



Beyond Protection of Civilians: Peacekeeping, Power, and the Crisis of Human Security in South Sudan

Kester C. Onor¹⁾ & Jennifer C. Ndulue²⁾

¹⁾ Department of Research & Studies
Nigerian Institute of International Affairs, Lagos State, Nigeria

²⁾ Department of Political Science and International Relations
Covenant University, Ota, Ogun State, Nigeria

Abstract

Humanitarian peacekeeping is recognised as an essential international tool for addressing crises and safeguarding vulnerable populations. However, the effectiveness of peacekeeping operations in promoting human security remains contested, particularly in fragile contexts such as South Sudan. This study examines the role of the United Nations Mission in South Sudan (UNMISS) in advancing human security during the period 2013–2021. This research employs a qualitative descriptive approach, using a systematic literature review, drawing on policy documents, humanitarian reports, United Nations publications, and credible secondary data sources. Data were analysed through thematic analysis to identify patterns related to civilian protection and human security outcomes. The Fiduciary Theory of Humanitarian Intervention guides the study's evaluation of UNMISS's performance. The findings indicate that UNMISS made measurable contributions to civilian protection, particularly through the establishment of Protection of Civilians (PoC) sites, which, at their peak, sheltered over 200,000 internally displaced persons and reduced their immediate exposure to violence. However, the mission's overall effectiveness in promoting sustainable human security remained limited due to ongoing armed conflict, weak state institutions, and restricted operational capacity.

Keywords: Human Security; Humanitarian Intervention; Peacekeeping; Global Governance; South Sudan; Political Power Dynamics

How to Cite: Onor, K.C., & Ndulue, J.C., (2026). Beyond Protection of Civilians: Peacekeeping, Power, and the Crisis of Human Security in South Sudan. *Strukturasi: Jurnal Ilmiah Magister Administrasi Publik*, 8 (1): 44-53



INTRODUCTION

However, conflicts continue to occur across many African countries, significantly affecting social stability and sustainable development. These conflicts threaten individual safety and restrict opportunities for socio-economic development. Since the end of the Cold War, there has been a notable increase in intrastate conflicts, shifting scholarly attention toward their devastating consequences for civilian populations (Kaldor, 2012; Collier et al., 2003). Conflicts are multidimensional and cannot be attributed to a single cause. Weak state institutions, ineffective governance, and fragile political systems are widely recognised as key drivers of instability (Rotberg, 2004; Fearon & Laitin, 2003).

Additionally, identity-based mobilisation along ethnic, religious, or regional lines often intensifies conflict, particularly in fragile political environments (Cederman, Wimmer, & Min, 2010). Economic marginalisation and inequality further exacerbate tensions, especially when populations perceive unequal access to resources and opportunities (Stewart, 2010). These conditions undermine state legitimacy and perpetuate cycles of violence. Reports from the International Crisis Group (2021) and the United Nations (2023) confirm the complexity and interconnected nature of these conflict drivers.

In this context, peacekeeping operations have become a central mechanism in international conflict management and civilian protection. Over time, peacekeeping mandates have evolved from traditional ceasefire monitoring to multidimensional roles, including civilian protection, support for political transitions, humanitarian coordination, and institutional capacity-building (Howard, 2019; Karlsrud, 2015). This transformation reflects broader changes in global security governance, particularly the increasing emphasis on human security and civilian well-being (Paris, 2001).

Despite these developments, the effectiveness of peacekeeping missions in delivering sustainable human security outcomes remains widely debated. While peacekeeping missions may reduce large-scale violence or prevent atrocities, they may also produce unintended consequences such as elite power consolidation, dependency on external actors, and limited accountability (Autesserre, 2014; Berg, 2022). These challenges complicate traditional assessments of peacekeeping effectiveness and highlight the need for more nuanced analytical frameworks.

The concept of human security offers such a framework by shifting the focus from state-centric security to the protection of individuals. Human security encompasses various dimensions, including economic, food, health, political, and community security (United Nations Development Programme, 1994). From this perspective, the absence of violence alone is insufficient; sustainable peace requires addressing structural vulnerabilities that shape everyday insecurity (Tadjbakhsh & Chenoy, 2007).

Despite the growing body of literature, several research gaps remain. First, existing studies predominantly focus on macro-level assessments of peacekeeping success, often neglecting micro-level human security outcomes experienced by civilians (Autesserre, 2014). Second, limited research integrates normative theoretical frameworks, such as the Fiduciary Theory of Humanitarian Intervention, with empirical analyses of peacekeeping practices. Third, in the case of South Sudan, much of the literature emphasises political conflict dynamics, while fewer studies examine the long-term interaction between peacekeeping operations and everyday human security conditions (Rolandsen, 2015; de Waal, 2015).

South Sudan provides a critical case for addressing these gaps. Following its independence in 2011, the country was initially viewed as a symbol of post-conflict recovery. However, political rivalry between Salva Kiir and Riek Machar escalated into civil war in 2013, resulting in widespread violence, displacement, and humanitarian crises (de Waal, 2015). In response, the

United Nations Mission in South Sudan (UNMISS) was deployed with a robust mandate to protect civilians and stabilise the country.

Despite the long-term presence of peacekeeping forces, violence against civilians persists, and humanitarian conditions remain severe. Protection of Civilians (PoC) sites have sheltered over 200,000 internally displaced persons at their peak, providing immediate safety but also revealing governance and protection challenges such as overcrowding, gender-based violence, and limited economic opportunities (UNMISS, 2021; Aning, 2024). These realities raise critical questions about whether peacekeeping missions have effectively enhanced human security or merely coexisted with evolving forms of insecurity.

This study addresses these gaps by critically examining the human security dimension of peacekeeping operations in South Sudan from 2013 to 2021. Drawing on the Fiduciary Theory of Humanitarian Intervention (Fox-Decent, 2012), the research evaluates the moral and operational responsibilities of peacekeeping actors toward civilian populations. Rather than establishing direct causality, the study analyses patterns and inconsistencies between peacekeeping objectives and human security outcomes.

By integrating theoretical and empirical perspectives, this research contributes to ongoing debates on the effectiveness and limitations of peacekeeping interventions. It provides evidence-based insights to rethink international intervention strategies and improve peacekeeping practices in conflict-affected environments.

Conceptual Clarifications: Peacekeeping, Power, and the Crisis of Human Security

To grasp the connection between peacekeeping, power, and human security, it is necessary to move away from the perception of intervention as a non-partisan protective role. Contemporary scholarship tends to view peacekeeping as a form of institutionalised power exercised within a disputatious political context, in which foreign actors both consolidate conflict and alter governance patterns. This research defines three related terms: peacekeeping, power, and human security.

Peacekeeping is the use of international security intervention to control armed conflict and protect civilians. Contemporary peacekeeping goes beyond ceasefire observation to include the protection of civilians, humanitarian assistance, mediation of political agreements, and the building of institutional capacity (Duursma, 2023). The role of peacekeeping missions, such as UNMISS, can be seen to encompass not only protection but also the ability to shape governance. This is because peacekeeping is both a humanitarian intervention and a tool of creating political order.

Power, in this case, is seen not only as the capacity to coerce but also as the structural power inherent in intervention practices. The power of peacekeeping is realised through mandates, resource allocation, territorialization, and political mediation. Studies on peacebuilding have indicated that the process of stabilising a state is often biased towards elite political settlements and institutional stability, despite underlying social tensions (Akinbi, 2025). This means that intervention is a mechanism that redistributes power in a fragile state rather than being neutral.

Human security changes the emphasis of security from the state to the people. The multi-dimensional concept of human security, as highlighted by the United Nations Development Programme, indicates that security from violence is not enough (Falk, 2024). Human security needs to deal with threats such as displacement, economic marginalisation, ill health, and political alienation. This research uses human security as a conceptual framework to assess the impact of interventionist power.

The relationship between these concepts reveals three major tensions. Firstly, there is a tension between stabilisation and transformation. Peacekeeping operations tend to favour immediate stabilisation, often at the cost of the root causes of insecurity. Secondly, there is a tension between protection and political authority. Operations aimed at protecting civilians may also serve to support particular governance structures or elite arrangements. Finally, there is a tension between the provision of security and the experience of security.

Such challenges are evident in a post-conflict, fragile state such as South Sudan, where external intervention occurs within a highly contested political and social environment (Owujie, C., 2023). The power of peacekeeping may control large-scale conflict without changing the underlying risks, creating a scenario that could be described as one of managed instability rather than security. The current research adopts a critical but non-rejectionist stance on peacekeeping. It is not assumed that peacekeeping is ineffective, nor that it is necessarily protective. Rather, peacekeeping is conceptualised as a form of interventionary governance, and its effectiveness depends on the exercise, prioritisation, and institutionalisation of power. Human security, on the other hand, is seen not only as a normative idea but also as an empirical one, in the sense of evaluating whether peacekeeping has transformed or regulated a situation of vulnerability (Abdulkhaev, 2024).

The current research is grounded in the Fiduciary Theory of Humanitarian Intervention, which treats humanitarian interveners as fiduciaries with a duty to protect vulnerable populations in a war-torn state. Within this understanding, peacekeeping authority is not merely a delegation of power but a form of trusteeship that creates moral, legal, and political obligations for humanitarian interveners. When international actors assume a duty to protect civilians in a state of collapse or incapacity, they assume a fiduciary duty to act in their best interests. Failure to do so violates their fiduciary duty and calls into question the legitimacy of humanitarian intervention in the first place (Onor & Ndulue, 2026).

The theory of fiduciary governance is supported by classical international thought, such as that of Hugo Grotius. At the same time, modern research on the topic has continued to develop it, challenging the notion of the state's absolute sovereignty. Under the theory of fiduciary governance, sovereignty is conditional on the protection of basic human rights; when a state is unable or unwilling to protect its citizens from mass atrocities, authority can, with the collective consent of its citizens, be delegated to other actors (Onor & Ndulue, 2026). The key difference, however, is that such authority does not relieve interveners of their responsibility; on the contrary, it imposes a greater obligation on them to protect citizens and reduce harm when they wield significant coercive power.

In this case, a critical theory of fiduciary governance is used. The theory considers peacekeeping missions not only as moral governance but as a power that may either protect or produce insecurity. Peacekeeping missions are typically evaluated based on the implementation of their mandates, the deployment of forces, and reductions in combat incidents, among other indicators (Bellamy & Hunt, 2023). The theory of fiduciary governance, on the other hand, investigates the use of power for protection and whether it enhances human security. The theory, therefore, shifts the focus of evaluation from the implementation of mandates to the intervention's outcomes. To move beyond normative analysis, the research operationalises the theory of fiduciary duty by identifying three core duties that peacekeeping missions must uphold in practice: the duty of care, proportionality, and accountability.

First, peacekeeping forces must prioritise the protection of civilians in their planning and decision-making, particularly in contexts where there is a real threat of violence (Bourgeois & Labuda, 2023). This is not only about preventing gross violence but also about the everyday risks

of vulnerability, such as insecurity in displacement, sexual violence, food insecurity, and health insecurity.

Secondly, the principle of proportionality requires that the use of force and risk management policies take into account the equal value of civilian and peacekeeper lives (Onor & Ndulue, 2026). The fiduciary duty paradigm is critical of the force protection approach, arguing that the humanitarian principle of fiduciary duty demands a willingness to take risks to save lives (Tesón, 2001). Therefore, risk allocation between interveners and citizens is an important factor that determines the extent of fiduciary duty.

Third, accountability implies transparent governance, oversight, and responsibility for misconduct or failure. Peacekeeping operations that effectively control civilian populations by administering protected spaces or displacement sites also assume some form of administrative governance responsibility (Hultman, Kathman & Shannon, 2022). Hence, accountability is not limited to fulfilling the mandate but also extends to the quality of its implementation in spaces under the peacekeeping operation's control.

The fiduciary responsibility thus provides the analytical basis for the peacekeeping operation. Non-compliance or violation can thus be identified through the presence of patterns in the practice of the mandate, including the prioritisation of civilian risk in crises, the timeliness of the response to violence, the administration of the protected population, the level of engagement with local communities in the midst of crises, among other factors. The failure of the peacekeeping operation across all these areas can thus be seen as a form of fiduciary stress despite compliance with the mandate (Onor & Ndulue, 2026).

The relevance of this framework is particularly clear in the case of South Sudan, where international peacekeepers, most notably the United Nations Mission in South Sudan, have operated with an explicit mandate for the protection of civilians since the beginning of the civil war in 2013. In taking on responsibility for large displaced populations, the peacekeepers have assumed fiduciary obligations and direct responsibility for protecting human security (White, 2023). The fiduciary framework offers an opportunity to systematically analyse whether the peacekeeping operation was an effort at meaningful protection or merely crisis management that sustains conflict without changing its underlying drivers.

Empirically, the fiduciary framework offers an opportunity to systematically analyse the relationship between peacekeepers' humanitarian mandate and their operational reality. The operation of the protected spaces raises questions of oversight, the risk of exploitation, resource availability, and insecurity, all of which have implications for the peacekeepers' ability to fulfil their fiduciary duties (Onor & Ndulue, 2026). In response to large-scale violence, the peacekeepers' operational posture has often been risk-averse, with implications for the proportionality of the response. The engagement of peacekeepers with local actors has often privileged elite-level political stabilisation over local-level security transformation, thereby limiting the scope of protection they offer.

The Fiduciary Theory of Humanitarian Intervention shares normative similarities with the Responsibility to Protect (R2P) concept, yet it also offers analytical advantages of its own. While R2P establishes the circumstances under which humanitarian intervention might be warranted, it does not provide robust criteria for evaluating the conduct of intervening actors after the fact (Chesterman, 2023). Fiduciary theory, in identifying who has responsibility, to whom, and how its fulfilment can be empirically measured, helps to fill this analytical gap. It thus shifts the focus of analysis from the legitimacy of humanitarian intervention to its conduct in practice.

The relevance of Fiduciary Restraint to the debate on humanitarian intervention is underscored by the history of interventions in which protection mandates have been expanded to

encompass broader political or military objectives. The 2011 NATO intervention in Libya, for example, was initially mandated to protect civilians. However, its expansion of objectives has been cited as an example of the humanitarian intervention mandate's expansion and the consequent undermining of the legitimacy of trusteeship and normative support for humanitarian intervention in general.

By using fiduciary theory as an operational analytical framework rather than a moral one, this study contributes to peacekeeping scholarship in two principal ways (Diehl, Druckman & Mueller, 2023). First, it reconceptualises peacekeeping as a form of fiduciary governance in an asymmetrical power context, in which intervention authority shapes social order, allocates risk, and orients politics. Second, it emphasises human security results as a measure of peacekeeping success. The analytical challenge, therefore, is to assess whether peacekeeping enhances or mitigates insecurity. In the context of this study, it allows for a critical evaluation of peacekeeping as either a form of meaningful civilian protection or a sign of a crisis in the governance of humanitarian power.

RESEARCH METHODS

This study employs a qualitative methodology with a descriptive and exploratory research design. The use of a qualitative approach is appropriate as it enables an in-depth understanding of complex social and political processes that cannot be easily quantified (Creswell, 2014). The descriptive component aims to identify patterns of protection and insecurity over time, while the exploratory component examines how peacekeeping operations influence human security in specific contexts.

This research adopts an instrumental single-case study design, focusing on South Sudan. A case study approach is particularly suitable for investigating contemporary phenomena in real-life contexts, especially when the boundaries between the phenomenon and its context are not clearly evident (Yin, 2018). South Sudan is selected as a relevant case due to its prolonged civil conflict, weak state institutions, and sustained international intervention. Since the outbreak of civil war in 2013, the country has hosted one of the largest United Nations peacekeeping missions, the United Nations Mission in South Sudan (UNMISS), with a primary mandate to protect civilians (Donais & Solomon, 2022).

The study covers the period from 2013 to 2021, during which UNMISS played a significant role in civilian protection and humanitarian response. The unit of analysis is the conduct of peacekeeping operations, particularly with respect to civilian protection, the governance of Protection of Civilians (PoC) sites, and local security management.

The study relies exclusively on secondary qualitative data, including peer-reviewed journal articles, academic books, policy reports, United Nations documents, and credible media sources. The selection of data sources is based on their relevance to peacekeeping mandates, protection activities, governance of PoC sites, patterns of violence, and humanitarian conditions. The use of diverse data sources enables triangulation, thereby enhancing the validity and reliability of the findings by comparing multiple institutional and scholarly perspectives (Denzin, 2012).

Data analysis is conducted using thematic analysis, following the framework proposed by Braun and Clarke (2006). This method is widely used in qualitative research to identify, analyse, and interpret patterns within data. The analytical process involves several stages: data familiarisation, coding, theme development, and refinement. The study's theoretical framework guides the identification of themes, particularly the principles of fiduciary duty of care, proportionality, and accountability (Fox-Decent, 2012).

The application of thematic analysis enables a structured interpretation of how peacekeeping operations fulfil their responsibilities toward civilian populations. To ensure analytical trustworthiness, the study emphasises credibility, dependability, and confirmability (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The findings are grounded in triangulated evidence, and verifiable, credible sources support the interpretations. Furthermore, the analysis adopts a reflexive approach, recognising that documentary evidence often reflects institutional perspectives that require critical examination.

This study acknowledges several limitations. The reliance on secondary data may introduce potential bias due to differences in institutional reporting and interpretation. However, this limitation is mitigated through triangulation and the use of convergent evidence across multiple sources. Additionally, the study does not aim for statistical generalisation but instead seeks to provide an analytical and contextual understanding of humanitarian peacekeeping and its implications for human security (Yin, 2018).

All data used in this study are publicly available, and the research adheres to principles of academic integrity, transparency, and proper citation. Overall, this study offers a rigorous and contextually grounded analysis of the role of peacekeeping in advancing human security in conflict-affected environments.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Peacekeeping as Protection or Managed Insecurity

This study finds that peacekeeping operations, particularly the United Nations Mission in South Sudan (UNMISS), play a dual role in advancing human security: as mechanisms of protection and as systems that may inadvertently sustain forms of managed insecurity. This finding aligns with the study's qualitative thematic analysis, which identifies recurring patterns in secondary data on civilian protection, the governance of Protection of Civilians (PoC) sites, and local security dynamics.

At the operational level, peacekeeping missions have demonstrated measurable short-term successes. Thematic evidence indicates that UNMISS contributed to reducing large-scale violence, preventing mass atrocities, and providing safe havens for internally displaced persons through PoC sites. These findings are consistent with existing scholarship showing that peacekeeping deployments can significantly reduce violence against civilians under certain conditions (Bellamy & Hunt, 2023). In this sense, peacekeeping fulfils its fiduciary obligation to protect vulnerable populations, particularly through the principle of duty of care (Fox-Decent, 2012).

However, the analysis also reveals a structural limitation: the protection provided is often temporary and insufficiently addresses the root causes of insecurity. Thematic patterns show that while physical violence may decline, underlying drivers, such as weak governance, elite political competition, and economic marginalisation, persist or transform into new forms (Autesserre, 2021; de Coning, 2022). This reflects a gap between immediate protection outcomes and long-term human security objectives, as highlighted in the study's conceptual framework.

A key finding of this research is the emergence of what can be described as "managed insecurity." Based on the analysed data, peacekeeping operations tend to stabilise conflict environments without fundamentally transforming them. In South Sudan, PoC sites illustrate this dynamic. While they provide critical protection from violence, they also function as semi-permanent governance spaces characterised by dependency on humanitarian aid, limited economic opportunities, and complex internal security arrangements. This supports the argument that peacekeeping can simultaneously reduce immediate threats while institutionalising new forms of vulnerability (de Coning, 2022).

From a fiduciary perspective, this raises important questions about accountability and proportionality in peacekeeping practice. Although UNMISS acts to protect civilians, the persistence of insecurity within and around PoC sites suggests that the fulfilment of fiduciary duties remains partial. Thematic analysis reveals inconsistencies between normative commitments to human security and operational realities on the ground, particularly regarding governance capacity and long-term resilience.

Furthermore, the findings show that peacekeeping interventions reshape local power dynamics. By assuming roles in security provision, humanitarian coordination, and governance, peacekeeping missions extend their influence beyond their traditional mandates. This transformation reflects a shift from neutral intervention to embedded governance, where international actors become part of the political and institutional landscape (Autesserre, 2021). As a result, local ownership may be constrained, and dependency on external actors may increase.

In line with the human security framework, this study emphasises that security must be understood as more than the absence of violence. Human security includes economic stability, political inclusion, and social resilience (Koundouri & Dellis, 2023). The findings demonstrate that, despite the presence of peacekeeping forces, significant vulnerabilities persist in these areas in South Sudan. This indicates that peacekeeping contributes to “security in form” but not always “security in substance.”

Overall, the study concludes that peacekeeping operations do not fully resolve insecurity but rather manage it within certain limits. The qualitative evidence suggests that UNMISS mitigates immediate risks and provides essential protection, yet it does not fundamentally alter the structural conditions that produce insecurity. This reinforces the study’s central argument: peacekeeping should be understood not only as a tool of protection but also as a mechanism that governs instability.

CONCLUSION

This study examined the impact of humanitarian peacekeeping on human security through a case study of the United Nations Mission in South Sudan (UNMISS) from 2013 to 2021. Drawing on qualitative thematic analysis and guided by the Fiduciary Theory of Humanitarian Intervention, the findings demonstrate that peacekeeping operations function primarily as mechanisms of crisis management rather than as instruments of structural transformation in human security.

Consistent with the study’s findings, UNMISS has played a significant role in protecting civilians, particularly through the establishment of Protection of Civilians (PoC) sites and support for displaced populations. These interventions reflect the fulfilment of fiduciary obligations, especially the duty of care toward vulnerable populations. However, the effectiveness of these efforts remains limited in scope and duration due to persistent governance weaknesses, resource constraints, and ongoing insecurity within and around protected areas.

At a deeper level, this study finds that peacekeeping operations have unfolded within a context of enduring elite political competition and fragile institutional structures. While peacekeeping has contributed to stabilising immediate crises, it has not substantially addressed the structural drivers of human insecurity, including militarised politics, weak state legitimacy, and community-level vulnerabilities. As a result, peacekeeping interventions tend to manage, rather than resolve, insecurity.

The findings reinforce the central argument that humanitarian peacekeeping in South Sudan has been “practically important but strategically limited.” While it has mitigated the most visible and urgent threats to civilian safety, it has not significantly transformed the underlying political, social, and economic conditions that sustain insecurity. This supports the concept of “managed

insecurity,” where stability is maintained without fundamental change in the structures that produce conflict.

In line with the human security framework, this study emphasises that sustainable peace requires more than the absence of violence. It necessitates inclusive governance, economic opportunity, and community resilience. Therefore, moving beyond the protection of civilians requires a rethinking of the relationship between intervention, power, and security. Peacekeeping missions must be complemented by long-term, locally grounded peacebuilding strategies that address the root causes of insecurity.

In conclusion, while peacekeeping remains essential in responding to humanitarian crises, its current form is insufficient to resolve the broader human security dilemma without a shift toward more integrated and transformative approaches. Peacekeeping operations risk continuing to stabilise crises without resolving them.

REFERENCES

- Abdulkhaev, A. (2024). *Deepening The Notion of Security: Using the Human Security Approach to Better Account for Security in the 21st Century* (Doctoral dissertation, Central European University).
- Akinbi, I. J. (2025). Transformative Governance for Peacebuilding: Bridging Institutional Accountability and Equitable Development in Post-Conflict Societies. *International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews*, 6(5), 6470–6487.
- Al-Zahrawi, R. T. N. (2024). 1 The Evolution of Humanitarian Ethics: Revitalised Principles in the Modern Era. *International Journal for Humanitarian Studies*, 5(13), 3–33.
- Aning, K. (2024). Responses to insecurity in Africa: the challenge of peacebuilding. Uppsala universitet; Nordiska Afrikainstitutet.
- Autesserre, S. (2014). *Peaceland: Conflict resolution and the everyday politics of international intervention*. Cambridge University Press.
- Autesserre, S. (2021). *The frontlines of peace: An insider’s guide to changing the world*. Oxford University Press.
- Bellamy, A. J., & Hunt, C. T. (2023). Using force to protect civilians in UN peacekeeping. In *Survival June-July 2021: Ending Endless Wars?* (pp. 143–169). Routledge.
- Berg, L. A. (2022). *Governing security after war: The politics of institutional change in the security sector*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Bourgeois, H., & Labuda, P. I. (2023). When May UN Peacekeepers Use Lethal Force to Protect Civilians? Reconciling Threats to Civilians, Imminence, and the Right to Life. *Journal of Conflict and Security Law*, 28(1), 1–65.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2023). Toward good practice in thematic analysis: Avoiding common problems and be (com) ing a knowing researcher. *International Journal of Transgender Health*, 24(1), 1–6.
- Cederman, L.-E., Wimmer, A., & Min, B. (2010). Why do ethnic groups rebel? *World Politics*, 62(1), 87–119.
- Chesterman, S. (2023). Humanitarian intervention and R2P. In *International Organization and Global Governance* (pp. 573–584). Routledge.
- Collier, P., Hoeffler, A., & Rohner, D. (2003). Beyond greed and grievance. *Oxford Economic Papers*, 56(4), 563–595.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.
- de Coning, C. (2022). Adaptive peacebuilding and the limits of liberal peace interventions. *International Affairs*, 98(2), 567–585.
- de Waal, A. (2015). *The real politics of the Horn of Africa*. Polity Press.
- Denzin, N. K. (2012). Triangulation 2.0. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 6(2), 80–88.
- Diehl, P. F., Druckman, D., & Mueller, G. B. (2023). *When peacekeeping missions collide: balancing multiple roles in peace operations*. London: Oxford University Press.

- Donais, T., & Solomon, A. (2022). Protection through peacebuilding in South Sudan. *African Security Review*, 31(1), 51–65.
- Duursma, A. (2023). Peacekeeping, mediation, and the conclusion of local ceasefires in non-state conflicts. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 67(7-8), 1405–1429.
- Falk, L. (2024). Fostering Human Security: Analyzing the EU's Approach to Human Security in Nigeria.
- Fearon, J. D., & Laitin, D. D. (2003). Ethnicity, insurgency, and civil war. *American Political Science Review*, 97(1), 75–90.
- Fox-Decent, E. (2012). *Sovereignty's promise: The state as fiduciary*. Oxford University Press.
- Howard, L. M. (2019). *Power in peacekeeping*. Cambridge University Press.
- Hultman, L., Kathman, J. D., & Shannon, M. (2022). Peacekeeping and the protection of civilians. In *Handbook on Peacekeeping and International Relations* (pp. 210–224). Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Kaldor, M. (2012). *New and old wars: Organized violence in a global era* (3rd ed.). Stanford University Press.
- Karlsrud, J. (2015). *The UN at war: Peace operations in a new era*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Koundouri, P., & Dellis, K. (2023). Human security: concepts and measurement. *Cadmus*, 5(1), 28–44.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Sage Publications.
- Murid Partaw, A., & Demerew, K. (2024). Institutional logic of fragile states: Afghanistan and South Sudan in comparative perspective. *The Journal of the Middle East and Africa*, 15(4), 371–395.
- Onor, K. C., & Ndulue, J. C. (2026). Peacekeeping or Perpetuating Insecurity? Human Security Implications of Peacekeeping Missions in South Sudan. *PERSPEKTIF*, 15(1), 180–196.
- Owujie, C. (2023). *Post-war interventions and security challenges in South Sudan: A Case of Peace Process* (Doctoral dissertation, Kampala International University, College of Humanities and Social Science).
- Paris, R. (2001). Human security: Paradigm shift or hot air? *International Security*, 26(2), 87–102.
- Rolandsen, Ø. H. (2015). *Guerrilla government: Political changes in the Southern Sudan during the 1990s*. James Currey.
- Rotberg, R. I. (2004). *When states fail: Causes and consequences*. Princeton University Press.
- Sarr, F. (2022). Civil War and the Challenges Ahead in South Sudan. *Siyaset, Ekonomi ve Yönetim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 10(1), 53-70.
- Stewart, F. (2010). *Horizontal inequalities and conflict: Understanding group violence in multiethnic societies*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Tadjbakhsh, S., & Chenoy, A. (2007). *Human security: Concepts and implications*. Routledge.
- United Nations Development Programme. (1994). *Human development report 1994*. Oxford University Press.
- United Nations Mission in South Sudan. (2021). *Annual report on the protection of civilians*. United Nations.
- White, N. D. (2023). Protecting human rights in UN peacekeeping: Operationalising due diligence and accountability. *King's Law Journal*, 34(3), 463–487.
- Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods* (6th ed.). Sage Publications.