomy in an international system defined by anarchy. "The nature of the system, and its pressures and constraints, are the major factors determining the security goals and relations of national governments" (Morgan, 2007, pp16-17). States are in constant competition to increase their power relative to other states (often in a military form), and these international interactions are more important than states' domestic cultures, leaders or political systems in determining behavior (Morgan, 2007).

Classical and neo-realist thinkers from Thucydides' (c.460-c.400BC), such as Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679), Niccolo Machiavelli (1469-1527), Jean Rousseau (1712-1778), Ken Waltz (1924-12013), Hans Morgenthau (1904-1980), Robert Art (1942-present), Robert Gilpin (1930-present), Stephen Walt (1955-present), Joan Gowa (1951-present), Robert Jervis (1940-present) and others of like mind holds an arrogant view of security that centers on the use of military force as the definition of security. They could be classified as the traditional security exponents. Realism forming the foundation of contemporary international security studies, the realist views anarchy and the absence of a power to regulate the interactions between states as the distinctive characteristics of international politics, hence security of states relies fundamentally on the military strength of the state. This accounts for States of weaker strength coming together during the 20th century to form a common front on what they call "security" issues. "Alliances" were the main form of regional security, and this originated "Collective Defence" with which a group of countries (or between one country and another) of similar ideology facing a common military threat stood by each other; and "Collective Security" which under the UN Security Council Charter VII, Article 42 authorizes the unanimous use of force to maintain or restore international peace and security (Martin, 2007).

Neorealist scholar Kenneth Waltz's Theory of International Politics, which combined an individualist 'micro-economic' approach to the international system with a classical realist emphasizes on power and material interests, as an important example of Neorealist thinking (Wendt, 1999 in Robinson, 2010). For Waltz, the international system requires states to operate competitively or be eliminated, like corporations within a free market (Robinson, 2010). Waltz as captured in Baldwin (1997), observes that "in anarchy, security is the highest end, only if survival is assured can states seek such other goals as tranquility, profit, and power" (p. 21). In this context, security or military strength of state is what positions her in the international system.

Waltz's view on security was analyzed by David Baldwin who opined that Waltz's equation of security with survival provides little or no guidance with respect to how to answer the question: 'survival of which values?' To say that states strive to ensure their own survival does not tell one very much. For Baldwin, Waltz's definition of states in terms of the functions they perform, including the making and enforcement of laws, defence against external attack, and the provision of food, clothing, housing, transportation, and other amenities consumed by the citizens is encompassing if all of these functions are included as part of the acquired values that define security. The concept becomes so broad that it loses its utility for distinguishing among policy goals. It might rule out subnational or international security interests as well as acquisitive and self-destructive ones (Baldwin, 1997).

The Liberals exposition on security originally arose from both deep scholarly and philosophical roots in the 17th and 18th centuries in which political liberalism began to take form that challenged nobility and equality. Shortly after, followed the enlightenment where liberal ideals began to develop with works by philosophers such as Voltaire (1694-1778), Locke (1632-1704), Smith (1723-1790), and German thinker Kant (1724-1804) (Eric, 2014). Liberal International

Relations theory is related to, but distinct from, the utopianism of the interwar period in which the utopians believed that war could be eliminated either by perfecting man or by perfecting government. The roots of modern liberal international relations theory can be traced back farther than utopianism (Cristol, 2017). Liberal scholars of security studies tried not to focus on nation-states but also on supranational, international organizations, institutions and on non-governmental organizations (civil society organizations) (Ormeçi, 2010, Moravcsik, 2010).

The Liberals dealt with both macro and micro issues such as culture, environment, economics etc. They also gave attention to military power but added economical and cultural power to the equation and posed a new picture of world order. Liberals thought that peace and security can be provided not only through deterrence, bipolar world or a hegemonic, regional power but also through economic integration which would lead to political integration. The liberal thought on security does not only see security beyond state boundaries, it also sees security as a developmental tool which goes physically structured security to other issues such as economic, education and health development.

The United Nations as an organ of world peace and security is an illustration of neoliberalism or institutional liberalism currently intervening in sovereign nations around the world, including South Sudan, to establish peace and security. The UN through UNMISS (United Nations Mission in South Sudan) is practically advancing the liberal and democratic order, to achieve peace and security in South Sudan. Ormeçi (2010), in his article described liberalism to have been heavily influenced by the German philosopher, Immanuel Kant (1724-1804) and Democratic Peace Theory. Immanuel Kant in his essay, 'Perpetual Peace' (1795), provided three "definitive conditions" for perpetual peace, each of which became a dominant strain of post-World War II liberal International Relations theory. Kant's neoliberal institutionalism (also called "neoliberalism" or "institutional liberalism")

emphasizes the importance of international institutions (Kant's "federation of free states") in maintaining peace and security; it is also referred to as commercial liberalism which emphasizes the importance of economic interdependence and free trade (Kant's "universal hospitality") in maintaining peace (Cristol, 2017).

In the Liberals' view, security would be achieved through spill-over effect of economic integration and this would lead to the permanent peace and integration of liberal democracies. However, liberals' criticisms of realism are seen as narrow, and were too optimistic about the effects of economic integration. The end of Cold War and the rapid success of Globalization did not end wars and social turbulences, and a new approach needed in IR theory and security studies. In few words, liberalism is a political philosophy or worldview founded on ideas of liberty and equality. Liberal scholars espouse a wide array of views depending on their understanding of these principles, but generally they support ideas and programmes such as freedom of speech, freedom of press, freedom of religion, free markets, civil rights, democratic societies, secular governments, globalization and international cooperation. John Locke (1632-1704) is often credited with founding liberalism as a distinct philosophical tradition; Locke argued that that each man has a natural right to life, liberty and property, while adding that governments must not violate these rights based on the social contract (Moravcsik, 2010).

As previously highlighted in Kant's account, liberal Institutionalism as an extension of liberals' approach to security is a foreign policy doctrine that argues that actor in the international system could reach a "peaceful world order", and not one of violence and insecurity that the realists argue; that war is unnatural, irrational and artificial, humans are not naturally violent-prone with one another (Burchill, 2005). The liberals believe that states should intervene in other sovereign states in order to pursue liberal objectives; such interventions are mainly humanitarian intervention through which different forms of aid

and support are given. This order emerged during the 19th century, notably under the auspices of British Foreign Secretary and Prime Minister Lord Palmerston and was developed in the second decade of the 20th century under U. S. President Woodrow Wilson. These liberals are perceived to be aiming at achieving global peace through nonviolence, democracy and freedom (Pugh, 2015). For these liberal, through multilateral organizations such as the United Nations, it is possible to avoid the worst excesses of “power politics”.

The liberals both at domestic and international spheres advocate for the use of other means such as good governance, responsibility, accountability, freedom, respect for human life and rights, negotiations, diplomacy etc to foster domestic and international security rather than rely solely on the use of military force to achieve security which is propagated by the realists (Bilgin, 2008). Robinson (2010) citing Booth (1991), exposes the weaknesses of traditional security as he emphasized growing international interdependence, the danger of arms races, the heavy burden of defense spending, and the changing nature of threats to people’s daily lives, as reasons to formulate a definition of security that is less focused on military power and more inclusive of economic, social, political and environmental issues (Robinson, 2010). Seeing security only from the lenses physical protection tends to overburden governments with military spending alone which may not address current security problems. Such as required in South Sudan, security considerations should include the wellbeing of the people it is designed to protect.

Rethinking security and understanding the varying nature of security was born out of necessity and the quest for a broader concept to accommodate more forms of security issues. This study as well as several scholars including politicians sees this step as a major shift from the traditional. Security for this study is better conceptualized from the liberal view which sees other non-military issues such as climate change, health matters, food shortage, and poverty as security issues. The

current security problem in South Sudan postulates the understanding of how complex the concept of ‘security’ can be, it encompasses a broad spectrum of the aforementioned non-military issues. Thus, the South Sudan’s security challenges was better appreciated from a broad perspective that recognizes other forms of security issues aside the traditional state-centric security. This is better addressed through the concept of human security (an offshoot of the liberals’ perspective), as this study seeks to evaluate the security situation in South Sudan.

Identifying Challenges faced by UNMISS and Local Civilians, and its Effects on Peace and Security of South Sudan

This study identified and discussed some challenges faced by the UN mission, and local civilians in South Sudan, of which most of the respondents believe, are hampering efficient and effective interventions/responses by the ongoing mission. These challenges range from natural/environmental challenges to man-made/political challenges. Also raised among others are social-economic factors, which some of the respondents see as major obstacle to peace and development of South Sudan. These challenges are also identified to be both internal and external. They are internal when they refer to challenges within the internal operations of the mission, and external when they refer to external obstacles and factors beyond the control of the mission.

The external challenges identified are as follows:

- i. **Environmental/natural challenges:** Bad weather conditions affect efficient and effective implementation of UNMISS activities. According to ASP Baba Hamisui (Interview- Male UNMISS Police, Juba, 10/01/2020), it rains all year round in South Sudan, and sometimes patrol teams’ don’t even go out because of prolonged rains. Another respondent, Mr. Jonathan Madhil (Interview, Adult male IDP, Juba PoC III, 26/11/2019) affirmed that movements within the PoC camps and most part of villages becomes more difficult whenever it

rains. The rains by extension make most parts of South Sudan's environments muddy in nature and movements even more difficult. This situation prevents effective military patrols to check insecurity.

- ii. **Lack of access roads and bridges to places of interest due to South Sudan's difficult terrain:** Accessing areas where there are human rights violations is most times challenging. A three hours journey make take up to three days to achieve, some of the bridges collapse during the pick of raining season. Most times it takes UN efforts from the engineering contingents to temporarily repair these bridges for that season before it gives way again. "Most time we have to resort to use of airplanes, and getting approvals for the use of Airplanes take too much of time due to the bureaucratic processes" (Interview-Alexander William, Male UNMISS Military Observer, Malakal, 27/01/2020). The effect of this challenge on the mission is that goals may take longer time to achieve, or sometimes not achieved at all.
- iii. **Hostile Nature of locals:** "The UN mission in South Sudan has been doing the same thing from 2005 till date since it first arrived as UNMIS, UNMD, UNIFFA and now UNMISS, the people are tired of the mission, sometimes they do not even want to see us", according to ASP Baba Hamisu (Interview- Male UNMISS Police, 10/01/2020). He said they face resistance and hostility even from the locals whom they have come to protect, especially at the lower level, some of the locals no longer appreciate the efforts of UNMISS in their communities. The high level of illiteracy of the people of South Sudan (UNESCO, 2020) exacerbates such hostility against strangers who are most times perceived as intruders. Baba recounted one time they were almost attacked when they went to donate a mobile police post to a community, which took the intervention of

the national police men to repel the attack. Ironically, he revealed that most times their protection as UNMISS troops are assured by the government police or army, who usually gives the UN patrol teams security cover any time they go out on patrol, making the mission dependant on South Sudan's Government, who most times withdraw its protection anytime their interest is affected. The effect of this on the mission is that, most times, it leaves the mission handicap, frustrated and out of favour from the people, government and government agencies it heavily rely on for support (Baba Hamisu-Interview- Male UNMISS Police, 10/01/2020).

- iv. **Political obstructions/lack of political will by South Sudanese Government and leaders:** According to Peter Waje (male UNMISS staff, Malakal, 08/11/2019), deliberate road blocks are sometimes mounted by the government to prevent UN forces from reaching areas where there are reports of human rights violations, and the government soldiers opens fire at any resistance or attempt by the UN forces to penetrate through. President Salva Kirr is said to have deliberately barred the UN protection forces from carrying out night patrols within the country for his political interest. Most respondents laments increased insecurity during the night seasons in terms of human rights violations such as armed groups' attacks, banditry, rape and racial killings (Lt. Col. DN Jaja, interview- Male UNMISS training Officer, Juba, 14/12/2019). The government is sometimes accused of lack of cooperating with the mission. In July 2016 when UN established a proxy camp for the Regional Protection Force (RPF) in Tompkin to enhance swift responses, the Government ordered the camp be moved from that location to the UN House for fear of its proximity to the presidential building (WO

Lawal Sani, interview- Male UNMISS troop, Juba, 11/12/2019).

The effect of political interference on effectiveness of the mission is very huge. Once government decisions and policies are born out of its leader's personal interest and not objectivity, such decisions or policies are bound to disrupt entrenchments of opposing ideas and policy action by any global institution. The sometimes silent but obvious political obstructions created and managed by Government of South Sudan has definitely weakened the UN mission in the country, and by extension mobilized a strong force against successful implementation of the UNMISS mandate of protecting civilians, and human rights violations.

- v. **Attacks on UNMISS facilities by armed groups:** The armed group attacks on UNMISS facilities is a major challenge to the mission. The two major tribes of Nuers and Dinkas are accused of being guilty of this crime. They are accused also of various crimes and human rights violation against each other including weaponising rape, banditry, cattle rustling, racial killings etc. These armed groups do not hesitate to attack UN facilities such as the PoC camps where civilians are kept for protection in order to access their victims (Michael Ambokile, Interview- Male UNPO Technical and Advisory Team member, Malakal, 14/01/2020). The effect of such attacks is that it jeopardizes efforts made by UNMISS to protect civilians, and in a way reduces confidence of the people on the mission. Such confidence loss may have adverse negative effect on the psychology of the people to trust the ability of the mission to shield them from human rights violations and attacks by oppositions.
- vi. **External interests:** External interests is made up of countries, business entities, individuals or groups who patronizes the people of South Sudan with soul aim of

achieving their own interest which sometimes are either economic or political. These external factors are mainly divided into two; some in support of the opposition armed groups, while some supports the government. These external forces interfere with the internal issues of the state of South Sudan for their profiteering and other benefits. According to Mr. Jonathan Madhil (Interview, Adult male IDP, Juba PoC III, 26/11/2019), "Uganda and Kenya are playing bad politics in this country, they are supporting the armed opposition groups for their economic interests". China is also fingered to be supplying the government of the day with arms, and getting crude oil and other benefits as compensation.

The negative effect of such personal economic interest rather than sanctions in line with global interest is the fact that it reduces UN efforts through a "back door". In the case of South Sudan's prolonged crises, the economic interest of China and frequent supply of arms to the Government of South Sudan may have consequently emboldened the government to take certain negative actions or inactions (i.e. non implementation of peace agreements) which in turn threatens regional and global peace that UN stands for. Such immoral economic alignments with government against the general interest of the people has a way of weakening the efforts put in by interveners, and some time makes it impossible to achieve expected outcome. External interests in the internal politics of South Sudan are asserted to play major role in negatively influencing decisions and actions of key players in the South Sudan conflict.

The internal challenges identified are as follows:

- i. **Language barrier between UNMISS forces.** Contingents from several countries assembles to serve under the UN mission in South Sudan (UNMISS), however some of these countries are non English speaking countries, and their contingents are mainly use to speaking or

communicating using their homeland lingua franca. The lack of a common communication language amongst mission staff in a way affects swift and effective coordination between contingents especially in during emergency response.

- ii. **Lack of professionalism/full commitment by UNMISS contingents:** According to Lt. Col. DN Jaja, most contingents serving under UNMISS owe their allegiance to their individual countries First; hence the willpower to confront and surmount the security challenges in South Sudan is sometimes lacking. Furthermore, some of the UN forces do not display professionalism in the discharge of their assignments. UN core values include professionalism, integrity and respect for one another (Interview- Male UNMISS training Officer, Juba, 14/12/2019). The effect of this is that it creates internal division and suspicions within the mission.
- iii. **The “weak” implementation of UNMISS Mandate:** According to Lawal Sani, “the conflict in South Sudan is different from what was experienced in Liberia where we had rebels fighting against the government, here in South Sudan the UN is not in control, the government is; what we have here are opposition groups resisting the government of the day, and this makes it difficult to define the approach or amount of force to use against them”. The UNMISS mandate only specify monitoring, reporting of human rights violation and protection of civilians as core areas of the mission, UN can neither arrest nor prosecute offenders (WO Lawal Sani, interview- Male UNMISS troop, Juba, 11/12/2019). The Mandate however is being faulted by some respondents for not being proactive in nature, and questioning the willpower by the mission to fully enforce chapter 7 of its mandate.

The use of force is only granted in chapter 7 (seven) of the mandate with conditions attached such as threat to lives of civilians or threat to the mission and lives of UN forces. Some respondents described the use of force in chapter seven as only written on paper, and has not been enforced. The UN Mandate may soon change from Protection of Civilians to Capacity Building (Lt. Col. DN Jaja, Interview- Male UNMISS training Officer, Juba, 14/12/2019). The lack of full implementation of UNMISS mandate emboldens the armed groups, and threatens the mission.

- iv. **Complicity by local UNMISS staff.** The UN employees working in South Sudan are broken into two components, which are international and local or what is referred to as national staff. The international staff refers to foreigners, men and women from other countries working under the UN mission in South Sudan, while the national staff refers to the indigenes, natives or locals employed by UN to serve under the mission (Interview- ASP Baba Hamisu, Male UNMISS Police, 10/01/2020). The national civilian staff of UNMISS are basically products of the South Sudan’s polarized society, with individuals clinging to their native tribal interest and hatred for opposite tribes. Within the UN local staffs lie’s the two major opposition tribes of Dinkas and Nuers. These two have been accused of victimizing each other in the discharge of their professional responsibilities as UN employees, and further sabotaging the efforts of the mission (Mr. Jonathan Madhil, Civilian Interview, Adult male IDP, Juba PoC III, 26/11/2019). Some of these staff are accused of politicizing their services and focused on benefits they can make for themselves and their people; favoring their tribes’ men during intervention exercises or distribution of palliatives (Anna Lado-

Interview, Adult Female Civilian, Malaka, 22/12/2019). This assertion by Anna and Jonathan corroborates Briggs (2017, p. 56), where a South Sudanese civilian justified the looting of the World Food Program (WFP) warehouse in Juba in July 2016, asserting that “humanitarians always give food to the Nuers, not to the Dinkas”.

- v. **Dwindling funding of the mission:** Donor countries are withdrawing gradually; most of the respondents lament dwindling funding of the mission. “We feel the effect of dwindling funding sometimes through the welfare packages available to us. Sometimes our air conditioner systems are put off to save gas, despite the extremely hot weather in Juba”, (ASP Baba Hamisu, Interview- Male UNMISS Police, Juba, 10/01/2020). Lack of consistency in funding affects the mission physically and psychologically, it affects the performance of mission staffs.
- vi. **Insufficient/lack of adequate equipment’s:** Working in South Sudan requires specific equipments that suites the difficult terrene considering the natural challenges and effects of poor leadership, underdevelopment and poor infrastructure. Lack or insufficient equipment is also identified by respondents as one of the challenges UNMISS is facing. For instance, “accessing areas of interest is quit a difficult task most times due to swampy nature of the terrene, or lack of access bridges, hence the need for suitable equipments to help convey troops to these areas, and sometimes these equipments are insufficient (Michael Ambokile, Interview- Male UNPO Technical and Advisory Team member, Malakal, 14/01/2020). The negative effect of non-availability of adequate equipment’s is unquantifiable, as it hampers swift and effective responses especially in times of emergency.

Conclusion:

This study discussed the security challenges faced in South Sudan today that ithave variety of causes with multidimensional implications. The natural disasters caused by climate change, leading to draught and food shortages, to the deep rooted ethnic motivated crimes, conflicts, political instability and corruption which has dragged the young nation into unwarranted poverty are all basic indices of the security situation of South Sudan today. The Leaders of South Sudan, Mr. Salva Kiir Mayardit (from the Dinka tribe) and main opposition leader, Mr. Rick Macher (from the Nuer tribe) struggle over power lead the country into a civil war since December 2013 leaving over 400,000 dead and over 3.5 million South Sudanese displaced, and worsened existing hardship experienced before the conflict. The political turmoil and security problems bedeviling the country have persisted despite efforts by the UN, NGOs, concerned nations, and individuals.

The United Nations intervention through UNMISS has deployed both material and human resources to South Sudan since 2013 when the conflict broke, for the primary purpose of protecting civilians, entrenching peace and security, and strengthening the rule of law. This task has come with enormous challenges highlighted in this study. The amount of resources deployed annually by the UN to South Sudan cannot be quantified in one swipe due to several other channels of deployments through her Agencies, with the hope of finding lasting peace and security in the young country. The hope for a brighter South Sudan relies on the actions and inactions of relevant stakeholders in the South Sudan project.

Every action must first be considered in the interest of the South Sudan people, and strategically taken towards restoring peace and security in the country. There must be a synergy between the intervening international agencies and the government/people of South Sudan for peace and security to be restored in the country. Yes, there may be some ‘tooting problems’ of distrust between UNMISS and the Government of South

Sudan (GoSS) that led to various incidents of sabotage on the mission, which by effect may have led to the protraction of the current security problem. However, the government (GoSS) and the people must cooperate with the UN in the larger interest of lasting peace and security in South Sudan.

Recommendations:

Based on the following, the study recommends that:

1. South Sudan's Government should partner with UN and other global Agencies to invest massively in infrastructure to ameliorate the negative effects of environmental and global warming challenges, to create more access roads, bridges, health care centers, accessible water, and improved energy supply within her communities
2. Increased equipments for UNMISS to help personnel have easy and timely access to troubled areas to protect civilians and confront any rising incident or threat to peace and security.
3. The Government and people of South Sudan should embrace peace and genuinely work together with UNMISS to establish security.
4. South Sudan's political gladiators, policy and decision makers need to exhibit the political will, void of corruption, respect peace agreements; and to apply South Sudan's resources through a systematic approach to bring the people out of deep rooted poverty, and place them on a part of prosperity that erodes 'poverty facilitated' crimes and insecurity within their communities. Investment in modern Agricultural practice will engage the people, and also help solve the food shortages experienced in the country.
5. Increase more Personnel on ground, both military and police for more patrols within and outside the camps, for swift responses in time of security breach
6. The international community and nations of interest should all join hands in making genuine efforts, void of economic/political interest to resolving the conflict, strengthen South Sudan legal system, and establish peace and security in the country.
7. UN should establish a standing Force, trained in ethics, technical and communication skills, including languages for ease of communication among staff, to address language barrier challenges among troop contributing countries, and the issues of complacency and inactions during their missions in countries around the world.
8. UN staffs/personnel must maintain neutrality in order to build trust and improve their relationship with people and Government of South Sudan towards peace, respect Agreements and human rights. South Sudan Government, and some interest groups involved in the ongoing conflict had accused UN and some of her staff of partiality in some instances.
9. UNMISS should exhibit the willpower to fully implement Chapter 7 of her Mandate anytime the need arises so as to also show capability to enforce peace and security, and deter deliberate spoilers of peace and security.
10. More funding for UNMISS peace support operation in South Sudan in order to elongate their period of stay in the country, in order to sustain every gains made, and to establish permanent peace and stability in South Sudan.
11. Massive systematic investment in the educational sector of South Sudan tailored towards reorienting and lifting majority of the people out of illiteracy, thereby eroding the deep-rooted tribal sentiments among the people, which have over the years led to various kinds of ethnocentric crimes.
12. The UN should bring about good sustainable security sector reforms in South Sudan, that would be driven by the South Sudanese

government, to address the concerns of all parts of the society, build security institutions that are accountable to civilian authorities, and ensure lasting peace in that country, and region.

13. UN should intensify the disarmament program to recover most of the illegal weapons in circulation, so as to mitigate and block the sources of proliferations of Small Arms and Light Weapons within South Sudan.
14. Political stability of South Sudan is required for UN to achieve meaningful progress in their ongoing peace support operation in the country. Hence UN should intensify drive on advocacy for political awareness and protection of human rights.

References:

1. AUCISS Report (2014). *South Sudan: Mobile teams prepare communities to self manage displacement response*. Retrieved February 12, 2025, from <https://www.acted.org/mobile-team-in-south-sudan>
2. African Union Commission of Inquiry on South Sudan [AUCISS] (2014, October). *Final Report*. Addis Ababa: African Union, Ethiopia. Retrieved February 13, 2025, from <http://www.au.int/en/auciss>.
3. African Union Commission of Inquiry on South Sudan [AUCISS] Report (2015, November). Enough Team. -Retrieved February, 2025, from <https://enoughproject.org/blog/african-union-commission-inquiry-south-sudan-report>.
4. Aleksandrovich, V. S. (2015). Civil war and the UN peacekeeping operation in South Sudan. *The Social Sciences, Medwell Journals*, 10 (5), 671-673.
5. Baldwin, D. A. (1997). *The concept of security: Review of international studies*. Retrieved February 20, 2016, from British International Studies Association, <https://www.pri.uncetn.edu/dbaldwin>
6. Briggs, C. (2017, January). Protection of civilians (POC) sites and their impact on the broader protection environment in South Sudan, *ODI HPN. Humanitarian Policy Group (HPG), Overseas Development Institute (ODI)*. Retrieved February 12, 2025, from <https://odihpn.org/magaze/protection-civilians-poc-sites-impact-broader/>
7. Briggs, C. (2017, May 31). *Protection of civilians sites: Lessons from South Sudan for Future Operation*. Retrieved February 17, 2025, from Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC), <https://reliefweb.int/nrc/south-sudan>.
8. Broga, D. (2016), *Loaded Guns, Smoking Barrels and Proliferation of Small Arms in South Sudan*. - Retrieved 13th February 2025.
9. CARE Report (2014, April 17th) *New report warns of worsening humanitarian disaster in South Sudan*. Retrieved February 13th, 2025, from <http://www.care.org/newsroom/press/press-release/report-warns-worsening-humanitarian-disaster-south-sudan/>
10. Da Costa, F. D. & De Coning, C. (2013, April). *UNMISS county support bases: Peace-keeping-peacebuilding nexus at work?* Norwegian institute of international affairs. Oslo: NUPI.
11. Edeh, O. S., Best, G. S., & Odo, C. U. (2025). United Nations peace support operations and security of South Sudan (2011-2018). *International Journal of Political Science (IJPS)*, Volume 11, Issue 2, 2025, PP18-32, ISSN 2454-9452 (Online). Retrieved August 20th 2025 from <https://doi.org/10.20431/2454-9452.1102003>
12. Factsheet. (2018, August 4). *Protection camp population in South Sudan*. Retrieved November 10, 2019, from <https://www.reuters.com>

13. Foltyn, S. (2016, April 25). UN bases in South Sudan are a blessing and a curse. *The Guardian*. Retrieved February 13, 2025, from <https://www.theguardian.com/global-development/2016/apr/26/un-bases-south-sudan-malakal-blessing-curse>
14. Gurtong (2018). Government of South Sudan States. Retrieved on April 20, 2018, from www.gurtong.net/governance/governments/government-of-south-sudan-state/tabid
15. Iaccino, L. (2016). South Sudan Conflict: *Five reasons why the civil war is happening*. Retrieved February 12, 2025, from <https://www.ibtimes.co.uk/south-sudan-five-reasons-why-the-civil-war-is-happening>.
16. Instituto Espanol De Estudios Estrategicos [IEEE] Framework Document (2011, June). *The evolution of the concept of security*. Ministerio De Defensa, The Spanish Institute of Strategic Studies. Framework Document (05)011. Retrieved May 20, 2017, from <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/ieee>
17. International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty [ICISS] (2001). *The responsibility to protect*. Report of the international commission on intervention and state sovereignty. International Development Research Center Ottawa, ON, Canada.
18. International Crisis Group [ICG] (2015). *South Sudan: Keeping faith with IGAD peace process*. International Crisis Group. Retrieved May 26, 2016, from <https://www.crisisgroup.org/horn-africa>
19. International Crisis Group Report (2021, February 10). Towards a viable future for South Sudan. Retrieved 27th June 2022 from <https://www.usip.org/africa/horn-africa/south-sudan/300-towards-viable-future-south-sudan>
20. Karlsrud, J. (2012). UN and local-level peacebuilding in South Sudan: the case of county support bases as platforms for early peacebuilding. *Ecpr Graduate Student Conference Bremen*. Retrieved February 13, 2025, from <https://ecpr.eu/Events/PaperDetails/57>
21. Ki-moon, B. (2012, May). *The UN SSR perspective* (Ref. No.12-28742). New York: United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operations, Office of Rule of Law and Security Institutions, Security Sector Reform Unit, United Nations.
22. Ki-moon, B. (2015, October 23). The United Nations celebrates its 70th anniversary with 70 achievements in South Sudan. *UNMISS Press Release*. Retrieved February 12, 2025, from <https://unmiss.unmissions.org/un-celebrates-its-70th-anniversary->
23. Kurtus, R. (2012). *Theory of security*. Retrieved February 15, 2025, from <https://www.scho-ol-for-champions.com>.
24. Lear, V. T. (2018). Two years after the Juba clashes: Has UNMISS's protection of displaced people improved? Retrieved February 12, 2025, from <http://peaceoperationsreview.org>
25. Manyok, P. (2016). Oil and Darfur's blood: China's thirst for Sudan's oil. *Journal of Political Sciences & Public Affairs*, 4(189). DOI:10.4172/2332-0761.1000189
26. Maru, M. T. (2013). The real reason behind South Sudan crisis. *Aljazeera Online*. Retrieved September 22, 2016, from http://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/opinion/the_reason_behind_south_sudan_crisis.html
27. Momodu, S. (2018, December 23). *Second Sudanese civil war (1983-2005)*. BlackPast.org. Retrieved February 20, 2020, from <https://www.blackpast.org/global-africa-history/events-global-africa-history/second-sudanese-civil-war-1983-2005/>
28. Moravcsik, A. (2010). *Liberal theories of international relations: A primer*. Princeton University. Retrieved January 17, 2017, from <https://www.priceton.edu/library/primer>

29. Morrah, M. (2017, May 27). A man-made disaster: Inside South Sudan's famine crisis with David Shearer. *Newshub*. Retrieved August 2, 2017, from <https://www.newshub.co.nz>.
30. Odo, C.U (2017). An introductory text in international relations. Jos: Matkol Press
31. Ormeci, O. (2010). *The concept of security and security studies*. Retrieved February 15, 2017, from <http://www.ozanormeci.com.tr/>
32. Oxfam International (2015). *Crisis in South Sudan*. Oxford: Oxfam GB. Retrieved May 28, 2016, from <https://www.oxfam.org/en/emergencies/crisis-in-south-sudan>.
33. Oxfam International Report (2014, October). *From crisis to catastrophe: South Sudan's man-made crisis*. Oxford: Oxfam GB. Retrieved August 17, 2017, from <https://www.oxfam.org/research/crisis-to-catastrophe/south-sudans-man-made-crisis>
34. Pugh, J. (2005). *Democratic Peace Theory: A review and evaluation*. A CEMPROC Working Paper Series in Peace, Conflict, and Development, Center for Mediation, Peace, and Resolution of Conflict, International. Retrieved September 21, 2017, from www.cemproc.org.
35. Smith, B. (1996). The need humanitarian intervention in Central Africa. *Field Report of the Human Right Brief*.
36. Smith, D. (2014). South Sudan: Children bear brunt of man-made disaster. *The Guardian.Com*. Retrieved August, 2017, from <https://www.theguardian.com>.
37. UN (2016). *Adopting resolution 2304 (2016), Security Council extends mission in South Sudan, authorizes expanded peacekeeping force to bolster civilian protection efforts*. Retrieved September 15, 2017, from: <https://press.un.org/en/2016/sc/2475.doc.htm>
38. UN (2016). UNMISS: *Background, the United Nations Mission in South Sudan*. Retrieved July 18, 2017, from: <https://unmiss.unmissions.org/background>
39. UN (2016, August 3). *OCHA: in South Sudan, UN humanitarian chief calls for end to attacks against civilians, aid workers*. Retrieved September 2, 2016, from UN News Web site: <https://news.un.org/story/2016/08/5>
40. UN (2016, June 4). *Sudan and South Sudan*. Retrieved June 4, 2016, from UN News Web site: <http://www.un.org/>
41. UN (2016, September 1). *WFP in emergency operation to assist around 80,000 South Sudanese refugees in Uganda*. Retrieved September 2, 2016, from UN News Web site: <https://news.un.org/2016/09/1>
42. UN (2017, December 4), *Adopting resolution 2392 (2017), Security Council grants mandate extension for United Nations Mission in South Sudan, pending review of operations*. Retrieved March 17, 2016, from <https://www.un.org>.
43. UN (2023). UNMISS, United Nations Mission in South Sudan, about the mission. Retrieved March 23, 2023, from <https://unmiss.unmissions.org/about-unmiss>
44. UN Career (2016). 28 out of the 35 CSBs have been established. *Consultant-Independent International Civil Works Engineer*. Retrieved January 20, 2018, from <https://uncareer.net/vacancy>.
45. UN Country Team Portal (2016). *UN agencies working in South Sudan*. Retrieved September 23, 2016, from <http://www.ss.one.un.org/united-nations-country-team>
46. UN News (2018, September, 4). *New home for scores of South Sudan's displaced*. Retrieved December 20, 2019, from <https://news.un.org/en/new-home-for-scores-south-sudan's-displaced>
47. UN Peacekeeping Fact Sheet (2017, June 30). *Peacekeeping fact sheet*. Retrieved September 3, 2017, from

- <https://peacekeeping.un.org/en/peacekeeping-fact-sheet-sep-2017>
48. UN Security Council (2005). Security Council establishes UN mission in Sudan for initial period of six months, unanimously adopting resolution 1590 (2005). *Meeting coverage and press releases*. Retrieved November 4, 2017, from <http://www.un.org/en/>
49. UN Security Council (2016). *Adopting Resolution 2304 (2016): Security Council extends mission in South Sudan, authorizes expanded peacekeeping force to bolster civilian protection efforts, the full text of resolution 2304 (2016)* –Retrieved September, 3, 2017, from <https://www.un.org/press/en/2016/sc12475.doc.htm>
50. UN Security Council (2016). *Executive summary of the independent special investigation into the violence in Juba in 2016 and response by the United Nations Mission in South Sudan* –Retrieved October, 4th, 2017, from <https://reliefweb.int/report/south-sudan/executive-summary>
51. UN Security Council, (2016, November 10), *Special report of the Secretary-General on the*
52. United Nations Peacekeeping (2014). *Security Sector Reform*. Retrieved March 20, 2016, from <http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping>.
53. United Nations Peacekeeping (2017). *Current peacekeeping operations: A list of our current UN peacekeeping operations around the world*. Retrieved April 26, 2017, from <http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/operations/current.shtml>
54. United Nations Report.(2016). *Executive summary of the independent special investigation into the violence which occurred in Juba in 2016 and UNMISS response*. Retrieved January 3, 2017, from <https://reliefweb.int/report/south-sudan>
55. UNMIS (2005). *UNMIS and the African Union*. Retrieved February 15, 2016, from UNMISS Web site: www.unmiss.org.
56. UNSSR (2012, May). *The United Nations SSR perspective. Sustainable Peace Through Justice and Security*. A Magazine Published by the Security Sector Reform Unit, Office of Rule of Law and Security Institutions, United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operations. New York. Retrieved March 20, 2016, from https://peacekeeping.un.org/sites/default/files/ssr_perspective_2012.pdf
57. Willmot, H., Sheeran, S., & Sharland, L. (2015). *Safety and security challenges in UN Peace Operations (IPI, No 10)*, New York: International Peace Institute