

Post-Conflict State Reconstruction and Inclusive Peacebuilding in Sudan: Rethinking Governance after the SAF–RSF War

Umar Gambo Yahaya

Department of Political Science and International Relations

Nile University of Nigeria, Abuja

Email: umargamboyahaya@gmail.com

Phone: +234-8035 346716

Abstract

This paper examined post-conflict state reconstruction and inclusive peacebuilding in Sudan in the aftermath of the Sudanese Armed Forces (SAF) and Rapid Support Forces (RSF) conflict. The study was motivated by the persistent collapse of governance structures, proliferation of armed militias, and failure of previous transitional arrangements to achieve sustainable peace. The main objective was to identify practical pathways for rebuilding state authority and legitimacy through institutional reform, Disarmament, Demobilization, and Reintegration (DDR), and inclusive governance frameworks. The paper adopted a qualitative case study approach, relying on secondary data sources, including academic literature, policy reports, and institutional publications. Data were analyzed using thematic analysis to identify key patterns related to governance failure, militarization, and peacebuilding strategies. The study was anchored on State Fragility Theory and Peacebuilding Theory to explain the structural drivers of conflict and pathways to sustainable peace. Findings revealed that the Sudan crisis is characterized by institutional collapse, fragmented authority, and entrenched militarized patronage networks, which undermine effective governance and DDR implementation. The study further found that exclusionary political processes and weak institutional frameworks have contributed to recurring instability. Inclusive peacebuilding and comprehensive security sector reform were identified as critical to sustainable reconstruction. The study concluded that post-conflict reconstruction in Sudan requires a multidimensional approach that integrates institutional reform, DDR processes, and grassroots participation. It recommended the establishment of inclusive transitional governance, integration of armed forces, and alignment of international support with local priorities to ensure long-term peace and stability.

Keywords: Sudan, peacebuilding, state reconstruction, DDR, governance

Introduction

The conflict in Sudan, particularly the violent confrontation between the Sudanese Armed Forces (SAF) and the Rapid Support Forces (RSF) that escalated in April 2023, has precipitated one of the most severe cases of state fragility and institutional collapse in contemporary Africa. The war has resulted in massive displacement, widespread destruction of infrastructure, and a deepening humanitarian crisis affecting over 30 million people in need of assistance (United Nations, 2024). Beyond its immediate humanitarian consequences, the conflict has exposed long-standing structural weaknesses within Sudan's political and governance systems, including the militarization of state institutions, fragmentation of authority, and the persistent exclusion of civilian actors from governance processes.

Historically, Sudan's governance has been shaped by cycles of authoritarian rule, civil war, and elite-driven political settlements. The 2019 revolution, which led to the removal of President Omar al-Bashir, was widely regarded as a critical turning point, offering prospects for democratic transition and institutional reform. However, the transitional arrangements that followed particularly the power-sharing agreement between civilian actors and military elites failed to dismantle entrenched military dominance. Instead, they institutionalized a dual power structure in which both the SAF and RSF retained significant autonomy and control over state resources (De Waal, 2022). This unresolved tension ultimately culminated in the breakdown of the transition and the eruption of violent conflict.

Scholars argue that Sudan exemplifies a broader pattern of **state fragility**, where the state lacks the capacity and legitimacy to perform core functions such as maintaining security and delivering public services (Rotberg, 2004). In such contexts, the proliferation of armed groups further undermines state authority by creating parallel systems of governance and economic control. The RSF, for instance, has evolved from a paramilitary force into a powerful political and economic actor, with independent command structures and access to significant financial resources, including gold mining (de Waal, 2022). This has intensified competition with the SAF and contributed to the fragmentation of state authority.

The crisis also highlights the limitations of traditional state-building and peacebuilding approaches. As Paris (2004) notes, liberal peacebuilding models often prioritize rapid democratization and elite power-sharing without adequately addressing underlying structural inequalities and security sector dynamics. In Sudan, such approaches failed to integrate armed actors into a unified national framework or establish effective civilian oversight of the military. Consequently, the transition remained fragile and ultimately collapsed.

Post-conflict reconstruction in Sudan therefore presents both a significant challenge and an opportunity to rethink governance and peacebuilding strategies. Sustainable peace will require a shift toward inclusive and context-specific approaches that address both structural and immediate drivers of conflict. This includes comprehensive security sector reform, effective DDR (Disarmament, Demobilization, and Reintegration) programs, and the strengthening of civilian institutions. Moreover, inclusive peacebuilding that incorporates grassroots participation and local ownership is essential for rebuilding trust and legitimacy (Lederach, 1997).

This study is situated within this broader debate and seeks to examine how post-conflict state reconstruction in Sudan can be reimagined to promote sustainable peace. By analyzing the

interplay between militarization, governance failure, and peacebuilding frameworks, the study aims to identify practical and policy-relevant pathways for restoring civil authority and rebuilding state legitimacy in Sudan.

Statement of the Problem

The persistence of violent conflict in Sudan underscores the failure of previous governance and peacebuilding arrangements to address the structural drivers of instability. Despite the 2019 political transition, which raised expectations for democratic reform, the continued dominance of military actors within the political system created a fragile and unsustainable power structure. As de Waal (2022) argues, the coexistence of parallel military authorities particularly the SAF and RSF produced a form of “competitive militarism” that ultimately led to state fragmentation and conflict. Similarly, Paris (2004) contends that post-conflict state-building efforts that prioritize elite power-sharing without addressing underlying security and institutional weaknesses often result in renewed instability rather than sustainable peace.

In Sudan, these dynamics have been exacerbated by the absence of effective DDR mechanisms and the failure to integrate armed groups into a unified national security framework. The resulting proliferation of militias and competing centers of power has undermined state authority and eroded public trust in governance institutions. Furthermore, the exclusion of civil society and local actors from peace processes has limited the legitimacy and effectiveness of reconstruction efforts.

Despite existing studies on Sudan’s conflict and political transition, there is limited integrative research that connects state fragility, militia politics, and peacebuilding strategies within a coherent analytical framework. Therefore, the problem this study seeks to address is how to develop inclusive and sustainable peacebuilding strategies that effectively integrate institutional reform, DDR processes, and civilian participation in order to rebuild state authority and legitimacy in post-conflict Sudan.

Objectives of the Study

Main Objective is to examine pathways for post-conflict state reconstruction and inclusive peacebuilding in Sudan following the SAF–RSF conflict. Specific Objectives:

1. To analyze the impact of militarization and armed militias on state fragility and governance collapse in Sudan.
2. To evaluate the role of inclusive peacebuilding, DDR processes, and institutional reform in rebuilding state legitimacy and civil authority.

Conceptual Review

Post-Conflict State Reconstruction

Post-conflict state reconstruction refers to the processes through which political authority, administrative systems, and security institutions are rebuilt after violent conflict. It involves restoring governance capacity, re-establishing the rule of law, and ensuring the delivery of public goods (Fukuyama, 2014). However, contemporary scholarship emphasizes that reconstruction is not merely a technical exercise of rebuilding institutions but also a deeply political process that requires legitimacy and social inclusion. Call (2011) critiques earlier notions of “failed states,”

arguing that reconstruction must address specific governance deficits particularly security, justice, and political representation rather than adopting one-size-fits-all institutional models.

Similarly, Paris (2004) highlights the limitations of liberal peacebuilding approaches that prioritize rapid institutionalization without first stabilizing security structures. In fragile contexts such as Sudan, this approach often results in weak institutions that lack both capacity and legitimacy. More recent analyses, such as de Waal (2022), further argue that reconstruction in Sudan must confront entrenched systems of militarized patronage, where political power is closely tied to control of armed forces and economic resources. From this perspective, post-conflict reconstruction in Sudan cannot be limited to rebuilding formal institutions; it must involve transforming the underlying power structures that sustain conflict. This includes integrating armed actors into a unified national framework and establishing civilian oversight. Thus, reconstruction is best understood as a multidimensional process combining institutional reform, political transformation, and legitimacy-building, which is essential for achieving sustainable peace in Sudan.

Inclusive Peacebuilding

Inclusive peacebuilding refers to approaches that prioritize the participation of diverse societal actors such as civil society organizations, local communities, women, and marginalized groups in peace processes. Unlike traditional elite-driven negotiations, inclusive peacebuilding emphasizes the importance of local ownership and grassroots engagement in achieving sustainable peace. Lederach (1997) argues that durable peace requires interaction across multiple levels of society, including top-level leaders, mid-level actors, and grassroots communities. This “bottom-up” approach recognizes that peace is not only negotiated but also socially constructed through relationships and trust-building.

More recent scholarship reinforces this perspective. Paffenholz (2015) demonstrates that inclusive peace processes are more likely to result in long-term stability because they enhance legitimacy and broaden the base of support for peace agreements. Similarly, Nilsson (2012) finds that peace agreements that incorporate civil society actors are significantly more likely to endure compared to those negotiated exclusively by elites. In the Sudanese context, the exclusion of civilian actors and grassroots movements from political transitions has been a major factor contributing to instability. As de Waal (2022) notes, peace processes dominated by military elites often fail to address societal grievances, thereby perpetuating cycles of conflict. Therefore, inclusive peacebuilding is not merely a normative ideal but a practical necessity. It provides a framework for addressing structural inequalities, rebuilding trust, and fostering social cohesion, all of which are critical for sustainable peace in post-conflict Sudan.

DDR (Disarmament, Demobilization, Reintegration)

Disarmament, Demobilization, and Reintegration (DDR) is a core component of post-conflict reconstruction, aimed at reducing the capacity for violence by dismantling armed groups and facilitating the transition of combatants into civilian life (United Nations, 2010). The process typically involves three stages: disarmament (collection of weapons), demobilization (disbanding of armed units), and reintegration (social and economic inclusion of ex-combatants).

Scholars emphasize that DDR is not merely a technical security process but a politically sensitive and context-dependent intervention. Muggah (2013) argues that successful DDR programs require alignment with broader political and economic reforms, including security sector reform and

governance restructuring. Without such integration, DDR efforts risk being superficial and unsustainable. Similarly, Knight (2014) highlights that reintegration is often the most challenging phase, as it requires long-term investment in livelihoods, education, and community reconciliation.

In Sudan, DDR is particularly complex due to the entrenched role of militias such as the RSF, which function not only as military actors but also as economic and political entities. As de Waal (2022) observes, these groups have developed independent revenue streams and command structures, making them resistant to disarmament. Consequently, DDR in Sudan must go beyond conventional approaches to address the political economy of armed groups. It requires a comprehensive strategy that integrates security, governance, and economic reform. Without effective DDR, efforts at state reconstruction and peacebuilding are unlikely to succeed.

Literature Review

The literature on post-conflict reconstruction and peacebuilding in fragile states has evolved significantly over the past two decades, reflecting growing recognition of the complexity of rebuilding governance structures in conflict-affected societies. Early scholarship on peacebuilding, particularly within the liberal peace tradition, emphasized the role of democratization, market reforms, and institutional development as pathways to stability. However, this approach has been increasingly critiqued for its limitations in contexts characterized by weak institutions and entrenched power asymmetries.

Paris (2004) provides one of the most influential critiques of liberal peacebuilding, arguing that rapid democratization and economic liberalization in fragile states can exacerbate instability rather than promote peace. According to Paris, the assumption that introducing democratic institutions will automatically lead to stability overlooks the fact that such institutions often lack the capacity to function effectively in post-conflict environments. This critique is particularly relevant to Sudan, where transitional governance arrangements failed to establish strong institutional foundations, thereby contributing to renewed conflict.

Similarly, Menkhaus (2007) highlights the challenges of governance in fragile states, arguing that the absence of effective state institutions often leads to the emergence of informal systems of authority. In such contexts, non-state actors including militias, local leaders, and economic elites fill governance vacuums, creating parallel structures that complicate state reconstruction. This perspective is highly applicable to Sudan, where the SAF and RSF have functioned as competing centers of authority, undermining the coherence of the state. In the African context, scholars have increasingly focused on the role of political economy in shaping conflict dynamics. de Waal (2022) emphasizes the concept of “militarized patronage networks,” where political power is sustained through control of armed groups and economic resources. In Sudan, this dynamic is evident in the relationship between military elites and resource extraction, particularly in sectors such as gold mining. These networks create strong incentives for armed actors to resist disarmament, thereby complicating DDR processes and undermining peacebuilding efforts.

Recent studies have also highlighted the limitations of transitional governance arrangements in Sudan. Young (2023) argues that the coexistence of SAF and RSF within the political system created a form of “parallel sovereignty,” where both entities exercised authority independently. This dual structure not only weakened state institutions but also increased the likelihood of conflict, as competing actors sought to consolidate power. Similarly, International Crisis Group

(2024) reports indicate that the failure to unify security forces and establish civilian oversight was a critical factor in the breakdown of Sudan's transition.

Another important strand of literature focuses on DDR (Disarmament, Demobilization, and Reintegration) as a central component of post-conflict reconstruction. While DDR programs are widely recognized as essential for reducing violence, scholars note that their effectiveness is often limited by political and economic constraints. Muggah (2013) argues that DDR must be integrated with broader governance reforms to be effective, while United Nations (2021) reports emphasize the importance of linking DDR to long-term development and reintegration strategies. In Sudan, the economic interests of armed groups and the absence of strong institutions have hindered the implementation of effective DDR programs.

In addition to institutional and security challenges, the literature increasingly emphasizes the importance of inclusive peacebuilding. Lederach (1997) advocates for a bottom-up approach that engages local communities and civil society actors in peace processes. More recent studies, such as Paffenholz (2015), demonstrate that inclusive peace processes are more likely to result in sustainable outcomes, as they enhance legitimacy and address underlying social grievances. However, in Sudan, peace processes have often been dominated by military and political elites, limiting the participation of broader society and undermining the sustainability of agreements.

Furthermore, contemporary scholarship highlights the need to address the humanitarian and socio-economic dimensions of post-conflict reconstruction. World Bank (2023) reports emphasize that rebuilding infrastructure, restoring livelihoods, and addressing displacement are critical for long-term stability. In Sudan, the scale of the humanitarian crisis characterized by widespread displacement and economic collapse poses significant challenges for reconstruction efforts. Overall, the literature reveals a growing consensus that post-conflict reconstruction in fragile states requires a multidimensional approach that integrates institutional reform, security sector transformation, and inclusive peacebuilding. However, it also highlights persistent challenges, including power asymmetry, weak institutions, and the political economy of conflict. In the case of Sudan, these challenges are particularly acute, given the entrenched role of military actors and the fragmentation of state authority.

Gap in the Literature

Despite extensive scholarship on post-conflict reconstruction and peacebuilding, significant gaps remain in understanding the Sudan crisis within an integrated analytical framework. Existing studies have largely examined the issue from fragmented perspectives. For instance, Paris (2004) focuses on the limitations of liberal peacebuilding approaches, emphasizing the risks of premature democratization in fragile states. Similarly, de Waal (2022) highlights the role of militarized patronage networks in sustaining conflict, particularly in Sudan, where armed actors operate as both political and economic entities. While these studies provide valuable insights, they tend to address specific dimensions of the problem rather than offering a comprehensive analysis.

Moreover, recent analyses of Sudan's conflict, such as Young (2023), have emphasized the role of dual military structures in creating "parallel sovereignty," which contributed to the collapse of transitional governance. However, these studies often focus on political and security dynamics without adequately linking them to broader peacebuilding strategies, particularly DDR processes and inclusive governance frameworks.

Additionally, there is limited context-specific research that integrates state fragility, militia politics, and peacebuilding mechanisms into a single analytical model. Most existing literature treats these variables independently, thereby overlooking their interconnections in shaping conflict outcomes. Therefore, the gap in the literature lies in the absence of a comprehensive and integrated analysis that connects state fragility, militarized power structures, DDR challenges, and inclusive peacebuilding strategies in post-conflict Sudan. This study seeks to fill this gap by providing a multidimensional and policy-oriented framework for sustainable state reconstruction.

Theoretical Framework

This study adopts **State Fragility Theory** and **Peacebuilding Theory** to provide a comprehensive analytical foundation for examining post-conflict reconstruction and inclusive peacebuilding in Sudan.

State Fragility Theory explains the inability of states to perform core functions such as maintaining security, providing public services, and exercising legitimate authority (Rotberg, 2004). Fragile states are often characterized by weak institutions, contested legitimacy, and the inability to monopolize the use of force. Call (2011) further refines this concept by emphasizing specific dimensions of fragility, including security gaps, governance deficits, and political exclusion. In the context of Sudan, state fragility is evident in the coexistence of rival armed actors (SAF and RSF), the collapse of civil governance, and the erosion of state legitimacy. The theory helps explain how militarization and fragmented authority contributed to the breakdown of Sudan's transitional process. It also provides a framework for understanding why rebuilding state capacity and legitimacy is essential for sustainable peace.

Peacebuilding Theory: Peacebuilding Theory focuses on processes aimed at transforming conflict and establishing sustainable peace through institutional reform, reconciliation, and inclusive governance (Lederach, 1997). It emphasizes the importance of addressing root causes of conflict, promoting social cohesion, and engaging multiple levels of society.

Paris (2004) critiques traditional liberal peacebuilding models, arguing that without strong institutions and local ownership, peacebuilding efforts may fail. Similarly, Paffenholz (2015) highlights the importance of inclusivity in peace processes, noting that broader participation enhances legitimacy and sustainability. Applied to Sudan, Peacebuilding Theory underscores the need for inclusive governance, DDR processes, and grassroots engagement to rebuild trust and legitimacy. It shifts the focus from elite-driven arrangements to comprehensive and participatory approaches necessary for long-term stability.

Methodology

This study adopts a qualitative case study design to examine post-conflict reconstruction and peacebuilding in Sudan. It relies on secondary data sources, including academic literature, policy reports, and institutional publications. Data will be analyzed using thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006), enabling the identification of patterns related to governance failure, militarization, and peacebuilding strategies. The approach is suitable for exploring complex conflict dynamics and generating context-specific insights.

Findings and Discussion

Institutional Collapse and Governance Crisis

The findings reveal that the Sudan conflict has precipitated a systemic collapse of state institutions, extending beyond physical destruction to include administrative paralysis and erosion of legitimacy. Core public services healthcare, education, and local governance have either ceased functioning or operate at minimal capacity, particularly in conflict-affected regions. This collapse reflects what Rotberg (2004) describes as the inability of the state to deliver “political goods,” including security and welfare.

Moreover, the fragmentation of authority between the SAF and RSF has created multiple competing centers of power, undermining centralized governance. In many areas, informal actors, militias, and local authorities have filled governance vacuums, reinforcing what Menkhaus (2007) terms “governance without government.” This has deepened the crisis of legitimacy, as citizens increasingly rely on non-state structures for survival.

From a theoretical standpoint, this condition aligns with State Fragility Theory, where the state loses its monopoly over violence and administrative control. The implication is that post-conflict reconstruction in Sudan must prioritize not only rebuilding institutions but also restoring state legitimacy and authority through inclusive and accountable governance mechanisms.

Challenges of DDR in Sudan

The study finds that DDR processes in Sudan face structural, political, and economic constraints. The RSF’s dual role as both a military force and an economic actor particularly through control of gold resources creates strong incentives to resist disarmament (de Waal, 2022). This reflects the broader political economy

Findings and Discussion

Institutional Collapse and Governance Crisis

The findings reveal that the Sudan conflict has precipitated a systemic collapse of state institutions, extending beyond physical destruction to include administrative paralysis and erosion of legitimacy. Core public services healthcare, education, and local governance have either ceased functioning or operate at minimal capacity, particularly in conflict-affected regions. This collapse reflects what Rotberg (2004) describes as the inability of the state to deliver “political goods,” including security and welfare.

Moreover, the fragmentation of authority between the SAF and RSF has created multiple competing centers of power, undermining centralized governance. In many areas, informal actors, militias, and local authorities have filled governance vacuums, reinforcing what Menkhaus (2007) terms “governance without government.” This has deepened the crisis of legitimacy, as citizens increasingly rely on non-state structures for survival. From a theoretical standpoint, this condition aligns with State Fragility Theory, where the state loses its monopoly over violence and administrative control. The implication is that post-conflict reconstruction in Sudan must prioritize not only rebuilding institutions but also restoring state legitimacy and authority through inclusive and accountable governance mechanisms.

Challenges of DDR in Sudan

The study finds that DDR processes in Sudan face structural, political, and economic constraints. The RSF's dual role as both a military force and an economic actor particularly through control of gold resources creates strong incentives to resist disarmament (de Waal, 2022). This reflects the broader political economy of conflict, where armed groups derive power and legitimacy from resource control.

Additionally, the absence of trust between conflicting parties complicates demobilization efforts. Muggah (2013) notes that DDR programs often fail when ex-combatants perceive disarmament as a threat to their security or livelihoods. In Sudan, this is exacerbated by weak state institutions incapable of guaranteeing security or providing alternative economic opportunities. Furthermore, DDR efforts are hindered by the lack of a unified national security framework, as rival forces maintain independent command structures. This suggests that DDR in Sudan cannot be implemented in isolation but must be integrated with broader security sector reform (SSR) and governance restructuring. Without addressing these underlying dynamics, DDR risks becoming superficial and unsustainable.

Need for Inclusive Governance

The findings underscore the centrality of inclusive governance in achieving sustainable peace in Sudan. Historically, political processes in Sudan have been dominated by military and elite actors, often excluding civil society, women, youth, and marginalized communities. This exclusion has contributed to recurring cycles of conflict by undermining the legitimacy of governance structures. Lederach (1997) argues that sustainable peace requires engagement at multiple levels of society, emphasizing the importance of grassroots participation. Similarly, Paffenholz (2015) demonstrates that inclusive peace processes are more likely to result in durable outcomes because they address broader societal grievances. In Sudan, the exclusion of civilian actors during the transitional period (2019–2021) weakened the foundation for democratic governance and contributed to the eventual collapse of the transition. Inclusive governance, therefore, is not merely a normative goal but a practical necessity for rebuilding trust, legitimacy, and social cohesion.

This implies that post-conflict reconstruction must prioritize participatory governance mechanisms, ensuring that diverse societal actors are actively involved in decision-making processes.

Institutional Reform and Security Sector Transformation

The study finds that institutional reform and security sector transformation are critical for sustainable peacebuilding in Sudan. The coexistence of multiple armed forces with competing loyalties has been a central driver of instability. As Call (2011) notes, effective state-building requires the consolidation of authority and the establishment of a monopoly over the use of force. In Sudan, this necessitates the integration of the SAF and RSF into a unified national army under civilian control. Without such reforms, militarization is likely to persist, perpetuating cycles of violence and undermining governance. Moreover, institutional reform must extend beyond the security sector to include judicial systems, public administration, and anti-corruption mechanisms. Fukuyama (2014) emphasizes that strong institutions are essential for political order and long-term stability. The findings suggest that reform efforts must be both comprehensive and context-

specific, addressing the political economy of power while strengthening institutional capacity and accountability.

Policy Implications

Based on the findings, the study identifies several policy-relevant pathways for post-conflict reconstruction in Sudan:

Establish inclusive transitional governance frameworks that incorporate civil society and marginalized groups.

Implement comprehensive DDR programs linked to economic reintegration and livelihood support.

Undertake security sector reform (SSR) to unify armed forces under civilian oversight.

Strengthen state institutions and rule of law to restore governance capacity and legitimacy.

Promote grassroots peacebuilding initiatives to foster reconciliation and social cohesion.

Align international support with local priorities, ensuring context-sensitive interventions.

These measures highlight the need for a holistic and integrated approach to peacebuilding that addresses both structural and immediate drivers of conflict.

Conclusion and Recommendations

The Sudan crisis illustrates the intricate relationship between state fragility, militarization, and governance collapse, demonstrating that post-conflict reconstruction is inherently complex and multidimensional. The findings reveal that the collapse of civil institutions, the entrenchment of armed militias, and the exclusion of key societal actors have collectively undermined prospects for sustainable peace. Reconstruction efforts that focus solely on institutional rebuilding without addressing underlying power dynamics are unlikely to succeed. Instead, sustainable peace requires a comprehensive approach that integrates institutional reform, inclusive governance, and effective DDR processes. The study also highlights the importance of addressing the political economy of conflict, particularly the role of resource control in sustaining armed groups. Ultimately, the pathway to peace in Sudan lies in transforming governance structures, rebuilding legitimacy, and fostering inclusive participation. Without such reforms, there is a significant risk that post-conflict reconstruction efforts will reproduce the very conditions that led to the current crisis.

Recommendations

1. Establish a civilian-led transitional authority with broad societal representation.
2. Integrate SAF and RSF into a unified national military structure.

3. Implement DDR programs with strong economic reintegration incentives.
4. Strengthen judicial and anti-corruption institutions for accountability.
5. Promote community-based peacebuilding and reconciliation initiatives.
6. Ensure coordinated international support aligned with local peacebuilding priorities.

References

- Call, C. T. (2011). Beyond the “failed state”: Toward conceptual alternatives.
- Call, C. T. (2011). Beyond the “failed state”: Toward conceptual alternatives. *European Journal of International Relations*.
- De Waal, A. (2022). *The real politics of the Horn of Africa*.
- Fukuyama, F. (2014). *Political order and political decay*.
- International Crisis Group. (2024). Sudan conflict reports.
- Knight, M. (2014). Disarmament, demobilization, and reintegration.
- Lederach, J. P. (1997). *Building peace*.
- Lederach, J. P. (1997). *Building peace: Sustainable reconciliation in divided societies*.
- Menkhaus, K. (2007). Governance without government.
- Muggah, R. (2013). DDR and post-conflict security.
- Nilsson, D. (2012). Anchoring the peace: Civil society actors in peace agreements. *International Interactions*.
- Paffenholz, T. (2015). Inclusive peace processes.
- Paris, R. (2004). *At war’s end: Building peace after civil conflict*.
- Rotberg, R. I. (2004). *When states fail: Causes and consequences*.
- United Nations. (2010). *Integrated DDR standards*.
- United Nations. (2021). DDR and peacebuilding reports.
- United Nations. (2024). Sudan humanitarian report.
- United Nations. (2024). Sudan humanitarian situation report.
- World Bank. (2023). Fragility and reconstruction reports.
- Young, J. (2023). Sudan’s transition and conflict dynamics.

