

Caux Dialogue on Land and Security

addressing the human connections between poverty, conflict and
environmental degradation

Caux, Switzerland, 10 – 14 July 2015

www.landlivespeace.org

Transcript for panel speeches delivered on 11th July 2015 at Caux Dialogue on Land and Security 2015, Panel on *“Building trust for collaboration – a precondition for scaling up land restoration. What can be achieved in strengthening relationships essential for governance and peace–building?”*

Dr Muhammad Swazuri, Jeremy Ive

Muhammad Swazuri

Dr MUHAMMAD SWAZURI is the Chairman of the National Land Commission of Kenya. He was awarded the ‘Order of the Grand Warrior of Kenya’ Commendation (O.G.W) by the President in 2004. Previously, he served as a Commissioner of the Kenyan Constitutional Review, CKRC and has held a number of academic positions. He holds a PhD in Land Economics from the University of Nairobi.

The examples which we will talk about in Kenya are reminiscent in other parts of the African continent– you can see from the graphs that were there that the African continent was on the receiving end in terms of the statistics which were being given. But there are certain issues which we need to understand. First of all, there is a heavy reliance on rain–fed agriculture, yet according to climate change, rainfall patterns are changing, and the volumes are also very unpredictable, sometimes it is very high and flooding, sometimes it is dry and therefore this destabilises the African farmer to a large extent. Then we have the issues of the land sizes. We have realised in most cases that the farm sizes are reducing. Even at the small scale order, because of the increasing populations and inheritance, but also because of

increasing numbers of consumers. How do we match that? It is a big problem, and then we also realise that people of the age of 30 and below don't understand what farming is. Very few of them actually visit farms. At the age of 20 you don't know anyone who does farming, other than reading about it in the classroom. So now who are the farm producers? Are they the old people, above 40, or above 50? Or who goes to farming- where does this population all go to after they finish school when they don't know about farming? Talk about water- the green water, especially. Most people are used to the blue on because it can be easily be seen, but taking out the green water is expensive, and distributing it is even worse. The fact that the focus is on to take it to where it is most needed, to urban areas, to industrialists, leaving very little for the farmer. Then we have the debate on how Africa can increase its food production. There is a new wave of investors, of multi-nationals, who are coming to Africa, to look for large chunks of land. There is debate as to whether, in modern tongues, that is land investment or land grabbing. How can we give out land to foreign investors when locals do not have enough to use. There is a debate in my country and neighbouring countries and some of these multinationals and companies are coming to grow food in Africa, not to feed Africa, but to take it to the Middle East, or other areas where the production is not as good. Then we have the problem of national water towers diminishing for obvious reasons, such as population increases, and also scaling up of human rights demands by civil society, which is one of the most important actors in this. On one hand we want to preserve water towers, whereas on the other side human rights activists are saying we need more space for the people. Then also we have the 10% national budget. We were in Ethiopia last year discussing this, and less than half of the African countries have managed to channel 10% of their GDPs to agriculture by last year. This means that the resources we are talking about, the state resources which are supposed to be geared towards African agricultural improvements are not forthcoming. Irrigation- where does the water come from? We want to irrigate, but where does the water come from? These projects also suffer the problem of information- the local people are usually not aware, apart from national announcements. The local people are not aware of this. And then where do you get such land from, is also another issue. Finally, there is a sector which is not being put in the limelight; pastoralism. This is a large percentage of African land; they need pasture, water and food. We cannot have this debate without putting across the demands of pastoralism. And most of the contestations about international land grab is because it targets land which appears vacant to the investor but is actually owned communally by pastoralists. Therefore the protests are not unfounded as such because you have to include

pastoralism in the question of food production rather than using their land in international grabs. Thank you very much.

~X~

Rev Dr Jeremy Ive

Rev Dr JEREMY IVE is the Director of Relational Peacebuilding Initiative, Cambridge, and an ordained minister in the Church of England.

I would like to present this model as a contribution to the combined thinking about the challenges which face us as an international community today. I am now director of Relational Peacebuilding Initiatives which is now a start-up getting back to the model which we were trying to work out before, and which seeks to apply the model in other national contexts.

It has often been noted that peace, security and development are indivisible, yet international interventions are too often reactive and ad hoc. The question is how are peace, security and development to be held together, amidst all the confusions of the post-soviet era and the rise of the forces which are tearing the world apart. The combined challenges of the contemporary international situation mean that more creative ways need to be found to face the challenges which confront us, not least those of climate change, which were outlined for us by Admiral Morisetti in opening this conference. The continuing failure to bring about peace and security has resulted in continuous setbacks in development, and indeed human catastrophes, of which mass displacement of populations is both a symptom and an effect. Formal diplomacy and the official channels too often reiterate the conflicting demands of the competing actors locked in a zero sum struggle with one another. It is here that I would like to express my considerable honour to share a platform with Joseph Montville, who first came up with the term 'type two diplomacy', because that is exactly what is needed. He explores possible solutions outside of public view, and promotes an environment, through the education of public opinion, which makes it safer for political leaders to take the risks of peace, as he puts it.

Precisely how this is to be mapped out is a matter of some discussion, and I can't guarantee that he will agree with the precise twists that I will give to it, but I am very grateful for the basic concept and the term, in fact. I would like to describe a

specific example of this; the Newark Park Initiative in South Africa. It ran from 1987 to 1989, it was a series of consultation bringing together carefully selected people, who were not themselves the standard bearers, but rather those capable of influencing the respective protagonists and those constituencies, with a carefully crafted programme of research, both in-house and commissioned. By bringing these participants to a neutral venue away from other participants, a safe space was created which allowed the systematically to grow in trust so they could act as catalysts to resolve critical sticking points in the process, and also to build consensus upon a principled framework which transcended party and other divisions -- indeed the ethnic divisions which cut across South Africa and which were hardened legislatively -- which they could all share. In this process we developed what is called the Newark Park method, bringing together people of influence in a safe environment, and feeding in carefully crafted research , initially largely prepared in house, and later commissioning key experts and reflecting the diversity of views, and we struck I believe on a crucial combination, bringing together the participants in touch with the protagonists, who could think through the long term alternatives , involved in building peace in an informed and open ended way. These were not merely dialogues, but also future focused research based consultations. They were taken beyond their positions to look at the facts of the matter and what the possibilities are. Initially, unbeknownst to us, this confidential process, looking into the future structures for peace, took place in tandem with a secret process, between members of the ANC, and others close to the South African government. The NPI helped to provide the long term vision while the secret process dealt more specifically with the modalities of the unbanning of the political organisations, the release of Mandela and the other political prisoners, and the commencement of other official negotiations.

The contacts built up in the programme later proved to be critical when, at the last moment, just when it looked as though the whole settlement in 1994 was about to collapse into violence with the exclusion of a third actor from the process, Professor Washington Okumu, from Kenya, provided decisive mediation which ensured the peaceful conduct of the first democratic elections. He had been executive director of the NPI. And we have repeated this in the context of post-genocide Rwanda, from 1990-1999, and only partially successfully in terms of this model- some amelioration in the areas of agriculture and justice, and I think we did make an impact there, but we didn't have the same break through effect that we did in South Africa, and then with much greater success in Sudan, from 1999, where our process meshed, eventually, it took some time to come with the track one process, resulting

in the crucial Machakos Protocol of 2002, later embodied and extended in the Comprehensive Peace Agreement worked out and signed in 2005, ending the bloodiest war of the late 20th century, in which over 2 million people had died. Strangely, largely unreported, again what our track 2 process contributed was a greater vision on what could be, and also greater inclusivity for those who had been left out of the official process.

In looking at the NPI it is possible to identify a number of key factors, and you will be familiar with these from Dr Schluter's presentation, so I will run through them very quickly as they applied to the process, and incidentally it also applies to the content but I am looking specifically at the process here. The principles of parity, mutual dignity and respect, directness, quality of communication, time and stability, multiplicity, breadth of knowledge of one another, and commonality- shared process and values.

Parity- the participants attended in their personal capacities and were treated equally- the fact that all the participants attended in a personal capacity meant that all the jockeying for power and influence was minimised.

Directness- it allowed for face to face conversation in a safe environment for the participants, allowing them to tell their stories to one another in a group session, and to build up trust through face to face conversation, and this was helped because of the confidential character of the process.

Continuity- it continued over the course of 4 years, with a core of participants building up their knowledge, but also drawing in others as it went along so that it cumulatively extended its reach and came closer and closer to the protagonists, and with the ability to influence them as well.

Multiplicity- all the issues were looked at systematically, but also during the process the participants developed a much better understanding of where each other were coming from- it allowed them to get to know one another, not just as interlocutors, but in the wider context, with all their backgrounds and concerns.

Really what was the basis of it all was commonality- the foundations of shared principles and values- all were committed to a peaceful and just resolution to the apartheid question on the basis of common principles. This bound the participants together, regardless of political affiliation, culture or ethnicity, into working together for peace within a jointly accepted framework.

To sum up- the key ingredients in a successful track two process along the models I am describing are to find and invite the right people, to nurture relationships, and to guide it by systematic research, for open ended yet principled consideration of the issues which need to be addressed for the resolution of the conflict concerned.

~X~

More information about the Caux Dialogue on Land and Security 2015 is available at www.landlivespeace.org.

In partnership with

