



Article

Ethnicity, Genocide and International Security

Akietuwopiribie Opuene Hart, PhD^{*1}

1. Department of Political and Administrative Studies, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Port Harcourt, Nigeria

* Correspondence: Akie.hart@uniport.edu.ng

Citation: Hart A. O. Ethnicity, Genocide and International Security. American Journal of Social and Humanitarian Research 2026, 7(3), 15-33.

Received: 08th Dec 2025

Revised: 10th Jan 2026

Accepted: 20th Feb 2026

Published: 03rd Mar 2026



Copyright: © 2026 by the authors. Submitted for open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

Abstract: The research paper explored the complex nexus of ethnicity, genocide and the general framework of international security and explained how ethnic identities are politicised to increase the level of genocidal violence in conflict areas, and how the process of destabilising the regions development. Its main aim is to examine the nature of the ethnic-based violence in the regional and international security systems and how effective the international mechanisms are in curbing such a crisis, especially the Responsibility to Protect (R2P) framework. The theoretical basis of the analysis is the Ethnic Conflict Theory developed by Donald L. Horowitz who argues that ethnic identity, resource scarcity and historical resentments entrenched in the past are the main factors which lead to interethnic violence. The study is methodologically qualitative as it uses a selected collection of secondary sources, such as scholarly treatises, peer-reviewed journal articles, governmental publications, and other credible international news outlets. The facts show that politicisation of ethnicity make mobilisation of collective identities directing to armed conflict an easier task, thus increasing the instability of the region, triggering a mass displacement, promoting growth of armed groups, and decaying state power. The inquiry also shows that international community reaction to ethnic genocides has been seen to be inconsistent and full of delays and this is because of a combination of political manoeuvring and institutional limitations. Furthermore, the study highlights the necessity to be more proactive and harmonised in international reacting to ethnic conflicts, to fortify international legal frameworks, to strengthen regional collaboration, and to make a difference by empowering local civil society organisations. Strong measures that have been recommended involve strengthening the application of R2P, enhancing regional cooperation on conflict prevention and empowering the activities of the grassroots organisations in reducing ethnic tension even before such tension turns violent. The study also suggests that veto power of the Council should be abrogated, or at least suspended, where the situations are dominated by humanitarian interests, to prevent mortal violence against unarmed civilians in the territories of the veto states, being like the ones in Sudan, Gaza, Ukraine, Israel, and Iran.

Keywords: Ethnicity, Genocide, International Security, R2p, Political Will, Regional Stability, Humanitarian Crisis.

1. Introduction

Ethnicity, which is usually regarded as a colorful blanket of common history, language and culture can also be a dangerous fault line in societies. Although it fosters a feeling of belonging, it can also disintegrate communities, creating divisions and conflicts. In some countries like Sudan, ethnic identity has been politicised to perpetuate violence, as in the case of the Darfur genocide where Arab militias committed atrocities against non-Arab communities, which triggered the mass displacement and suffering [1]. The politicisation of ethnicity often transforms the cultural differences into conflict sources. In

Sudan, tensions have been fueled and social cohesion has been undermined by ethnic cleansing campaigns against such groups like the Massalit by the Rapid Support Forces (RSF) [1]. These changes highlight the urgency to comprehend ethnicity as not only a cultural signifier but also as an effective tool that may bring communities together and tear them apart.

The responses of the international community towards such ethnic conflicts are varied and some of the intervention efforts are said to be intended to alleviate the situation but in some cases, they have the unintended negative effects. The initiatives that have been being conducted outside of Sudan to suppress ethnic violence are often marred by geopolitical interests and the dynamics that are deeply rooted in the area [1]. This fact underscores the need to come up with subtle measures that would take into consideration the complex interaction of ethnicity and conflict. Ethnicity in conflict is therefore crucial in the development of the strategies to strengthen peace and security. The examination of case studies, including Sudan, can help the scholars learn more about the mechanisms of politicisation and mobilisation of ethnic identities, thus informing the creation of more effective interventions and policies to prevent and solve conflicts.

Genocide is the worst kind of ethnic conflict whereby there is a systematic attempt to destroy a particular group of people based on ethnicity. The United Nations defines genocide as acts that are carried out with the aim of destroying a national, ethnical, racial, or religious group either completely or partially (United Nations, n.d.). These acts are murder, grievous bodily or mental injury and imposition of conditions that are likely to cause physical destruction of the group. Sudan is a chilling example of genocide as evidenced by recent events. The RSF along with allied militias have been accused of committing genocide against non-Arab populations in Darfur, with the use of mass killings, sexual violence, and forced displacement being the methods [1]. Such acts have elicited a lot of condemnation and international responsibility.

International response to the atrocities of genocide has been mixed. There are legal mechanisms (primarily the International Criminal Court) to seek the offenders, but often, political factors make it difficult to act decisively (United Nations, n.d.). This effect brings out the difficulties of translating legal norms into tangible interventions. The prevention, accountability, and support of the affected communities are multidimensional strategies of addressing genocide. Through the study of recent genocides, scholars and policymakers can generalise to prevent future atrocities and thus help the international community to keep its promise of safeguarding vulnerable groups.

International security is increasingly affected by internal conflicts especially those based on ethnic lines. The ethnic violence usually leads to the fragility of the state, the consequences of which go beyond the boundaries of the countries. As an example, the Sudanese war has not only ruined the country but also destabilised the neighbouring areas, triggering cross-border migration and extremist ideology [3]. Ethnic conflicts cannot be viewed in isolation, due to the interconnectedness of global security. The humanitarian crises caused by such conflicts often lead to resource-consuming international responses, which can put a strain on diplomatic ties and, in the case of the involvement of external actors with stakes in the conflict, further divide it and increase its scope.

The United Nations and other international organizations are in the middle of the stage in reducing the security consequences of ethnic violence. The goals of these organisations are to mitigate the destabilising impact of conflict on regional and international stability through peacekeeping operations, sanctions, and diplomacy (United Nations, n.d.). However, the effectiveness of these policy interventions depends on the political will of respective individual member states and also on the specific complexity that goes along with each conflict situation. It is very important to value that ethnicity, genocide and international security are interdependent aspects that cannot be treated in a fragmented approach that may not be effective in curbing the factors that have led to the

conflict. The international community can dream to achieve a safer and more peaceful world through building strong conversations, participatory governance systems and by improving collaboration.

The complexity of modern conflicts is enhanced by the fact that ethnicity, genocide, and international security are interrelated. When the ethnic identities are politicised, they are able to spark the occurrence of genocides, hence raising security issues around the globe. There should be a three-pronged strategy of conflict resolution including the resolution of tensions based on ethnic grounds, responsibility of those who committed atrocity, and the general security landscape. This need is confirmed by the Sudan case: ethnic violence and genocidal behaviour have not only destroyed the country but they are also posing a threat to the stability in the region. Although the reaction of the international community has done a commendable job, the response has not been proactive but has so far been reactive, thus highlighting the need to intervene and prevent in time.

Moreover, security is a global issue which means that ethnic conflicts have effects that spread way beyond their source. Such confrontations result in massive displacement, spreading extremist beliefs and destabilising of the neighbouring states among others. It, therefore, follows that the dilemma on whether ethnicity, genocide and international security has a nexus is not only a moral call but a strategic requirement to ensure that the world order is held together.

Statement of the problem

The phenomena of ethnicity, genocide, and international security are interlaced with each other, as they are in the contemporary world, defining the modern conflicts and humanitarian crises. Politicisation of ethnic identities tends to be in the form of the exclusionary practices hence exacerbation of tensions leading to the onset of violence. The Rapid Support Forces (RSF) have in Sudan been alleged to have committed genocide against non-Arab ethnicities, especially the Masalit, via orchestrated mass killings, sexual violence and forced displacement. The atrocities undermine communities and divide social fabrics, thus creating instability in the long run. The global reaction, which was at once condemned as slow and weak, puts strong question on the effectiveness of available machinery that aims at pre-empting and responding to ethnic violence.

The continued occurrence of genocidal acts even with the international legal frameworks and normative commitments highlights a substantive lapse in the international response to ethnic conflicts. Responsibility to protect (R2P) doctrine, which was devised to predict and avert genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity, has faced some daunting operational problems. The situation in Sudan is also case in point, with the United States declaring the situation as genocide in January 2025, even though evidence of atrocities was building up over time [4]. This procrastination is manifested in institutional ineffectiveness that is enhanced by the political factors and the conflicting interests of great powers, which often hinder effective and timely action. Failure to take immediate action against open warning signals not only contributes to the more misery of people, but it also weakens the efficacy of global tools which were apparently designed to protect vulnerable communities.

The effects of unchecked ethnic violence are beyond the borders of a single nation thus posing a very real challenge to international security. The ethnic separations often ignite mass displacement leading to refugee crises which put pressure on the neighbouring states and destabilize the regional order. The case of Sudan displaced over a dozen million people, with most of them fleeing to neighboring countries hence increasing tensions and humanitarian problems in the area [5]. Also, dissemination of radical views and emergence of armed groups in conflict areas further destabilise the regions making them a breeding ground of transnational threats. The inability of the international community to effectively deal with the nexus of ethnicity, genocide, and security therefore creates a threat to the upholding peace and stability in the world.

It is on this analytical background that this study was conceptualized to discuss the complex interrelations between ethnicity, genocide, and international security with a special focus on the recent events in Sudan. Through a systematic study of these interrelated problems, the study aims to make its contribution to a better understanding of the issues at stake and to suggest measures that will make international responses more efficient in preventing and reducing ethnic violence and its extensive effects.

The three research questions that guide the study based on the foregoing considerations are as follows: (1) What structural and political factors are impeding the timely application of the Responsibility to Protect in alleged cases of genocide? (2) What is the role of ethnic exclusion and identity politicisation patterns in the increase in violence in the modern Sudanese conflicts? (3) How can international institutions restructure their mechanisms to be more effective in dealing with the threats of unchecked ethnic violence to international security?

Ethnicity, genocide and international security are closely related issues that play a vital role in defining the modern conflict dynamics and humanitarian crises. Politicisation of ethnic identities is an ordinary practice that leads to the development of exclusionary practices, hence creating tensions and violence. To illustrate this point, the Rapid Support Forces (RSF) in Sudan have been reported to have engaged in genocide against non-Arab ethnic groups, especially the Masalit people, by committing mass killings, sexual violence, and forced displacement [1]. Such acts do not only destroy communities, but also destroy social fabric, which results in long-term instability. The reaction of the international community to such atrocities has been criticised as being slow and insufficient, hence bringing into question the effectiveness of the mechanisms that are in place to prevent and deal with ethnic violence.

The continuation of genocidal activities despite the existence of international legal systems and standards implies that the international community is doing very little to address ethnic conflicts. The doctrine of the Responsibility to Protect (R2P) which was developed to prevent genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing, and crimes against humanity has been challenged in its implementation. In Sudan, the United States took until January 2025 to declare the situation a genocide despite the fact that the evidence of atrocities was accumulating [4]. This procrastination is an indication of greater ills in international institutions, including political considerations and clashing interests of the mighty states, which are likely to hinder decisive and timely action. The failure to act in time to notice the apparent danger signals not only increases human suffering but also undermines the confidence in the international mechanisms that are designed to protect the vulnerable groups.

The outcomes of unchecked ethnic violence are not limited to national borders and are a grave danger to global security. Conflicts that are based on ethnicity typically lead to mass displacement and this leads to refugee crises that strains the stability of neighbouring states and the region. Over a dozen million displaced individuals, a significant number of whom have been forced to seek refuge in other nations, have been caused by the crisis in Sudan, which has aggravated tensions and humanitarian concerns in the region [6]. Moreover, the spread of extremist views and the development of armed formations in conflict areas only destabilise the regions, making them breeding grounds of transnational threats. The inability of the international community to effectively respond to the interrelations between ethnicity, genocide and security undermines the process of maintaining peace in the global arena.

It is against this backdrop that this study was conducted in order to examine the intricate interdependence between ethnicity, genocide and international security especially with reference to the recent incidents in Sudan. By analyzing these interdependent problems, the research will contribute to the better comprehension of the underlying problems and suggest more effective international reactions to prevent and

treat ethnic violence and its long-term consequences. The above led to the formulation of three research questions to guide the study as follows:

- 1) How does the politicization of ethnic identities contribute to the escalation of genocidal violence in conflict zones?
- 2) What are the limitations and challenges in the implementation of international legal frameworks, such as the Responsibility to Protect (R2P), in preventing and addressing ethnic-based genocides?
- 3) In what ways do ethnic conflicts and genocides exacerbate regional instability and threaten international security, particularly in neighboring countries and beyond?

Literature Review

Ethnicity

Ethnicity is a complex phenomenon that is instrumental in creating individual, group and society fabrics. It generally includes common cultural aspects, language use and historical accounts that define the identity of a group in a collective manner. The idea has received a strong academic examination in the contexts of sociology, anthropology, and political science, in large part due to its far-reaching consequences in respect of intergroup dynamics and conflict.

To have a thorough understanding of the concept of ethnicity, it is important to give a summary of the different definitions advanced by scholars each of which has provided a unique approach that identifies the fluidity and ambiguity surrounding ethnic identity. These contradictory definitions help to understand how the concept of ethnicity is changing and how it is used in myriads of ways to shape social relationships and political processes.

Ethnicity has a number of academic definitions. According to Barth, ethnicity is a social organization based on substantial cultural differences socially appreciated [7]. He contends that ethnic boundaries are socially constructed, thus, entailing differentiation and maintenance of group identities. However, his definition can be considered incomplete because it does not take into consideration the most important role of historical and political contexts which constitute ethnic identity [7]. Based on Barth, Weber (1978) defines ethnicity as a group of people who are united by common ancestry, language and culture. Although Weber extends the concept to encompass common cultural practices, he does not pay attention to the dynamic and changing character of ethnic identity (Weber, 1978). This leads to the need to have a more contextualized understanding.

Smith argues that ethnicity is based on the experience of collective memory and past experiences that unite people [8]. Although such definition foreshadows history, it does not take into account the contemporary geopolitical dynamics and the shifting nature of group membership through time, thus limiting ethnicity to predetermined cultural and historical characteristics [8]. On the other hand, Jenkins suggests that ethnicity is a socially constructed category that changes and develops depending on the experiences of a group of people in relation to the rest of the society [9]. This view is flexible to the dynamism of ethnicity but may be enhanced through a more profound analysis of external influences like colonialism and globalization that determine ethnic identities in the modern context [9]. Lastly Nagel provides a broader definition where ethnicity is seen as a self-identification process that is affected by internal and external forces- such as political, economic and social changes [10]. Although Nagel elucidates the fluidity of ethnicity, he is not able to explain the intersectionality of ethnicity with other dimensions of identity, including gender, class, and religion, which are central to the modern ethnic processes [10].

According to these divergent views, ethnicity can be defined as a dynamic, socially constructed identity that incorporates shared cultural practices, past experiences, and shared memory that are adjusted by internal group processes and external forces like politics, globalization, and historical legacies. It is a constantly changing identity that is often determined against other ethnic groups and is subject to the dynamic sociopolitical

context. This synthesis is sensitive to the historical and social dimensions of ethnicity but it is also aware of its dynamism in contemporary societies.

Genocide

Genocide is one of the most atrocious crimes against humanity, where it refers to the deliberate, methodical destruction of a national, ethnic, racial, or religious group. The conceptualization of the term was first coined in 1944 by Raphael Lemkin to refer to the atrocities of the Holocaust, but has since been extended to a continuum of mass atrocities globally. Even though genocide is commonly associated with mass murder, it is a broad term of devastating actions, such as severe physical or psychological damage, preventing birth, and forcibly moving children between groups. Genocide has been discussed by scholars in various fields of study, such as intent, group identity and political and social contexts that enable such atrocities, thus demonstrating the multidimensional aspect of the issue.

Lemkin described genocide as the mass extermination of a nation or an ethnic group using mass killing, cultural extermination and forced migration [11]. His classic definition emphasizes the vast scope of genocide beyond homicide, and it is a ruthless campaign that seeks to eliminate a group completely. However, due to the fact that Lemkin focuses on nations and ethnicities in quite strict terms, his definition might not be able to reflect the dynamic nature of group identities and modern ethnic conflicts [11]. Moses extended Lemkin by stating that genocide is not only physical destruction but also symbolic and cultural destruction of group identity [12]. Although this is a more inclusive perspective, it may obscure the difference between genocide and other forms of collective violence, such as ethnic cleansing, where the goal is not to eliminate the target population, but to displace it [12].

Stanton, one of the most outstanding researchers on the topic, outlined a sequence of steps in the genocide process, such as classification, symbolization, dehumanization, organization, polarization, preparation, extermination, and denial. His model prefigures the systematic process of a target population being systematically assaulted and destroyed. Although this is strong in explaining the sequential nature of genocide, this method might not be in a position to capture the immediate, violent nature of the crime and the complexity of international reactions to the continued genocides [13].

Chiot introduces the concept of genocide as a political policy used by a state or an organized group to kill perceived enemies based on their ethnic or social identity. He argues that genocide is a normal instrument of statecraft, which is used to centralize power by removing threats. Although such definition highlights the political intentions of genocide, it runs the risk of overemphasizing the role of state actors and ignore situations where non-state actors commit acts of genocidal violence [14].

Hinton provides a psychological explanation, stating that genocide is driven by a group of cultural and psychological factors that dehumanize the victim group. He assumes that genocidal activities are frequently committed in the name of ideologies that breed the us versus them mentality. Even though this approach sheds light on the psychological processes of genocide, it might not be sufficient to explain the geopolitical and historical circumstances that trigger such tragedies [15].

To crown it all, genocide can be defined as a planned, organized attempt to destroy, wholly or partially, a group of people on the basis of national, ethnic, racial, or religious characteristics. It goes beyond mass killings and includes physical, psychological, and cultural destruction by violence, displacement, and identity destruction. Genocide is revealed as a process that develops in phases, and it usually starts with dehumanization and ends with complete destruction or forced assimilation, and thus the complex historical and modern aspects of genocide are influenced by political, psychological, and cultural factors.

International Security

International security is a multidimensional and broad area of interest that is concerned with the protection of states, regions and the entire system against threats that may compromise peace, stability and sovereignty. In addition to its military connotation, security is political, economic, environmental and societal in nature and as such, it dictates whether the world is stable or unstable. The dynamics between the state and non-state actors influence the international security and represent both traditional and non-traditional threats. The concept of security has been changing due to the dynamics of international relations and scholars have come up with different perspectives that depict the intricacy of the international environment. To deal with the different dimensions of security, including the conventional military issues to human security, it is necessary to have a holistic approach that explains the numerous challenges facing the international community.

Waltz theorizes security in the realist paradigm, which states are mostly interested in maintaining sovereignty and territorial integrity. He focuses on the balance of power in the international system whereby states have military capacities to protect against the threat of rivals. This state-centric approach emphasizes the role of military strength and state competition; nevertheless, it has been criticized to ignore the increased importance of non-state actors and transnational threats in modern world security [16].

Baldwin has a more inclusive definition, and it describes security as the lack of threats to the values obtained. Baldwin includes other non-military threats like terrorism, natural calamities, and financial crises by going beyond a militaristic perspective. However, his model does not adequately describe how these threats are interconnected in an increasingly globalized world and the inclusion of wider concepts of human security that include individuals and non-state actors as central actors [17].

Lake expounding on Baldwin, points out the importance of cooperation and international institutions in ensuring security. He emphasizes cooperation as the means of addressing common challenges such as arms control, environmental degradation, and global health threats, hence, making security not state-to-state relations but transnational issues. However, the definition of Lake is not broad enough to consider global power imbalances and inequalities that define security dynamics [18].

Gaddis uses a historical approach and assumes that the focus of international security is to avoid war and promote stability in the international system. He supports deterrence, diplomacy and strengthening of institutions to restrain conflict. Although diplomacy is stressed, the views of Gaddis do not consider the emergence of new threats like climate change, cyber warfare, and human rights violations that require a multidimensional approach [19].

Kaldor introduces a vision of human security, which puts the emphasis on the individual instead of the state. She insists on giving more priority to the prevention of violent conflict and poverty and political repression and expanding security to encompass environmental crisis, economic inequality, and human rights abuses. The vision of Kaldor is a major breakthrough in the direction of a comprehensive view of the concept of security; nevertheless, it is difficult to implement such a broad definition in the current international framework [20].

Based on these scholarly discussions, the concept of international security can be understood as the efforts of states, international institutions, and non-state actors to maintain peace, stability, and human wellbeing across borders. It is a combination of military, political, economic, environmental and social aspects, which covers both conventional and non-conventional threats. Security is therefore not limited to the state level but it is transferred to human security which ensures the protection and rights of the people of the world. This synthesis combines the various aspects that characterize the global security environment armed conflict, terrorism, climate change, pandemics, and

economic inequality, and highlights the necessity of international collaboration and multilateral solutions in addressing these common problems.

Theoretical Underpinning

This paper relies on the Ethnic Conflict Theory by Donald L. Horowitz, which he presented in his masterpiece book *Ethnic Groups in Conflict* (1985). Horowitz is a renowned political scientist who came up with the theory to explain the origin and dynamics of ethnic conflict and especially in highly fragmented societies. His analysis incorporates the knowledge of political science, sociology, and psychology and thus provides an extensive platform of interpreting ethnic conflict.

According to Horowitz, ethnic conflict is a result of group identity, resource competition and historical grievances. He emphasizes the salience of ethnic affiliation as an effective source of group identity and is able to produce strong intergroup competition and conflict. This view is of special importance to the study of genocide, in that it outlines the way in which the perceived dangers to ethnic identity may end up in violent consequences. Moreover, Horowitz also discusses how political structures and institutions contribute to reducing or increasing ethnic tensions and thus enhances our understanding of processes that define international security.

The reason why the Horowitz theory will be useful in this study is its ability to explain the underlying causes of ethnic violence and its consequences on global peace. In line with this, the theory can be used to inform policymakers and international organizations on these latent causes of genocide, which will translate into more effective preventive and corrective measures which will be applied to tame genocidal activities hence increasing international security.

2. Method and Materials

The research methodology in this study is qualitative as it is going to analyze the interrelations among ethnicity, genocide and international security. The secondary sources of data such as textbooks, peer-reviewed journal articles, newspapers, government documents as well as international news sources offered extensive historical, political, and sociological accounts of ethnic conflicts, genocides and their implications to international security. This breadth of secondary material was very useful and provided a wide range of viewpoints and in-depth analyses that was needed due to the complexity and multidimensionality of the subject matter.

The data obtained were subjected to content analysis in detail, which is a method of qualitative research that is used to analyze the themes, patterns, and trends underlying the textual data. This approach allowed the researcher to critically analyze the material of the secondary sources, defining the main aspects, including the role of ethnic identity, the political reasons of genocidal actions, and the reaction of the international community to such events. The content analysis enabled a subtle interpretation of the role of ethnic conflict in global insecurity and the implications of the same on international peacekeeping missions and genocide prevention. The results were analysed to make meaningful conclusions on the connection between ethnicity, genocide and international security.

3. Results and Discussion

What is the role of politicization of ethnic identities in the intensification of genocidal violence in conflict areas?

Politicisation of ethnic identities has become a major issue in the increase of genocidal violence in conflict areas. This is a process of manipulation and instrumentalisation of ethnic differences by political forces to pursue certain goals, which in many cases results in marginalisation or extermination of perceived opposing groups. This politicisation of ethnicity turns ethnicity into a powerful political instrument, which

can be used to cause mass violence and atrocities. Therefore, it is important to know how politicisation of ethnic identities leads to genocidal violence to come up with measures to prevent and reduce such instances in conflict-prone areas.

Ethnic Identity as a Political Tool: Ethnic identity when politicised is a potent tool of political mobilisation and domination. This is the most pronounced in conflict areas where ethnic lines are further entrenched and used by political elites to gain strategic advantage. Ethnic identity is usually manipulated by leaders to strengthen their power by appealing to the perceived interests of a certain ethnic group. In this case, politicisation of ethnicity is used as a means to create loyalty and unity among the supporters of the leader, and at the same time demonise and alienate other ethnic groups. This manipulation is not only used to consolidate the base of the leader but also to legitimize exclusionary policies and systematic denial of resources, opportunities, and rights to the targeted group. As an example, in the Sudan case, the Arab dominated government has used ethnic identities to mobilize Arab communities against non-Arab communities in Darfur. The government successfully built a support base by demonizing non-Arab ethnicities as enemies of the state, which only contributed to ethnic tensions that resulted in widespread violence [21]. Ethnic identity is thus a divisive instrument, which is used to manipulate the masses to gain political mileage at the expense of social harmony and peace.

With the political elites fanning the flames of ethnic division, an us versus them mentality is created, further entrenching the divide between groups. Such divisive rhetoric is not just a way of social mobilisation but also a means of justification of exclusionary and discriminatory policies. When leaders frame one ethnic group as a threat to the security or future of the nation, it becomes simpler to justify violence and marginalisation against that group. In the Rwandan Genocide, Hutu extremists exploited the ethnic tensions that had existed between the Hutus and Tutsis, portraying the Tutsi minority as an eternal threat to Hutu supremacy. This story was used by the Hutu government to explain the systematic murder of more than 800,000 Tutsis in only 100 days as a self-defence measure [22]. The dehumanisation of Tutsis was made possible by the fact that they were portrayed as enemies of the state. In this regard, ethnic identity is used as a slogan that dwarfs the common humanity of all groups and transforms them into enemies instead of fellow citizens.

Moreover, the ethnic identity manipulation may lead to the development of violence, which will eventually lead to genocide. Political elites can create an ethnic enemy, which gives them a moral reason to destroy or expel the targeted group. Politicisation of ethnic identity is usually followed by genocidal violence since it offers a solution to political and social issues through the removal of perceived threats. The example of the Bosnian War in the 1990s shows that ethnic manipulation may result in violent consequences. The ethnic hatred created by leaders like Radovan Karadzic and Ratko Mladic based on the differences between Serbs, Croats, and Muslims resulted in the genocide of Bosnian Muslims in the Siege of Srebrenica in 1995. They justified the mass murder of Muslim civilians as a self-defensive mechanism to protect the Bosnian Serb people by highlighting ethnic and religious differences [23]. These examples indicate the role of politicisation of ethnic identities in the increase of violence where ethnic differences are turned into the reasons to kill and cleanse ethnicities all in the name of political domination. The connection between ethnic-based political mobilisation and genocidal violence is evident in such extreme situations, when ethnic identity turns into the instrument of power and the justification of mass killing.

Mobilisation of Ethnic Groups to Violent Purposes: Politicisation of ethnic identities can also result in mobilisation of ethnic groups to violent purposes where political leaders use ethnic differences to pursue their interests by use of violence. In this regard, the leaders tend to justify such violence as a way of defending the interests of the group, its survival or progress, and make it look like a defensive action. The targeted ethnic group is

positioned as a threat to the existence of the mobilised group, so violence appears as a response to the existential crisis. Such framing is especially effective in societies that already have historical grievances and ethnic divisions. In the Rwandan Genocide, the Hutu extremists portrayed the Tutsi people as an enemy that was going to destroy the Hutu political and social supremacy. They demonized the Tutsis as foreign invaders or an internal enemy that had to be eliminated to ensure the survival of the Hutus through massive propaganda [22], [24]. The rhetoric used by the genocide perpetrators is very important in the mobilisation of groups to engage in violent acts against the perceived enemy where violence is not only justified but also necessary to ensure the survival of the group.

Propaganda is one of the most effective weapons employed in the process of mobilisation of ethnic groups and dehumanises the targeted group. Political elites tend to use extreme propaganda campaigns that demonize the other ethnic group as subhuman, and they do not deserve the same moral treatment. This process is actually dehumanising the targeted group and turning them into a barrier or a threat to the existence of the mobilised group. The government and its allied Arab militias in the Darfur region of Sudan have systematically provoked the Arab ethnic groups to perpetrate atrocities on the non-Arab groups, especially the Fur, Masalit, and Zaghawa. The Sudanese government framed these ethnic groups as rebels and enemies of the state, which justified violent measures against them as the larger ethnic survival and national unity struggle [1], [21]. The government and militias could use the violence as a struggle between ethnic survival and destruction to gain support and involvement of ethnic Arabs who had not been involved in the conflict before. This dehumanising rhetoric and propaganda facilitated the justification of the mass atrocities that followed, resulting in a genocide-like situation in Darfur.

The use of ethnic groups to mobilise to engage in violence has a significant effect on the members of the group, making them insensitive to the ethical consequences of their actions. The more the propaganda creates a rift between the us and them, the more people will be inclined to think that the targeted ethnic group is a legitimate object of violence and thus the moral inhibition to engage in or support genocidal activities will be reduced. This moral disengagement process is important in the explanation of the perpetuation of large-scale violence in ethnic conflicts. As an example, in Darfur, the government promoted the Arab militias, the Janjaweed, to violently act against non-Arab communities. These militias were usually composed of young men who had been conditioned to believe that what they were doing was a necessary ethnic survival campaign by being constantly bombarded with anti-rebel propaganda and images of the non-Arab groups as subhuman. The same strategies have been witnessed in other genocidal situations where youths especially men are recruited and radicalised to perpetrate violence. In these settings, the involvement in genocide is presented as a heroic or a necessary action, which makes people more vulnerable to committing violent acts, which they would have otherwise refused [21], [23]. The influence of propaganda on the formation of the opinion of the masses and the guidance of violence cannot be overestimated, since it directly affects the perception of people about the legitimacy of their actions and the moral correctness of genocidal violence.

Institutionalisation of Ethnic Violence: Ethnic violence may quickly become institutionalised once it has been initiated, becoming entrenched in state machineries and social systems. Ethnic violence that is supported or enabled by the state usually acquires the legitimacy needed to continue and spread. In this case, governments can develop policies and systems that discriminate against some ethnic groups actively, so that the targeted groups continue to be marginalised and oppressed. These institutionalised forms of discrimination are usually not limited to social interactions but also spread to legal, economic and political systems so that violence against these groups is not only tolerated but also systematised and institutionalised. As an example, institutionalised ethnic

violence in the apartheid-era South Africa was reinforced by laws that legalised racial segregation and denied the non-white population basic rights. Such policies turned the state into an instrument of ethnic control, establishing a system in which violence was naturalised, which made it more difficult to eliminate. In the same way, in the Darfur region of Sudan, the systematic backing of the Arab militias by the government in their violent campaigns against the non-Arab ethnic groups institutionalised the violence, making it part of the state apparatus. The fact that the Sudanese government supported the Janjaweed militia in their attacks on the Fur, Masalit, and Zaghawa populations demonstrates how the state can be a driver of both direct violence and structural discrimination [1], [21].

Institutionalisation of ethnic violence results in the normalisation of the practices and thus becomes a deeply rooted practice in society. In societies where such violence is institutionalised, the rest of the population tends to be desensitised to the fact that it is happening. What begins as a specific, violent campaign can turn into routine events that are ignored or rationalized by the government. In the example of the Rwanda genocide, years of political mobilisation on ethnic lines led to the violence against the Tutsis being justified as a reaction to the perceived threat they posed to the Hutu majority. This story, coupled with the propaganda by the state, helped to dehumanise the Tutsi people, and the mass violence was not only tolerated but was institutionalised in the social structure. On the same note, the Sudanese government has employed violence to exert its authority over the non-Arab ethnic groups in Darfur, which has displaced millions of people and destabilised the region. The support of the state to the militias and the establishment of the political and social environment in which such violence was perceived as normal have enabled the atrocities to persist without any checks [21], [22]. These examples show how the state promotion of ethnic violence creates the conditions in which this kind of behaviour becomes a part of the social environment, and it is hard to criticize or eliminate.

The reaction of the international community to institutionalised ethnic violence is usually weak and delayed, and the violence is left to grow unabated. The absence of a prompt response or a serious action makes the situation worse, as it continues to torture the targeted ethnic groups. A good example of this is the Darfur conflict whereby, although there were rampant reports of atrocities, the international community was not quick to act with effective measures.

Even though international organisations like the United Nations and the African Union later came in, their intervention was delayed by political intrigues and the unwillingness of influential states to act decisively. The inability of the international community to intervene promptly enabled the violence to continue over the years with no serious repercussions to the perpetrators of the atrocities. This is also the case in Myanmar, where the persecution of the Rohingya Muslim minority was not condemned and intervened upon by the international community, even though there was evidence of ethnic cleansing and violence. This slow or ineffective reaction by the international community sends a wrong signal to governments that indulge in such activities giving them a feeling of impunity. The example of Sudan shows that the reaction of the international community may be insufficient to stop ethnic violence in case the violence is institutionalised, and in case the political or strategic interests do not allow immediate response [20], [25]. The continued existence of institutionalised ethnic violence is therefore not only a local phenomenon but also an international failure and political inaction.

What are the limitations and challenges in the implementation of international legal frameworks, such as the Responsibility to Protect (R2P) in preventing and addressing ethnic-based genocides?

The Responsibility to Protect (R2P) is a global political commitment endorsed by the United Nations to prevent and respond to mass atrocity crimes, including genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing, and crimes against humanity. Although it has been adopted, the

use of R2P has been limited and challenged especially in dealing with ethnic based genocides. These obstacles are as a result of a number of factors such as political, institutional, and operational limitations that undermine the success of R2P in preventing and responding to such atrocities.

Political Will and Sovereignty Issues: The issue of political will is one of the greatest challenges to the successful application of the Responsibility to Protect (R2P) especially by states that have a lot of geopolitical influence. The state sovereignty principle that states have the right to manage their domestic affairs without interference by other states tends to clash with the international community duty to intervene in situations of mass atrocities. Strong nations, particularly those that have economic or strategic interests in a particular region, often put national interests above humanitarian considerations. Consequently, they can either intervene selectively or opt to do nothing, even when there is clear indication of ethnic-based genocides. A clear case in point is the Darfur conflict, in which, despite the reports of ethnic cleansing and violence against non-Arab communities, the international community response was pathetic. Their political and economic relations with Sudan made China and Russia reluctant to take any stronger actions or even intervene militarily in Darfur [21]. Bellamy argues that the frustration is based on the failure of the international community to act in a decisive manner that would lead to the elimination of violence and increased the agony of the affected populations [26]. This scenario hence throws light on the dilemma per se of the Responsibility to Protect (R2P) in an overall international system whereby the interests and sovereignty of states take precedence over the call to protect the vulnerable groups of people who are the victims of mass atrocities.

The presence of the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) also underscores the ineffectiveness of R2P taking into consideration the dominant factor in politics. The five permanent members, including China, France, Russia, the United Kingdom, and the United States have the veto power, thus leaving the UNSC largely vulnerable to their mutual tastes and essentially approving R2P interventions. The very structure often leads to stagnation with one or a group of permanent members blocking intervention initiatives due to national interest even in the face of large-scale atrocities. It was quite notable when the Syrian civil war was ensuing and the UNSC did not approve substantial intervention despite reported use of chemical weapons and numerous violations of international law due to the vetoes of Russia and China, which had strategic interests that corresponded with the Bashar al-Assad regime [26]. The humanitarian crisis that dragged on in Syria therefore revealed the weak side of R2P since little substantial response was taken to end the disaster which had been going on several years. The inability of the UNSC to react appropriately in regard to R2P issues is another indication of how politics always takes the centre stage at the expense of humanitarian concerns hence the diminishing credibility as well as operationalisation of the principle. This case represents the dilemma that the international law has to achieve in balancing the state sovereignty with the need to stop ethnic-based genocide and other atrocities committed on a large scale level. The legitimacy of international interventions to crises is subverted by prioritisation of political expediency at the expense of immediate humanitarian need and continues to keep the affected people vulnerable.

Institutional and Structural Challenges: The institutional system behind the Responsibility to Protect (R2P) is also under a lot of pressure, especially in terms of the shortcomings of the UN Office on Genocide Prevention and the Responsibility to Protect (OSAPG). OSAPG is charged with the responsibility of overseeing and giving advice on the application of R2P but its capacity to shape state behaviour and to generate international action is very limited. Among the fundamental constraints is the fact that OSAPG does not have adequate resources and power.

The office works under the larger UN system and is frequently stymied by the politics of international relations, in which powerful member states can prevent or stall

effective action. The different degrees of commitment of the UN member states also weaken the effectiveness of OSAPG. To illustrate, the office can issue warnings and give advice on the possible threats, but it does not have the capacity to implement its suggestions or force states to follow them. This is the case with the Syrian Civil War where the UN, including OSAPG, failed to mobilise a unified international action to the rising atrocities. Even though the UN reports also indicated the violence and human rights violations, the international actors were divided, and political interests did not allow the R2P to be implemented [26], [27]. The inability to act due to the lack of political will and the limited powers of OSAPG are the factors that diminish the effectiveness of R2P in preventing ethnic-based genocides, highlighting the institutional difficulties in conflict areas.

Another major challenge to the effectiveness of R2P is the lack of a coherent and coherent early warning and rapid response mechanism to emerging threats. Although a number of efforts are made to prevent atrocities, including the Framework of Analysis of Atrocity Crimes developed by the UN, these tools are not always used efficiently and in a timely fashion. The Framework, aimed at detecting and examining the early indicators of possible genocides, does not have a coherent and accelerated mechanism of action. This inability to act in time usually enables situations to degenerate into full-scale genocides. Another sad case of this was witnessed in Myanmar where the signs of violence against the Rohingya Muslim community were overlooked. The UNHCR and other human rights organisations sounded the alarm several times regarding the discriminatory policies and violent rhetoric that were being used against the Rohingya, but the international community did not do much until it was too late. By the time the violence culminated in 2017, tens of thousands of Rohingya were killed, and hundreds of thousands displaced. The slow response of the international community to the situation in Myanmar shows the flaws of the R2P system, as even with the initial warnings, no quick and unified action was taken to stop the atrocities [26], [28]. This case shows that the absence of an effective early-warning system and a prompt response mechanism weakens the ability of R2P to defend vulnerable groups and stop ethnic genocides.

Operational and Legal Constraints: There are major logistical and legal constraints to the operationalisation of the Responsibility to Protect (R2P), especially when military interventions are approved. The inability to coordinate the activities of different international actors, such as states, military organisations, and non-governmental organisations (NGOs), which can have different priorities and capabilities, is one of the fundamental problems of such interventions. These coordination issues are usually complicated by the restrictions imposed on the mandates of the military which may limit the extent of interventions. R2P was used in the 2011 NATO intervention in Libya to save civilians against the violent suppression of opposition forces by Muammar Gaddafi. The intervention was first celebrated as a success, since it stopped a possible massacre in Benghazi and led to the eventual overthrow of Gaddafi.

Nevertheless, the operation soon went beyond its mandate, as NATO troops started to focus on regime change, which was not included in the initial mission that was authorised by the UN Security Council [26]. Such an extension of the mandate resulted in a long-term conflict that destabilised the region and has caused continued instability in Libya. The critique of the intervention points to the dilemmas of the necessity to act quickly to save civilians and the dangers of going beyond the limits of the mandate, which can only increase tensions and discredit R2P as a protective mechanism [26], [29].

The use of R2P is also legally inconsistent since the international community tends to react to crises selectively on the basis of political, strategic, or economic interests. This discrepancy weakens the universality of R2P and casts doubt on its legitimacy and efficacy as a global intervention principle. There are instances where there is strong international interest and intervention like the case of Libya and there are those that are left unattended

to even when there is a clear indication of mass atrocities. A vivid example of this selective application is the genocide in Rwanda in 1994. Despite the fact that there were major indicators of the violence that was about to happen such as the mobilisation of the Hutu extremists and the spread of genocidal rhetoric, the international community especially the UN did not intervene effectively in time to stop the mass killings of up to 800,000 Tutsis. The inaction in the Rwandan Genocide is commonly considered as one of the greatest failures of the UN and R2P, as the international community and the UN peacekeeping forces in Rwanda intervened too late and too little. This failure further demonstrated the inability of international law to deal with cases when political interests prevail over humanitarian interests, therefore, further challenging the validity of R2P when it is applied inconsistently or not timely [22], [26]. The Rwandan experience is a bitter lesson that the legal framework that supports R2P should be applied more uniformly, and not intervene selectively on the basis of geopolitical interests.

How do ethnic conflicts and genocides increase regional instability and pose a threat to international security, especially in neighboring states and beyond?

Ethnic conflicts and genocides do not remain within the boundaries of a country; their consequences usually spread to the neighbouring states and may become a serious threat to the stability of the region and international security. Such crises may result in mass displacement, the emergence of armed groups and destabilisation of neighbouring governments, thus forming a complex network of security issues that cross national borders. Thus, it is important to learn how ethnic conflicts and genocides contribute to the regional instability to create effective international responses and preventive strategies. Cross-Border Displacement and Humanitarian Crises: Mass displacement of people is one of the most direct and obvious effects of ethnic conflicts and genocides. When communities are running away due to violence, they tend to take shelter in the neighbouring countries, which results in major refugee crises. A good example is the Rwandan Genocide in 1994, when more than two million Rwandans, mainly Hutus, fled to neighbouring countries including Zaire (now the Democratic Republic of Congo), Uganda, and Tanzania. The humanitarian crisis was overwhelming because of the sudden influx of refugees, which host countries could not cope with the huge numbers of displaced persons. Refugee camps were hastily set up, yet they were in dire need of food, water, and medicine. The absence of proper shelter, as well as the unsanitary conditions, resulted in the spread of diseases like cholera and dysentery that killed thousands of people in the refugee population [1], [22]. The political and economic systems of these host countries were also overwhelmed by the influx of refugees who did not have the resources to take care of the displaced.

Moreover, the existence of armed groups in these camps, such as the genocidal Hutu militia, increased tensions, which resulted in armed clashes between refugees and the security forces of the host country. This brought about more instability not only to the refugees but also to the neighbouring countries that had to contend with the security threat of the presence of armed combatants in their countries.

Besides the direct humanitarian issues, the cross-border displacement may destabilise the neighbouring states in a significant way. The case of Darfur, Sudan, demonstrates that the refugee flows may have a long-term effect on the stability in the region. The current war in Darfur that started in 2003 has led to more than 3.1 million refugees and internally displaced persons (IDPs) that have overwhelmed the resources of the neighbouring nations like Chad and South Sudan. These nations, which are already facing their own economic and political problems, have had to shoulder the humanitarian burden, offering shelter, food and medical care to a huge number of displaced persons. This has overloaded their social services, caused competition over limited resources, and in other instances, increased ethnic tensions between the host populations and refugees. As an example, in Chad, which has a long border with Sudan, the inflow of refugees in Darfur

has contributed to the increased tension between Chadian Arabs and Sudanese refugees, resulting in land and resources conflicts [1], [21].

In addition, armed groups in refugee camps have resulted in cross-border insurgencies where some rebel groups have used refugee camps as launching pads to attack Sudan, further complicating the security situation in the region. The reaction of the international community to such cases has been in most cases slow and uncoordinated with little resources and the host countries have to bear a lot of the burden of the crisis. This absence of a full international support has worsened the situation of neighbouring countries and extended the misery of refugees. This inability to properly deal with the causes of displacement and offer sufficient resources has led to a cycle of instability that has been destabilising the region ever since.

Spread of Armed Groups and Regional Conflicts: Ethnic conflicts and genocides may play a significant role in the spread of armed groups that cross national boundaries and increase regional instability and result in wider conflicts. A good example of how such conflicts may spill over to the neighbouring countries is the aftermath of the Rwandan Genocide. After the mass killings in Rwanda in 1994, most of the perpetrators who were mainly of the Hutu ethnic group fled to neighbouring countries like Zaire (now the Democratic Republic of Congo), Uganda and Tanzania. They established armed groups in these countries, the most prominent being the Forces Democratiques de Liberation du Rwanda (FDLR) that still engaged in violent acts. The existence of these groups did not only present a security challenge to the refugees and the host countries but also was at the center of the outbreak of the First and Second Congo Wars that ravaged the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) between 1996 and 2003. These wars involved several neighbouring nations such as Uganda, Rwanda and Angola and were marked by fierce battles, gross violation of human rights and deaths in millions. The situation was also complicated by the fact that ethnic divisions in the DRC were used by both internal and external forces, making the region one of the bloodiest and longest conflicts since World War II [21], [30]. The presence of armed groups, which are created and maintained after the ethnic violence and genocide, also demonstrates the long-term effects of the first acts of genocide on the regional security, as these groups remain to destabilise the region.

In the same way, the weakening of the state power in the Sahel region of Africa has led to the development and spread of extremist groups, which further destabilize the region. Increasing insecurity has been experienced in countries like Mali, Burkina Faso, and Niger, mainly because of the existence of groups like Jamaat Nusrat ul-Islam wa al-Muslimin (JNIM) which has been involved in many attacks on civilians and security forces in the region. These Al-Qaeda affiliated groups take advantage of local ethnic differences, political instability, and socio-economic grievances to recruit fighters and increase their influence. They move through porous borders and avoid military action, establishing safe havens in remote locations, which makes it hard to contain their operations by the national governments and international forces. As an example, in Mali, the Tuareg uprising in the north left a power vacuum, which was later occupied by extremist groups such as JNIM, destabilising not only Mali but also its neighbours, especially Burkina Faso and Niger, where similar insurgencies have developed. These militias contribute to ethnic conflicts and promote violence among the various communities making it even harder to restore peace. Extremism and the emergence of transnational terrorism in the Sahel region have become a major security issue to the regional and international stakeholders. The unstable situation in Mali has attracted external forces, including the French army, and led to the creation of multinational organizations, including the G5 Sahel, but the continued violence indicates that such cross-border security issues are hard to resolve [31], [32], [33], [34], [35], [36]. The emergence of armed groups after ethnic conflicts and genocides not only destabilises the countries involved but also jeopardises the security of the region and the world as a whole because it allows the proliferation of terrorism and violent extremism.

Weakening State Sovereignty and Regional Governance: Ethnic conflicts and genocides can be very detrimental to the sovereignty and governance systems of the neighbouring states especially when external forces are involved [37], [38], [39], [40]. The assistance of armed groups, either by direct military action or by supporting local militias, may result in serious diplomatic tensions and cause proxy wars. As an example, in the Darfur conflict, the government of Sudan sponsored armed groups that not only acted in Sudan but also in the neighbouring countries of Chad and the Central African Republic. This foreign intervention led to instability in the region as it fueled the already existing ethnic conflicts and also triggered new conflicts in these nations. The situation was further complicated by the fact that Sudan supported rebel groups in Chad including the Sudanese-backed Chadian rebels, which resulted in border clashes and internal instability in Chad [41], [42], [43], [44].

The presence of external forces, including the Sudanese government and other militias, has often led to retaliatory measures and a complicated network of conflicts involving both state and non-state actors [1], [21]. Such external interference compromises the sovereignty of the neighbouring states because in most cases, they are not able to run their internal affairs without interference. It also puts a strain on diplomatic ties and these countries find it hard to collaborate in the quest of peace and security.

In addition, destabilisation of one nation may have long-term consequences to the neighbouring countries, resulting in loss of state power, lawlessness and displacement of masses. In the case of a country that is involved in ethnic conflict or genocide, the political and social systems usually fail and this leaves a vacuum of power that may extend to other neighbouring areas. The war in Syria, as an example, has not only resulted in the destruction of the governance structures in the country but also has had a significant effect on the neighbouring countries such as Lebanon, Jordan and Turkey. These countries have received millions of refugees, which has put a huge burden on their social services and has caused tensions among their own citizens.

Additionally, the disintegration of the Syrian state apparatus contributed to the unification of extremist groups, in particular, ISIS, on the territory, which complicated the destabilisation of the neighbouring states. Equally, the South Sudan war has witnessed the transnational arming movement of armed forces with the neighbouring nations like Uganda and Sudan being directly or indirectly involved in the war. This dynamic creates a situation of instability, where weaker states are more susceptible to internal and external dangers. In part, the continuation of this cycle can be explained by the failure of the international community to combat the causes of ethnic conflicts and genocides; more often than not, interventions have been reactive and have not addressed underlying issues of governance, ethnic inequalities, and the issue of state legitimacy [26], [29]. This has left the region languishing in instability and the future of long term peace has risen to be unclear.

4. Conclusion

Finally, the paper highlights the complex and prolonged consequences of ethnic conflicts and genocides, specifically, referring to Sudan and similar situations. Using the Ethnic Conflict Theory by Donald Horowitz, the study will reveal the way politicised ethnicity may trigger violence hence creating instability in the countries sanctioned and the countries analysed. The framework presented by Horowitz that preordains the impact of ethnic affiliation, resource competition and historic grievances offers an extensive prism according to which the specificity of conflict development and the role of these variables in genocidal violence could be investigated. The results confirm that ethnicity can be used politically to increase tensions and in the process, support the breeding of armed groups that, on the one hand, threaten national and regional security.

The findings of this study validate the fact that politicisation of ethnic identities is usually mobilising groups to pursue violent goals, which intensifies the conflicts in the regions. The national borders are crossed during such wars, which causes mass displacement, humanitarian crisis, and spread of armed groups which threaten international security. The case studies of Sudan and Rwanda demonstrate that institutionalised ethnic violence can become deep-rooted in the state and social conventions and thus begins a cycle of instability that is hard to eradicate. Furthermore, the ineffective nature of international processes like the Responsibility to Protect (R2P) that are hindered by political and institutional constraints and fail to intervene on time and in emergencies contribute to the prolonged and uneven reaction of the international community to ethnic genocide.

Based on these results, the research proposes a more subtle and active international reaction to ethnic conflicts and genocides. It proposes a multi-dimensional solution that does not only focus on the humanitarian needs of the moment but also on the political and social causes of the ethnic tensions. The international community should also strive to enhance legal frameworks like R2P and make sure that there is timely and coordinated response to prevent and respond to genocidal violence, which will eventually lead to world peace and stability. With the realization of the interrelationship that exists between ethnicity, genocide, and international security, policymakers will be able to come up with better strategies to curb the causes and effects of such conflicts.

The application of the veto power by the Western countries especially the five permanent members of the security council to not only defend its national Interests but also defend its allies even when there are pressing Humanitarian issues at hand should be addressed in the elimination of the veto or the suspension of its application when Humanitarian issues are at stake.

Recommendations

In accordance with the above findings and conclusion, the following recommendations were mentioned:

- 1) **Enhancing International Legal Frameworks:** To overcome the weaknesses of such frameworks as R2P, it is necessary to make them more effective, i.e. to make international responses faster and more coordinated. This is possible through enhancing the enforcement system of international law and ensuring that norms are universally followed, which would enable timely action in ethnic conflicts and genocides. The political will of influential states should also be addressed by the international community so that humanitarian issues are put on the first place rather than national interests.
- 2) **Encouraging Regional Cooperation:** Since ethnic conflicts and genocides are transnational, regional cooperation needs to be enhanced to avoid spill over of violence. The neighbouring nations should cooperate in the management of refugees, security and conflict prevention. International and regional organisations are expected to encourage activities that enhance dialogue among states, offer support in capacity building and mediate conflicts before they degenerate into full-scale violence thereby ensuring regional stability and avoiding mass displacement.
- 3) **Strengthening of Civil Society and Local Institutions:** There should be an attempt to empower local institutions and civil society organizations that are involved in conflict prevention and peacebuilding. The ethnic tensions can be dealt with by empowering these groups at the grassroots level before they become serious. This involves encouraging local projects that facilitate inter-ethnic dialogue, resolve underlying grievances, and offer forums of peaceful conflict resolution. Local actors are usually able to react faster to the emergent threats and help to establish long-term social cohesion and resilience.

The Veto power or the Limit thereof is required to be eliminated in the case of humanitarian issues and this will not only help the developing nations (such as the civilians of Africa, Gaza, Ukraine, Israel and Iran) but also the developed nations by preventing the inflow of refugees to their countries.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Human Rights Watch, “‘The Massalit Will Not Come Home’: Ethnic Cleansing and Crimes Against Humanity in Sudan,” May 9, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://www.hrw.org/report/2024/05/09/massalit-will-not-come-home/ethnic-cleansing-and-crimes-against-humanity-el>
- [2]. Council on Foreign Relations, “Conflict in the Democratic Republic of Congo,” 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://www.cfr.org/global-conflict-tracker/conflict/violence-democratic-republic-congo>
- [3]. Council on Foreign Relations, “Civil War in Sudan,” May 15, 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://www.cfr.org/global-conflict-tracker/conflict/power-struggle-sudan>
- [4]. U.S. Department of State, “Genocide Determination in Sudan and Imposing Accountability Measures,” Jan. 7, 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://2021-2025.state.gov/genocide-determination-in-sudan-and-imposing-accountability-measures/>
- [5]. *The Guardian*, “War in Sudan: Breaking the Silence,” Aug. 16, 2024. [Online]. Available: https://www.lemonde.fr/en/opinion/article/2024/08/16/war-in-sudan-breaking-the-silence_6716669_23.html
- [6]. *The Guardian*, “‘If you are black, you are finished’: The ethnically targeted violence raging in Sudan,” Jan. 10, 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://www.theguardian.com/global-development/2025/jan/10/ethnically-targeted-violence-raging-sudan-darfur>
- [7]. F. Barth, *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social Organization of Culture Difference*. Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press, 1969.
- [8]. A. D. Smith, *The Ethnic Origins of Nations*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1986.
- [9]. R. Jenkins, *Social Identity*, 3rd ed. London: Routledge, 2008.
- [10]. J. Nagel, *Ethnicity and the Politics of Identity*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2009.
- [11]. R. Lemkin, *Axis Rule in Occupied Europe: Laws of Occupation, Analysis of Government, and Proposals for Redress*. Washington, DC: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1944.
- [12]. A. D. Moses, *Genocide and Barbarism: The Question of Modernity in the Comparison of Genocide and Ethnic Cleansing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- [13]. G. Stanton, “The 8 stages of genocide,” Genocide Watch, 2007. [Online]. Available: <https://www.genocidewatch.org>
- [14]. D. Chirot, *Why Societies Collapse: A Comparative Approach*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2013.
- [15]. A. L. Hinton, *Genocide: A Comprehensive Introduction*, 2nd ed. London: Routledge, 2016.
- [16]. K. N. Waltz, *Theory of International Politics*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill, 1979.
- [17]. D. A. Baldwin, “The concept of security,” *Review of International Studies*, vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 5–26, 1997, doi: 10.1017/S0260210500000016.
- [18]. D. A. Lake, “Anarchy, hierarchy, and the variety of international security,” *International Organization*, vol. 50, no. 1, pp. 1–33, 1996, doi: 10.1017/S0020818300001262.
- [19]. J. L. Gaddis, *The Cold War: A New History*. New York, NY: Penguin Press, 2005.
- [20]. M. Kaldor, *New and Old Wars: Organized Violence in a Global Era*, 3rd ed. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2012.
- [21]. G. Prunier, *Darfur: The Ambivalent Genocide*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2015.
- [22]. A. Des Forges, *Leave None to Tell the Story: Genocide in Rwanda*. New York, NY: Human Rights Watch, 2018.
- [23]. J. Glaurdić, *The Balkan Wars and the Politics of Ethnicity*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2019.
- [24]. S. Straus, *The Order of Genocide: Race, Power, and War in Rwanda*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2015.
- [25]. *The Guardian*, “WHO says attack on Sudanese hospital killed more than 40 civilians,” Jun. 24, 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2025/jun/24/sudan-hospital-attack-west-kordofan>
- [26]. A. J. Bellamy, *The Responsibility to Protect: A Defense*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015.
- [27]. Stimson Center, “An assessment of the UN Office on Genocide Prevention and the Responsibility to Protect,” 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://www.stimson.org/2024/an-assessment-of-the-un-office-on-genocide-prevention-and-the-responsibility-to-protect/>

- [28]. United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), "The Rohingya Crisis," 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://www.unhcr.org/en-us/rohingya-crisis.html>
- [29]. R. Gowan, "Libya and the Responsibility to Protect: The consequences of intervention," *International Politics Review*, 2019.
- [30]. D. Keen, *Conflict and Collusion in Sierra Leone: Crisis in Governance*. Woodbridge: James Currey, 2017.
- [31]. International Crisis Group, "The Sahel: Time for a regional security approach," 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://www.crisisgroup.org/africa/sahel>
- [32]. United Nations, "Office on Genocide Prevention and the Responsibility to Protect," n.d. [Online]. Available: <https://www.un.org/en/genocide-prevention>
- [33]. United Nations, "Responsibility to Protect," n.d. [Online]. Available: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Responsibility_to_protect
- [34]. Amnesty International, "Why is the Democratic Republic of Congo wracked by conflict?" 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://www.amnesty.org/en/latest/campaigns/2024/10/why-is-the-democratic-republic-of-congo-wracked-by-conflict/>
- [35]. T. H. Eriksen, *Ethnicity and Nationalism: Anthropological Perspectives*, 3rd ed. London: Pluto Press, 2010.
- [36]. A. O. Hart, "Population, ethnicity, clientelism and political representation in the federal executive and legislative arm of government: A comparative analysis," *American Journal of Leadership and Governance*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 22–36, 2022.
- [37]. D. L. Horowitz, *Ethnic Groups in Conflict*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1985.
- [38]. Human Rights Watch, *World Report 2015: Sudan*, 2015. [Online]. Available: <https://www.hrw.org/world-report/2015/country-chapters/sudan>
- [39]. Policy Center for the New South, "Crisis in Sudan: A complex power play with regional implications and global stakes," 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://www.policycenter.ma/publications/crisis-sudan-complex-power-play-regional-implications-and-global-stakes>
- [40]. *Time*, "Sudan crisis: A global challenge," May 13, 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://time.com/7017127/sudan-darfur-crisis/>
- [41]. United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), *Global Trends: Forced Displacement in 2024*, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://www.unhcr.org/globaltrends2024>
- [42]. United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA), *Sudan Humanitarian Response Plan 2024*, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://www.unocha.org/sudan>
- [43]. United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA), *Sudan Humanitarian Response Plan 2024*, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://www.unocha.org/sudan>
- [44]. United Nations Peacekeeping, "UN peacekeeping chief warns that conflict in Sudan is spilling into Central African Republic," 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://apnews.com/article/6b61d480fbd617794332bda69657f1b2>