

University of the Bush
23-26 March 2009: Korke Kebele, near Finchawa.

SEMINAR 1, MOBILITY AND LAND TENURE: Katherine Homewood and Saverio Krätli

Welcome by Abb Nura Dida, Chairman of Oromia Pastoralists Association

Welcome. These seminars are being held in the Gujji rangelands, where herders live and graze their animals. This is an appropriate place to discuss pastoralism. The people gathered here are those who practise pastoralism in Ethiopia and Kenya and those who study pastoralism. The objective of this event is for these two groups of people to exchange views and learn from each other.

Session 1: Led by Katherine Homewood of University College London

This session looks at how Western scientists and observers understand what pastoralists do. It will focus on:

1. why it is so important for pastoralists to be able to move with their herds, why mobility is of central importance to pastoralists and;
2. access to land and land tenure - how it is changing and how it is affecting people's ability to move with their herds.

For much of the last hundred years Western scientists and Western administrators thought that mobility was a very bad thing. This is something that comes from our Western traditions, our Western environments and the way that Westerners manage their livestock in Europe. Westerners brought this knowledge to Africa. Colonial administrations encouraged the development of western livestock rearing systems in Africa. Even modern African nations started to adopt the idea of settling the people and of discouraging mobility.

Between the 1960s and the 1980s many governments in East, South and West Africa tried to discourage mobility. However it became clear that this wasn't helping pastoralists do well and in the 1980s scientists began to realise that mobility might be important to livestock production. Still though most national policies emphasised settlement, and there is something of a contrast between the views and goals of mobile pastoralists on the one hand and government policies of sedentarisation on the other.

In many parts of Africa, mobility is becoming more and more difficult to achieve – more land is being taken for private use and livestock have to compete with farming and areas set aside for conservation. Why is keeping the ability to move so important to pastoralists in the drylands? This presentation will discuss three things on the importance of mobility. Firstly, an overview of pastoralist peoples in different parts of Africa and how they use mobility. Secondly, how the different conditions of water and soil are understood by westerners to be important for mobility and thirdly, about how concerns about overgrazing and overstocking have effected government policies.

An overview of pastoralist peoples in different parts of Africa

Most of Africa is arid or semiarid and pastoralism is very important in those areas because the animals move to where there is rain and where there is production.

The pastoralists from Kenya and Ethiopia at this seminar are just part of an enormous range of pastoralist peoples across Africa. There are Moorish people on the west African coast, the Tuareg or Tamasheq people of the Sahara, the Fulfulde or Fulani people who range from West Africa through Niger, Chad, Cameroun and even into CAR. There are many West African groups who live on the basis of their livestock as do the people gathered here today. There are many different peoples in North-east Africa and the Horn, eg the Bagara Arabs and the Beja of northern Sudan, the many who are here, Somali, Oromo etc and in East Africa, the Masai, the Turkana, the Barabaig people of Tanzania and many many more.

As you move south from the areas occupied by Masai and Barabaig, you get into areas where tsetse and *trichomoniasis* is very difficult and there are fewer pastoralists. But further south, there are historically big pastoralist communities, such as the Shona of Zimbabwe, the Tswana of Botswana etc, but these people are not mobile any more because there have been so many changes in their history. As you move further round to SW Africa into Namibia you come back to people who are still pastoralists, the Dama people and the Herero people for example, who are still very much dependant on their livestock. So there is a huge variety of different ways of being a pastoralist across Africa.

People have been practising pastoralism in Africa for thousands of years. It has been practised in North Africa for 8-10 thousand years. As you get into Kenya, pastoralism has probably been around for 4 or 5 thousand years. This is a tradition that has a very long history. And people with that very long history know a huge amount about their environment.

How the different conditions of water and soil are understood by westerners to be important for mobility.

Western science understands pastoralist systems in terms of the interaction between rainfall and soil fertility. Areas that have very low rainfall and very low soil fertility, for example the W African Sahel, there is a very short rainy season of maybe 6 weeks and then no rain for the rest of the year. Because it is so short, there is enough moisture during that time for the forage to be of good quality and animals move there.

The other extreme is where you have high rainfall but low nutrient availability, so there are poor soils but high rainfall. In these areas, such as much of West Africa, Myombo in Tanzania and the Guinea Savannah, there is only very good pasture when the rains first start. As the rain continues, the pasture gets taller, courser and more fibrous and is no good for cattle, so it stays standing into the dry season. This standing grass is then burnt to increase the soil fertility.

Some areas have very high soil fertility and very little rainfall, especially on volcanic soils, eg the Serengeti in Tanzania. These areas produce the best grass in the world, but for a few weeks of the year, when everybody with livestock as well as many wild animals come to this one area to feed. But after 6 weeks or so, there is no more rain and no more growth and it becomes like a desert.

Finally there are areas that have high soil fertility and high water availability such as the Rift Valley highlands. You can do anything with these areas so there is a lot of competition for them. In some cases pastoralist peoples control them and in some cases farmers or other people control them. They can support any kind of vegetation depending on how you manage them. Everybody tries to control those areas because they are so good and in times of drought, they are a safety net.

In any one pastoralist area there is a mix of these conditions and people move so as to make the best of the forage available and avoid the risk of disease at different times of year and different seasons.

There are different conditions through time as well as through space. For example, grazing and browsing in one area allow certain seedlings to become established and they grow up into the sort of forest that we are in now, so different opportunities are presented to different generations at different periods of time.

Western scientists now understand pastoralist systems as making the most of this mosaic of different conditions of soil and water and as conditions change through time you move to make the most of that too. They have also understood that there is a big contrast between this and the way that westerners have managed their systems in Europe.

How Western systems have evolved – carrying capacity etc

This issue has often led to some misunderstandings. In Western conditions rainfall is much less variable. Climate conditions are much more predictable, so westerners have always tried to manage for stability rather than for constant change. They have tried to make the conditions right for the animals to stay in one place, so there has been a great deal of concern over the carrying capacity of a particular place and about the danger of over-grazing it.

Western systems have tended to think you can set a certain number of animals to use an area that receives a particular level of rainfall so as to get the maximum health and growth and so as to not damage the pasture. The understanding has been that if you go beyond that level then you get poor animal health and poor pasture, which deteriorates in the longer term.

Westerners have tended to see change as being bad. In particular there has been a strong western concern that variable environments are produced by putting too many animals on the range, which in turn causes over-grazing, the loss of good species of grass and forage, and erosion. And the belief was that this had caused decreased productivity in the long term.

However, over the last 10-15 years, Westerners have started to realise that what works in the very predictable and stable western environment does not necessarily work so well in the much more variable African environments. They have understood that the idea of carrying capacity - having a stable number of animals in a restricted space and not allowing them to move - may not be so successful in Africa; that if you don't know how much rain is going to fall, when it is going to fall and where it is going to fall, then you can't set the number of animals for a particular area as you don't know what is actually going to happen.

Western science has begun to understand that mobility and the ability to respond to unpredictable conditions is very important to African pastoralists and that rather than trying to keep to some ideal, average set of conditions which is the way the western systems work, African pastoralists have to respond to opportunity as it arises and that they use mobility so as to respond to that.

While in the west, the state of the vegetation is very much controlled by people, in African systems there are many other factors that are complicating the situation

- very variable
- variable amounts of wildlife grazing and browsing,
- occasionally epidemics of disease which affects both domestic animals and wildlife and which therefore affect how much grazing and browsing happens,
- different patterns of fire which in some cases is controlled in some cases not,
- successional stage as seedlings grow into small shrubs and shrubs grow into big trees.

Some of these factors are affected by the way people in Africa graze their animals but others are beyond the control of people and people have to live with them.

In sum, Western concerns in the past have focussed on trying to manage rangeland and vegetation condition for stability so we've worried about carrying capacity, the number of animals that can fit on the range and stocking rates. There has been particular concern about overstocking and overgrazing and an attempt to interpret changes to the vegetation as degradation. There has been a tendency to see the use of fire as very destructive, but now Westerners have started to understand that for pastoralist people the central concern is more how is the animal doing and whether conditions elsewhere offer better conditions for the animal. Over the last few years westerners have started to see the pastoralist logic and understand its value.

Nura Dida sums up:

The West[erners] [can] predict their rain and they get good rain, so they can manage their land according to their stock. They know the type of vegetation an area of land will produce and it is under their control. They will get their acreage of the land according to the size of their herds. So the number of the animals should not exceed the carrying capacity of the land – that is how the West manage themselves. They know that this herd size will not cause the pasture to deteriorate. Then they looked at Africans and ask, “Why don't they behave like Europeans?” They do not know how to manage their land. Now a change has come because Westerners have understood the patterns of rain, the areas with low rainfall, the type of vegetation [found in these areas] – that is why the issue of de-stocking and over-stocking is not an issue now, but the issue of movement is: They have now understood the importance of movement. Sometimes rain falls here, and then it does not fall for the rest of the year. So people have to follow the rain.

Questions

Q. Ibrahim Adano, Gabra from Sorupa, Ethiopia: These Westerners who settle and who do not move, who do not migrate with their animals – How many animals do they have? Is it a large number and are they kept in a farm?

Secondly, is there competition over land between crop farmers and pastoralists? Is the rangeland interrupted and disturbed by the farmland?

A. Homewood: If you go back 300 years in Europe, groups of people owned land in common. There were some areas for winter grazing and some areas for summer grazing. But about 200-300 years ago the 'enclosures' started, when wealthy people were able to exclude the poorer people. They formed very big estates where they could move their animals, but the others were pushed off the land. Those who were pushed off became very poor; some moved to cities and took jobs in cities, and some existed as very poor smallholders.

In Europe, the big farmers have tended to use the most fertile areas for crops and if they have them, livestock, which they manage intensively, feeding them grain from the crops and keeping them in a very restricted area. Then there are some small areas of hill-farmers who live more as pastoralists and move their animals in summer and winter, using the poorer quality land.

In Tanzania, where the state owns all the land, if you are a farmer it is very clear where your crops are and you have permission to grow your crops there and use it as your own land. But the state in Tanzania does not recognize grazing as an important function, so if you are a pastoralist and you need to move, you can easily lose access to that land because you are not there the whole time. The state recognizes that the farmer needs a piece of land to farm, but they do not recognize that the pastoralist needs a large area of land to live on. There are rights for the small crop farmer, and there are rights for the big industrial farmers and there are also rights for wildlife conservation areas but the pastoralist rangeland gets squeezed smaller and smaller.

In Tanzania many Maasai pastoralists have started to cultivate even though they know that the crops will fail because that is the only way that they can have some recognition of tenure of that land. If you cultivate, your use of the land is recognised, if you are a pastoralist, it is not.

Q. Nura Dida: Can you compare the actual size of animals in Africa and Europe?

A. Homewood: The areas that are used for livestock in Europe are very fertile and they have fertiliser added to them, so you have large numbers of animals in a small area and for three months of the year or even more, in winter, those animals are indoors and given cut fodder to eat. Those are very high-density production systems.

But then, in some mountain areas, like the Pyrenees and the Alps, there are systems which are more like pastoralists of Africa, where people go up on the mountain in the summer, and come back down to the valley in the winter. However their movements are very restricted and they are not productive systems. They are mostly kept for environmental purposes. The government pays these people to manage their livestock in that way because it preserves the environment.

Q. Sekko Mohamed Said, Afar, Ethiopia: I appreciate your presentation that previously many people misunderstood pastoralists and tried to impose their ideas and ways on pastoralists. Even the World Bank, whenever they suggest a project, it is

based on European thinking. The way we live suits us and is now being understood by the West.

A. Homewood: I am pleased if Westerners are starting to understand, it is a good sign. But scientific understanding is one thing, and government policy is another thing. And although Western scientists are beginning to understand the skills of pastoralists, government policies still tend to focus on much more settled, fenced systems with much less mobility.

For a government it is easier to deal with settled boundaries, so the idea of mobility is problematic for many governments.

Q: If the scientists have understood the way of movement and mobility of pastoralists, it is good for them. Then, the African governments, why can't they listen to the information given by scientists? Why are they still rigid on the policies of settlement? Is it that they do not want to hear or is it that they haven't received this information?

A. Homewood: I think it is several things and it is complicated. One part of it is that government is trying to integrate and bring to together the demands of farmers, the demands of wildlife conservation people, the demands of pastoralists and the demands of industrialists who may want big dams etc. It is also difficult for a settled government to think in terms of mobility and to be very accepting that their people move. It is easier to tax people and to educate people in schools if you have a settled population and the government sees that as its responsibility.

There are some cases in Tanzania where it has been to the benefit of a particular government official to forbid pastoralists to move into certain areas and then to lease that area to an industry or to an outside entrepreneur. So there can be issues of corruption as well.

Q. Ugass Hamud Sheikh, Madogashe, Kenya: Do these pastoralists in other parts of Africa from here keep camels?

A. Homewood: From what we know, there have been pastoralists in Africa for 10,000 years, but camels only arrived quite recently in North Africa, West Africa and the Horn, where camel keeping has become established over hundreds of years, maybe even one or two thousand years. But because they are a relatively recent arrival, it is only recently that they have been introduced in other parts. Samburu people in Kenya for example, have got camels and are good camel keepers now, but it is something that they learned over the last few hundred years from people further North. There are now also some camels in Namibia, in South-West Africa. They have been taken there and people are learning how to use them. They are not yet so skilled. These skills are coming from you and moving further South into Africa. Camels are very susceptible to diseases, especially *trichomoniasis* and that has stopped them getting further South until very recently.

Q. Ibrahim Abate, Oromia Pastoralists Association, Ethiopia:

1. When we compare the similarities and differences between the Western style of keeping cattle and the pastoralists, we see the intensive Western system and the

extensive systems practiced by pastoralists in Africa. In that case, pastoralists also have their own characteristics with regards to the reasons and purpose of keeping animals. In the Western case, rearing cattle is targeted to very limited purposes. But livestock for African pastoralists is many things. It means different things.

A. Homewood: It is true that Western livestock systems are usually very specialised. We do not have a lot of different species, just one species, maybe just cattle, or maybe just sheep. We do not have a lot of animals that come from different places with different qualities, we specialise on one breed. And within that, Western systems tend to specialise on one product: One animal is reared just to produce cast to give meat, or one animal is reared just to produce large quantities of milk, or another is reared just to be a draft labour animal for power.

By contrast, there are some African pastoralist systems that specialise but it is more common to find that people have many different species: cattle, camels, sheep, goats and each one has its virtues and its weaknesses. Each one gives a different kind of product: meat, milk, hides, manure - many different things that are all used. As well as all of those products, these livestock are important in African systems for social reasons. It forms the basis of the legal system - if you want to get married it involves livestock; if there is a law case it involves livestock, if it is a time of religious prayers, it probably involves livestock as well. There is a much wider and richer meaning to livestock in African pastoralist systems.

Q. Ibrahim Abate. The misunderstanding of pastoralists comes initially from the Western world. They tried to spread their ideas and change the mind of African governments because they had the power to do so. That concept spread within a very short period of time and changed the minds of African governments. Today, you [the Westerners/or Western scientists] realised that this is wrong and you start understanding and changing your mind, but still there is a problem with African governments. We have to find a strategy to address that because things for pastoralists are changing rapidly. The viability of pastoralism is under question unless the [African] governments change their mind and try to support pastoralists.

A. Homewood. Governments tend to be slow to change their opinion so scientists have a responsibility; they have created a problem and they need to do something about it. This is complicated because scientists are not good at politics. What has become clear is that it can be very useful for governments to claim that pastoralists are not using the land properly. It can be very useful for a government to claim that people's livestock management practice is bringing about environmental degradation because then a government can justify taking control of resources that are of value.

In some parts of Africa – Botswana, Zimbabwe, South Africa – this process has gone a lot further than here in East Africa. In those places, a lot of the land is privately owned, it is very difficult for pastoralists to move and the government has changed the system. There is much less mobility than you see here in Ethiopia. This is a system that can work, but will present problems especially with changing climates, because mobility is so important in coping with that. There are countries that have gone much further down the road towards government or private tenure of land which is difficult for pastoralist mobility. But with international awareness of why pastoralists need to move and with local awareness of people explaining it, then

national governments will have to listen a little bit if they are getting it from above and from below.

Q. Haibor Mogole, Rendille, Kenya: I do not know about Ethiopia, but in Kenya the government is not aware of pastoralists. The government knows only those pastoralists who are settled, they do not know the other ones who are in the bush herding their animals.

You have said that in Europe there are livestock owners who have livestock in an enclosure and those who are 'movers' between the hills and the valleys. They have agreements with conservationists that in times of stress the livestock are allowed to graze animals in the national parks and the government supports those who rear animals in the hill and valley. Sometimes we move to national parks during times of stress, and the government is very furious when they see pastoralists surrounding the parks, because to the government of Kenya, wild game is more important than livestock or human beings. This is our situation. Do European governments care for both pastoralists and their livestock?

During colonial times, the colonial government did not just leave the pastoralists to their own ways of land management; they helped us. The colonial government administrator would come and talk to the elders, telling them "During wet-season, please stay in this area. During dry-season, people are allowed to move to a certain area." People were not allowed to manage their land irrationally. Today, there is no planning. The planning system that the colonial government used to support the elders with has now disintegrated because the present government in Kenya tells people, "You are free people; go anywhere" – that "go anywhere" has distorted our system.

I am happy that western scientists now understand the importance of mobility, but the issue of the government making us settle has crippled our system and has even made old people not live as long. People used to live long because of that mobility – children, elders all moved together. They were all healthy because they got nutrition directly from animal products. Now, due to settlement elders do not receive enough nutrition because they only get given food aid, which doesn't include animal products. There is a serious dietary change, which is affecting pastoralists.

A. Homewood: On the national parks, in many parts of Europe, there is cooperation between protected areas and pastoralists. In the UK, for example, pastoralist land use is seen as an important part of maintaining a landscape that is valued by everybody in the country and also internationally.

An analogy might be the Ngorongoro conservation area in Tanzania, which is valued internationally. We know it is pastoralist use that creates this landscape and maintains it. There is a lot of cooperation between pastoralists and the government in those areas. But I would say that these are pastoralists who choose to live in a way that is perhaps less prosperous than for many other people in the UK or France. They like this lifestyle, but they voluntarily say "we will make less money, but we live this way because we like to do it".

Nura Dida: It is good to discuss mobility of animals and mobility of pastoralists so that we develop a common position on mobility. Are pastoralists mobile or immobile?

If mobility is there, can you explain its benefit and importance? If there is no mobility, what has stopped you from mobility?

Molu Kulu Galgalo, Gabra, Bubisa, Kenya: We are still mobile. Livestock depends on pasture and pasture cannot be found in one place. At times rain falls in one place and sometimes it falls in another. We move in search of pasture. Some types of livestock cannot stay for long in one area. Camels, for example, cannot stay for longer than 30 days in one enclosure, even during wet-season. For cattle also, it is important to be where there is enough pasture. It is good for animals to move longer distances to water, rather than to a grazing point. We depend on livestock for meat and milk. If they do not get enough pasture and feed, the people who living from the animals don't get meat and milk. If the situation is not suitable for animals, it is not suitable for people either. That is why the mobility is important.

Duba Wario, Merti, Kenya. If an area is suitable for livestock, it is also suitable for people. There are places that even if there is not enough pasture, are still very good for animals, and you can see their body condition improving. There are also areas, where there is enough pasture but animals do not do well. We look at all that and we can even move to a place where there is not a lot of pasture but animals become healthier and their body condition improves. Whenever we move, we observe the animal's condition after a week and if it has not improved despite their being plenty of pasture, we even go back to the place we came from with only a little pasture, but where the animal was better off.

At times, there is water containing certain minerals that help animals to strengthen their body condition. Water also forces pastoralist to move. It is not only about the availability of water, but also about the type of water. For example, when animals drink nutritious water it protects them from harmful pests. That is why movement is important.

Ugass Hamud Sheikh: If animals stay in one area for a long period, there are small insects found there. They suck the animals' blood and human beings'. They may also cause skin disease. In Somali, we call it *kukk-kud'a*, It is not a tick.

As Molu Kulu said, if camels stay in one place for more than one month, the camel will remember when it had good pasture some time back and will try to back there.

Eregey Hosiah Ekiyeyes, Turkana, Kenya. There are areas known to have plenty of water and grass - those are the riverine areas. During the dry-season, they move towards the rivers where plenty of water is available. During rainy season, they move from rivers to plains. There are areas known to us with salty ground so people move there to have their animals lick the salty soil. Another reason why people move is that your livestock will just force you to move just because they know there is better grass in another place. And these days, a very bad tradition has occurred these days of people fighting each other and this causes them to move to safety.

Guyo Ture Halake, Maikona, Kenya: I am 50 years old and I have been a herder all my life. I have cattle, sheep, goats and camels and all these animals require different management. One of the animals that supports our movement is the camel. The camel supports us because when we move we load elderly people and children on the camel

for transport. We have learned many things from these animals. For example, we look at the intestines of goats, sheep and cattle when they are slaughtered and learn a lot from them. The intestines can predict war, peace or rains. We tell each other about the intestines' predictions. The intestine can also tell you whether the rain is good, if the coming rains are going to be abundant or not and when the rains are coming, it will tell you whether to expect a drought. If people talk about mobility being bad for pastoralists, those are people who do not understand pastoralists, who do not know us. All our life and our prosperity depend on that movement. If people want to learn about pastoralism, they need to talk to pastoralists.

Emmanuel Lotim, West Pokot, Kenya: Mobility is important for pastoralists. All our great ancestors were mobile. When animals move, they move in search of either pasture or water. If they get enough water and enough pasture, you are sure of your animals multiplying. We always want to have hundreds of livestock, not just 10 or 20, because it is a source of food and livelihood. When people talk of conflict, it is because of this movement. We want to look for fresh pasture and water, but the other group also wants that pasture. Then there is conflict. In recent years, the young men and women move with the animals, and the elderly people have started to stay in one place.

Adan Kullo Tannu, Merti, Kenya. I came here as a youth pastoralist from Merti. Once the youth of Merti discussed the negative aspects of movement, that sometimes people move all their animals out of Merti for better pasture and then the town's people lack milk. We looked at alternatives and decided to buy a few goats that can browse near the river and provide milk. When we compare the animals that are moving and at those who do not, there are a lot of differences. We admire and appreciate those people who move – the animals are much healthier than ours. We also have goats that move with other herders. They get different types of plants and different types of water. The elders have always been telling us that there is some water that cleans the intestine system; it cleans worms out of the animal's stomach. These are reasons why the goats that move are healthier than those that don't.

Mohamed Guyo Tullu, Merti, Kenya. When animals do not move, they do not multiply, they do not get pregnant, they do not get on heat. Even if they get pregnant, they give birth prematurely. When they move from place to place they get pregnant earlier, conceive earlier and give birth to healthy calves.

Haji Diba Kiyana, Merti, Kenya. We have agreed on the importance of movement. Before they move, mobile people plan their movement based on previous observations. People sit together, they discuss and plan their movement. Even before movement is decided, they send surveillance, people who will check on the availability of water and pasture. People do not just move because they want to move. From Merti, Wasso, or Isiolo we can send a surveillance team as far as Moyale, and when the surveillance team comes back and reports back that there is enough pasture and water that is when the decision is made.

Nura Dida. There is a proverb that says that *when women are in maternity, they have a common pain.*

Sekko Mohamed Said, Afar, Ethiopia The Afar also move. There is no difference between us and the other pastoralists here in terms of mobility. We thought people do not understand and know us. But now that people understand us, people are now realising the way pastoralists live.

In Afar, one of the major problems is that the Afar people are being squeezed by both government interest in land and conflict. The Afar now have a serious problem getting enough grazing.

There is one way that we are difference from Kenyan pastoralists. They look at the animals' intestines to predict their future. We look at the stars. We are people monitoring stars. By looking at the stars we can predict whether there will be rain or no rain. It is by the stars that conservation of pasture for the long drought takes place. To predict war or conflict, we collect around 34 different stones and mix them to learn about up-coming attacks and fighting.

Without movement there is no prosperity for livestock. There are many types of movement, but I would like to narrow them down to two. The movement is dictated by the availability of both pasture and water. There are also different types of pasture that determine movement. There are some types of grass that are very weak and can even be blown out by the wind. We move to those pastures during the wet-season and livestock grazes there so that it is made use of before it dries. Once these are depleted they go back to stronger pasture that cannot be blown off by wind. We move to certain places only in wet-season because we have to make use of that area as there is no water [and grazing] during dry-season and we have to take care of our environment.

Ugass Mohamed Gurra, Gurra Domole, Ethiopia: Pastoralists usually move seasonally, according to the short rainy season, the long rainy season, the short dry season and the long dry season. There are places where the animals go for grazing during rainy season, and during dry season there are also places where animals graze. First, scouts are sent to identify the best places. Then the elders decide whether the movement will take place or not. These days, the movement pattern has changed. The major decision is based on where water and pasture may be available. This is my view on movement and mobility.

Khadija Hussein, Warder, Ethiopia: This morning the facilitator was talking about the difference between the Western climate system and the African climate system. We do not have wells in the area where we are living, only concrete water reservoirs (*birkett*) which are constructed for a large amount of money. In our area, the number of cattle is very small due to the difficult environment. The main livestock in our area are camels and goats. Sometimes, the camels are taken to very distant areas, sometimes even close to Addis Ababa crossing the highland areas of Eastern Ethiopia. We love animals so much. Sometimes it seems that we give more attention to our animals than to our children.

Comment. There are two types of water – one is water that supports families and livestock, the other is for livestock only and contains important minerals and serves as medicine.

Hajii Kassarau Jilo, Kereyu, Fentale, Ethiopia: I am 71 years old and I have seen many things. All my life, my diet has been based on animal products. I only started to eat things other than livestock products a few years ago. When it rains in a new place, some people are hesitant and do not want to move. Those who do not want to move lose their animals, and those who move are lucky and their animals prosper; that is what I have seen. When people in a certain area move while others do not and when they join together, those that moved their animals have plenty of milk, while the others have nothing to eat. When there is no rain and no movement, there is no pastoralism.

The European style and systems of pastoralism are different from ours due to differences in climate etc. If we learn about European systems, we shall pick aspects of it that will benefit us. We cannot be like Europeans, with the animals in enclosure, with fences and with ranches because of our environment. Unless we move or unless we get rains, there is no way we can survive, there is no way our livestock can prosper.

Haji Kararsa Guracha, Liban, Ethiopia. This meeting is very important because it reminds us of where we are coming from, where we are now and to think ahead focusing on [our] future. The issue I would like to mention is that we can only live on *finn*.

Dr. Boku Tache Dida, Ethiopia: *Finn* is a very complex concept. Sometimes you have plenty of everything – plenty of pasture, plenty of water, but the condition of the livestock does not improve. Pastoralists attribute this to a lack of something, and this something is called *finn*. Conversely, in absence of these essential resources the condition of livestock may still be very good, [the animals are] very healthy, very fat and they provide enough milk. This is called *finn*. The animal could be in a good physical condition and yet if they lack the *finn*, it means a lack of productivity. *Finn* describes a condition whereby livestock are in a very good condition, without even having good pasture and good water.

Tumal Orto, Maikona, Kenya. *Finn* could be either positive or negative. In 1973, there was an eclipse of the sun, and then pastoralists said there was a change of *finn* in the universe. Sometimes there is plenty of rain, but the animals are not improving. There is a low productivity, then *Finn* is negative.

Finn is about whether the animal's body condition responds positively or not. We use the word *finn* describing the [good] animals condition although there is no pasture and not enough water, but still the animals are very healthy, they are fat and they provide enough milk. We look at all this and we say we are in a good season, in a good condition. Movement is decided on the basis of *finn*.

Haji Kararsa Guracha, Liban, Ethiopia. Animals can communicate with people using certain behaviours. When animals are sleeping, there are ways for them to tell you that they do not like this area and they want to move. There is animal body language that tells you to move. They tell you where there is a good condition for the animals and when the rains are coming. People usually talk to each other about what the animals tell them, because are trying to say that their future lies in a certain

direction. Forget about people planning [for animals], animals can also tell us to plan for them.

People with the same mindset, the same herds and commonalities sit together at this gathering. We all talk one language [when it comes to pastoralist issues] although we are different people speaking different languages, but we have one commonality.

There is a proverb which says that all women in maternity have the same pain. When we Borana talk about livestock, we talk about “the three with sweet milk” which refers to camels, goats, sheep and cattle. We also refer to them as animals with cloved hooves.

What do camels and shoats live on? What do cattle feed on? What forces them to move, to look for pasture? Even human beings, when they eat pasta or rice for three days they need a change, they need another diet. Animals also need this kind of change, different types of pasture not only one species of grass.

The grass that is growing after a place has been burnt is sweeter and more nutritious for cattle. Just as liver tastes sweet, so is the grass that grows after an area is burnt to the animals. We usually manage our area by keeping the animals in different grazing patterns. We burn an area when we leave it so that there is fresh grass and good pasture when we return to that land.

Ibrahim Adano, Sorupa, Ethiopia: I have been managing livestock all my life. I have seen different people managing livestock in different ways. There are those who are immobile, there are those who are mobile. Those who are mobile are still prospering, and those who are immobile are almost destitute. The importance of mobility is what we experience, not what we are being told or information we got from other places.

Dr. Boku Tache, Ethiopia: Borana, Gujji and Gabbra pastoralists also move from place to place for ceremonies and certain rituals. The ritual is a symbol of that community – when Gabbra are in this ritual movement they move from place to place and it symbolises that these are Gabbra for example. This movement has its own recognition of tradition and conserving culture and tradition. Also, these rituals have a tremendous value and also strengthen the economic value of pastoralism.

Abraham Bongosso, Nyangatom, Ethiopia: Mobility is very important, but it can also have a negative aspect for the pastoralist community.

My people, the Nyangtom and our neighbours, the Turkana, Toposa, Surma and Dasanech all move with our animals. But when we leave our particular area, there is fighting because of competition over pasture and resources. A lot of lives have been lost because of mobility.

If we say we have to restrict the movement of the pastoralists it is like killing pastoralists directly, but if pastoralists move from place to place, how can they educate their children?

Rhamsy Chuol, Gambella, Ethiopia. In Gambella, pastoralists move from one specific place to another every year. Village A is always a highland [area], and during

the rainy season it isn't over-flooded and swampy. When the floods retreat in the dry season, we move to village B which is a swampy area, that has dried out after the rains.

There are tribes in the Sudan who come over to Ethiopia looking for pasture. They also raid our cattle and kill our people and this has forced the community not to move as previously from village A to village B, but to wander about in order to escape from death and raiding. They go far, far away from previous places. The insecure conditions [in Gambella] are very, very serious.

The other reason for movement in Gambella is that here in Ethiopia the government seems reluctant about how to treat our animals and how to control transmittable diseases. But on the Southern Sudan side there are people trying to improve the cattle's condition and helping pastoralists to treat or eradicate diseases. Therefore, Ethiopians move to across the border to get their animals treated. I do not know why our government is doing that and whether it knows the value and importance of these animals. But they eat meat, so why do they not know the value of it? I do not know where they want to get their meat from in the future.

Now a question: If we are to arise into federal level, how do you think we can approach the government to solve these problems that we as pastoralists are facing every day?

Nura Dida. People referred to mobility also in the context of conflict or war. This aspect of mobility has not much relation to the 'normal' mobility as it is running away from conflict and war; it is running for peace and safety. Mobility is related to a planned movement, but that other movement that is caused by war is different to normal mobility.

Session 2: Livestock behaviour and the Wodabe of Niger

Nura Dida: Today's programme will be on land tenure, but before we move onto that, Saverio will present and share his experiences.

Severio Krätli. I am going to talk about research I did in West Africa with Wodaabe pastoralists, a sub-group of the Fulani in Niger. The Wodaabe do many of the things that you have mentioned. In particular, there are two things that they do that seem to be similar. One is exploiting the quality of the pasture, rather than just looking for more pasture. Therefore in a way, by exploiting quality, they exploit the very characteristics of their environment – unpredictability. And that makes it unique in Africa and different from what we find in the West.

The Western scientists, even those who have understood the differences between these two kinds of environments, are still looking at unpredictability and the features of the African environment as a problem compared to an environment that is more predictable and stable, the environment they know best.

Even many, among those who now think that mobility is a good thing, still see it as the solution to this problem of unpredictability. But yesterday afternoon, most of you

repeatedly described mobility as something that gives you prosperity, not just the solution to a problem, not just the way to survive, but more than that.

When pastoralists have to settle for some reason, they might still be able to survive but those who keep mobile will have more chances to have prosperity by keeping livestock.

The Wodaabe do exactly that – they exploit the diversity in the bush using the animals that they breed and train. They exploit the unpredictability of rains, which results in different distribution of nutrients from what we find in more stable environments. To them the unpredictability of the very dry environment, where they live, is not a problem. It is what they produce with.

The dry environments are normally described as poor in nutrients. That is only half of the story. The other half is how these nutrients are concentrated. Where rains are very unpredictable, concentrations can be very high. Even if there are not many nutrients overall, you can find places where these nutrients are actually quite high, almost as high as in stable environments.

The most obvious is where there is grass because it has rained compared to where there is not because it has not rained. Western scientists have understood this well. But there are many other aspects of different concentrations.

We also know, and so do the Wodaabe, that within one type of plant, for example within the same type of grass, certain individual plants have more nutrients than others. And, of course, within the individual plant certain parts of the plant have more nutrients than others. We also know that the same plant will have more nutrients in the afternoon and in the evening than in the morning. Finally, certain combinations of different plants will help the animal more than just eating perhaps the most nutritious plant that is available in the area; it is not enough by itself.

The animals can eat from tree leaves. Cattle can eat from tree leaves, while camel cannot. Cattle can eat from bushes as well. Eating these different things works a little bit like for us eating pasta with sauce – it increases your desire to eat more, it increases the appetite and therefore helps the animal to eat more and to put on more weight.

As I said, the environment in which the Wodaabe work is very dry which means that for about 9 months, the animals only eat dry matter and lose weight. It is crucial that they lose as little weight as possible. If everything is fine, they then have two months of rain to eat as much green matter as they can in order to put on as much weight as possible. It is a small window and then they have to survive again for another 9 months.

If they lose appetite, it is bad news. Again, there is a problem of concentration, because if the animals eat a poor diet, they actually eat less. We know from certain studies that when cows are presented with very poor pasture, they lose appetite. Instead of eating more to gain the same amount of nutrients, they lose appetite, eat less and lose weight.

This emphasis on quality, I believe, is one of the things that have made it more difficult for Western science to understand why pastoralists are exploiting unpredictability and how unpredictability is actually not that bad for pastoralists in Africa.

The fact that the animals can select what they eat is very important to this system. The Wodaabe take their animals to where the best pasture and the best water is. But that is only half the story because the animals have then to eat the best part of the plant, and the best plant on the grass. There is no way the herder can force the animal to do it if they do not know how to do it already.

In order to know what to eat, they learn it. The animals learn it from one another – from the mother, from watching the other ones eating, from being in a herd that already knows. In order to learn and choose well, they must not be disturbed.

Somebody said yesterday that camels do not like to smell their faeces on the ground so after a few days they are not happy and want to go away. Cows are the same. They do not like noise and confusion; they do not like to be afraid.

They do not like competition with other animals. So if there is a lot of competition in the herd it disturbs choosing and eating. All these aspects that are associated with learning and with choosing are also associated with the fact that the animals are just living creatures – they have a brain, they have the capacity to learn and they have the capacity to have fear and to like and dislike things.

But when scientists in Europe started to first learn about animal production some 150 years ago, it was at the same time when machines were about to be used at a very large scale for agricultural production. When the scientists looked at animal production, they naturally thought that the best way to understand how animals behave, eat and produce within the system was to think of them as if they had been machines. This idea has lasted for a long time and is still present in the minds of many scientists in this sector.

If you can imagine, it is like understanding a cow as a machine to consume grass and to produce milk, like a car consumes petrol. What matters is how much grass you put in, and then you will have a certain amount of milk coming out. It is a simplification.

Here there is no room for quality. It is all about quantity. Machines do not have emotions, they do not choose and they do not learn. A production system like the one of the Wodaabe and yours, I am sure, based on the capacity of the animal to choose and to learn and reacting to emotions is very difficult to understand if you start from the idea that animals are machines.

Among the scientists not everybody thinks the same. There are different clans, just like among the pastoralists. That would not be a big problem if they talked to one another, but they often do not and this results in different groups of scientists having very good knowledge on what they work on directly, and sometimes not so good knowledge on other things.

For example, this capacity of animals to learn and to choose what they eat – some scientists are working on it, and others are not, within the same group [of people] who study how to produce with livestock. But the good news is that there are now some that are studying that. And to them this understanding that animals can choose and can learn how eat is very much the latest news, it is a matter of the last 10 to 15 years. These misunderstandings come from the fact that they do not work with pastoralists. They do not know that you have always had this kind of knowledge.

Finally, a little story from America. You heard yesterday that there are very intensive ways of producing livestock in the West that consist of keeping animals in buildings and feeding them with artificial fodder. This is a very costly way of producing that only works if you can sell your animal at a very high price. Some 15 years ago, small producers in the US did not find this system convenient or viable anymore. They decided to take the animals out of the buildings and back to the pasture. Then something very surprising happened: The cows were standing on this very nice green grass, but did not eat it because they did not know that they were supposed to eat grass; they had never seen it before. These were animals that have been living in buildings for generations and that have never seen grass before, they have never heard of it. So they were just looking at it, mooing, but not eating it. That is how some scientists thought that maybe there was something to learn there and they started to study this phenomenon of learning what to eat and then expanded it and started to learn how to teach animals to eat different things, but that is a different story.

Q. Wako Galgalo, Yabello, Ethiopia. I have a question related to my own experience. Animals select species of grass or plants to eat. There are places with plenty of grass but animals do not want to eat that grass. They choose areas with little grass and to collect dead grass instead of eating the fresh, standing hay.

And for you as the herder, the understanding is that animals have no brain. That is why they refuse to go to the big grass. This is confusion – to us, the big grass is beneficial to the animal compared to places where there is less grass. But animals concentrate on places where there is little grass.

A. Saverio Kratli: Animals do not know just because they are animals; they have to learn it like anybody else. There will be good herders and bad herders and there will be good animals in selecting the best bite and others that have not learned it. So it is a possibility that simply these animals do not know very much about what to eat because they have not learned it and they have not had the chance to learn it or they may choose other things from the herder. The only way to know is whether by eating what they eat, are they getting in a better shape, or not. If they are, then they are probably doing something they know how to do and that has some use and if they are losing weight, they are not very competent animals.

I worked with Fulani herders in the South of Niger, herders who do a bit of farming and also keep animals. At the beginning of the rainy season, everybody from the same village takes their herds north because the pasture is better.

Some come back as soon as the rainy season finishes, but some stay in the North for another 3-4 months. When I asked [them] why so, they said because some herds are not accustomed to eating the grass in the North after the dry season arrives; they loose

weight. But the others, they know what to do and on the same pasture, they gain weight. These are animals of the same village, of the same breed, of the same families.

Q. Molu Kulu Galgalo, Bubisa, Kenya: Animals will feed on what you taught them. Camel calves [for example], before they are being released to the larger herd, they are being fed at home. So when they are released to the field, they will go for the place that you taught them while they were in the enclosure. If you feed them on the other grass, they will look for that once they are released. If you feed them on leaves, they will look for leaves once they are released. We normally feed leaves to the calves and when they are released so they don't have to bend down to eat the grass from the ground. All animals will behave the way you train them.

Diba Adan, Sorupa, Ethiopia. We need to balance our discussions and consider all animals: Cattle, sheep, goat and camels. Maybe the Wodaabe only herd cattle, but when we are discussing, let us balance talk about shoats, camel and cattle. Today the camel provides the most support to pastoralists around here.

A. Saverio Kratli: I am aware of one study similar to mine on the Wodaabe people done among the Rendille with camels and arriving at very similar results. Although the knowledge that different species of animals may have and what the camels choose to eat might be different from what the cattle may choose to eat, but the principle, I think, is the same: The principle of exploiting; this capacity of the animals of eating where the nutrients are more concentrated and therefore exploiting the fact that in highly unpredictable environments you have these concentrations which you would not have in uniform, stable environments like in the West.

Q. Godana Jatini, Yabello, Ethiopia. We keep all varieties of animals – cattle, sheep, goats, camel, horses, donkeys and some even keep poultry. Among these animals, which one is the most preferable species for pastoralists; which is the number one?

There is a Boran proverb saying that those who plan for cattle, they know even how to plan for sheep and goats. When you are planning for cattle, you are already taking care of herd sheep and goat.

Murha Abekari, Afar, Ethiopia. In countries where goats were the first thing being bred, then people's favourite animal will be the goat. In countries where cattle are the first, it will be cattle, in countries where camel are first, it will be camel. But it will be always one of the four, never a donkey because donkeys are only supporting.

Question. You are convincing us that scientists are coming closer to where the pastoralists are. The skills, knowledge and information that you are documenting, how fast can it be until reaching the policy-makers, the people who govern us so that they also understand us and can help us on our situation. How can we be supported? Can this feed into development programmes?

Ato Nura: The first thing is that pastoralists are not being heard. Forget about this feeding into development programmes. The first thing is for pastoralists to be heard and understood.

Session 3 – Land Tenure, access to land and Control of Land

Homewood: Land tenure, access to land and control of land is something which is becoming a real worry for many mobile pastoralists.

I want to do three things. First, just to list the different kinds of land tenure; secondly, to give you an example from Maasai Land in both Kenya and Tanzania; and thirdly to outline some of the issues and worries that are coming out of the changes that we see.

Westerners recognise four kinds of land tenure:

1. Common resources - land that is held by a common group;
2. Private resources;
3. State land;
4. Open-access, land which is not owned and controlled by anyone in particular, it is 'open' to anyone.

Common Land

Common land is the sort of tenure that you are all familiar with. It is the traditional way of managing most grazing, water and fuel wood in many pastoralist societies. Under common land, the land belongs to the group and the group jointly own it, they manage it, they monitor it, they look at its condition and they police it, they enforce exclusion of outsiders if that is necessary.

Membership of a group is the group that you are born into; the tribe, or section or particular sub-group within a tribe that you are born into, or maybe you become related to them by marriage, or maybe by friendship or political negotiation you are adopted into that group. It is very flexible.

The size of the group might be quite small. For example, in Borana there is a wonderful example of common property resources with the Borana wells. There is a group of people who collaborate to maintain the well, to use it and to organise the sequence of use. That is a common property management group.

Access to the common resource is usually determined by the elders or by the leaders, but they do not own it, they look after the resource for their people. The wonderful thing about common resources is that often the management systems are very flexible. If one group has a particular shortage, they can come to another group and through offering a gift, a token of respect they can negotiate temporary access to where there is more of the resource. Common resources are a very good way of managing grazing, water and fuel wood in areas where the variability of the environment makes availability very unpredictable.

Private Land

With private ownership you have just one individual or maybe a very small group of individuals who have complete control. Because European legal systems are used to private property, very often national legal systems that Europeans brought with colonisation to many African countries support very private property very strongly; they support the owner to exclude other people.

You find private ownership in pastoralist systems as well. You may find someone who owns a particular tree, or a particular small well they have dug themselves or in Maasai-land, people create calf-pastures outside their homestead and that is a privately owned resource. It can be a good way of managing very predictable resources and people may control small areas or may even fence them but they know what they can do with that area because conditions are predictable.

State Land

In countries that were colonised by Europeans often the colonisers took control of large amounts of the land, especially the high-potential land. They gave settlers the right to settle on the land they took control of. Local people were allowed to stay in some areas, but the rights of determination over that land were often kept by the state.

From the 1960s, which was the decade of independence, different states in Africa took different parts and some of them, like Kenya, were very capitalist and they began to privatise a lot of the land that had been left for local people. Other countries like Tanzania were very socialist and the state kept the land for the people.

The 1980s was the decade of financial controls that the World Bank imposed on many developing countries and the socialist states had some difficulties managing all the land they had control of. It tended to go two ways: Either the socialist state started to lease large areas of land to get money from outsiders - they were no longer so much managing the land for the people, but managing the land to get money for the state - or the land became what we call open-access - uncontrolled and anybody could move in.

Open-access is always a problem. First, because you get conflict between different people wanting to use it where there is no system. Secondly, because it is very easy to over-use the resource as each one takes as much as he can get from it, while he can access it; so the resource can be damaged.

Here is an example on how Maasai-land is managed now on the Kenyan side and on the Tanzanian side of their common border. In Kenya, the process of privatising common land started very early, even before independence. By now, most of Kajiado and Narok districts are divided into 100-acre plots that are individually owned. There are some real problems with the process of privatisation because it is easily manipulated, either by leaders who have not got the interests of their people at heart or by outsiders who gain access.

The process of privatisation has left some people with private complete control of a particular area of land, but it has left many other people with nothing. It can also create a big problem for women, because the process of land registration is usually done in the name of the male household head. If he is a good manager, there is no problem, but if he is an alcoholic or a wastrel, his family loses everything. It has not stopped mobility, but it has made it more complicated because instead of negotiating with one group of elders, you have to negotiate with every individual land owner to go across their land or into their pastures if you want reciprocal access.

In Tanzania, there was a very different process. At independence, Tanzania became a socialist state and the president, Nyerere, wanted a process of villagisation – everybody had to move into socialist villages, including the pastoralists

The Tanzanian state did not like the idea of tribes and tribal differences. So, people were not allowed to say ‘I am Maasai, I want to be here’, if you were Tanzanian, you were meant to have the right to be anywhere in Tanzania, to settle anywhere in Tanzania.

This process favoured the farmers over the pastoralists because the farmers would settle wherever there was good water or potentially good soil, and the pastoralists, because they were moving, had less access. From the 1980s, villages have been meant to have rights over their own resources - over farming land and over grazing land. But in fact, the government only recognises tenure where there are crops. Increasingly, land is being taken by the state and leased to outside entrepreneurs, including conservation organisations, big agricultural organisations and development purposes like dams. The grazing lands because they are seen as empty and not owned and used consistently by anyone, so they are the first to be taken.

Even today there is a major wave of evictions affecting pastoralists across Tanzania, they are being pushed out of their land and not given other land to go to. When they are pushed out and they have to move, they are seen as the cause of conflict with the settled farming communities in whose villages they try to come. Normally, the press and newspapers are very polite about the government in Tanzania. But this situation has reached a point where they now call this the ‘national anti-livestock policy’.

In sum, there are some real problems that have come from these changes in land ownership. First, the change of tenure from traditional to colonial, from colonial to state, from state to private creates multiple layers of ownership, a lot of confusion, and a lot of conflict.

Second, there is a problem of maintaining mobility. Either pastoralists are being squeezed because of the spread of these leased enterprises, agriculture, conservation and so on, or else they have to negotiate with more and more people to maintain their mobility.

All of the tenure changes, whether in capitalist or socialist countries, seem to be disadvantages for mobile people. Governments often see grazing land as empty land. Pastoralists get forced into strategic cultivating – cultivating not get a crop, but just to show that they use that bit of land.

As far as we understand it, climate change will mean a greater frequency of extreme events – extreme droughts, extreme rains that will create more problems - or more opportunities if you like – but which make mobility more important, rather than less important.

Q. Wako Galgalo, Borana, Ethiopia. We have heard about Maasai group ranches. Are they based on clans, or are they area-based? Who owns the land? Which type is the most appropriate land tenure system for the pastoralists?

A. Katherine Homewood: Group ranches were based on communities of people who come from the same Maasai section, so they are closely related families. But before independence and the creation of the group ranches, the colonial administration moved many Maasai from Laikipia Plateau to southern Kenya, pushing rival sections of Maasai into a single area. When the group ranches were set up, they gave boundaries between rival groups that do not get on.

The Maasai group ranches were an attempt to keep some level of communal management but to turn it into private ownership by the group. So people would have title to that land, and could sell that land if they wanted. The problem is that the leaders of the group ranch did not always manage it in the interest of the rest of the group. That is why the rest of the group on group ranches are now keen to divide and get their own piece of land.

Regarding which land system works best for mobile pastoralists. In every group of mobile pastoralist groups across Africa you will probably find a mixture of common resources and some resources that are owned privately. But most of the pastoral resources are managed as common property systems. There are only a very few resources, maybe a well you dug yourself, maybe a gum Arabic tree that is very valuable and that you have planted.

Nura Dida: I visited group ranches in Koora, Kajiado District, Kenya, and I was told about how the clans owning and managing land together. When another clan has no pasture in their area, they come and discuss with the other clan [who have pasture]. The clan which owns the land commonly also manages the grazing pattern.

Q. Udessa Ture, Gujji Zone, Ethiopia. Is the socialist arrangement in Tanzania taking care of pastoralists? Is it that the pastoralist refused to accept that system and got out of the Tanzanian system since they are not part of the arrangement? Where are they in the arrangement of the land tenure system based on socialism in Tanzania?

A. Homewood: In Tanzania, the Maasai are very much part of socialism and there are many features of their society which work very well on socialist principles. But there are some particular difficulties. Tanzania does not like to recognise tribal differences. You cannot say 'I am a Maasai', or 'I am a Barabaig and this is ancestrally my area'. Tanzania does not like people to say 'I am a pastoralist and I have interest in common with other pastoralists'. Pastoralist NGOs in Tanzania are seen as political organisations and are looked on favourably by the government.

Pastoralists in Tanzania, including the Maasai, have faced difficulties about whether to educate their children. As a result only a very small number of pastoralist children have been educated compared to children of other groups. This has meant that pastoralists are not well represented in the Tanzanian government. And even if educated Maasai pastoralists become important in government, they sometimes leave behind the interests of their people.

The areas the Tanzanian Maasai have occupied for hundreds of years are extremely valuable areas. They are in the Rift Valley and have very high soil fertility and quite good rainfall. But they are also extremely valuable for tourism. Some of the most famous tourist destinations in the world – like the Ngorongoro Crater – are in

Maasai-land. So there is a lot of pressure from outsiders to get access to those resources, either to cultivate big farms for commercial purposes or to get tourist enterprises with high-paying lodges or eco-tourism services. There are many people interested in using Maasai resources not for pastoralism, but for other purposes.

Q. Ibrahim Adano, Borana Zone, Ethiopia: The idea of socialism in Tanzania was introduced by its first president, Nyerere. Since Nyerere – is it still the same president? - Is socialism still working in Tanzania?

A. Homewood: Nyerere died. He was much loved as a president, but he took some actions which had some very dramatic effects on Tanzania. After he ceased to be president, there was in a sense a regime change. From the mid 1980s, Tanzania saw major change imposed partly by global economic pressures, partly by the World Bank. Many countries like Tanzania were forced to move more towards a capitalist system, but the Tanzanian state kept control of land.

Q. Ibrahim Adano, Borana Zone, Ethiopia: There are people who tie animals to trees, for example, one or two cattle somewhere, or some goats. I have only heard about that. Have you as a person interested in pastoralism and experienced with pastoralist groups seen that anywhere? Is that happening to camels, too?

A. Homewood: I am not experienced with camels, but I have seen tethered camels in Sudan and in Egypt eating the stalks of sorghum and millet. That is all I have seen, but I do not know whether they have been permanently tethered, or whether it was temporary.

Q. Isaak Ibrahim, Bale Zone, Ethiopia: In Africa, there is no plan for pastoralists to be allocated a certain large area of land. There are no rights for pastoralists in land planning? What future do our governments hold for us?

Q. Abdi Da'ad, PCAE, Ethiopia. Pastoralists are not violating the rights of any other people; they are not violating the farmer's rights, they are not violating anybody's rights. Do we know any instance of pastoralists violating rights? What is the intention behind these governments to commit this violation?

Q. Sekko Mohamed Said: Pastoralists are forgotten. If we compare the farmers and the pastoralists, the government has always considered farmers in planning in terms of everything – marketing the crops, making sure there will be huge production, but there is no planning for pastoralists. I would like to give an example: People that eat *injera*, cannot eat dry *injera* without meat, without animal products. Why do they forget pastoralists while they cannot do without animal products. Even the children of those planning for the country, cannot do without milk. And this milk comes from the pastoralists.

A. Homewood: This is the biggest problem that is facing pastoralists across the whole of Africa, and in other continents as well, like in Asia for example.

From what I have seen most governments have a mixture of motives. Some are very good. They see that they have a responsibility to provide health services, and education services and transport – all of those things are more easily done for people who are in

one place than for people who are moving. They feel that they would be able to carry out their responsibilities if only people would stay in one place. In a sense, that is a good motive even if it may not be very practicable.

But of course there are motives that are perhaps less benevolent too. Particularly with rising populations and with outside investors coming in with a lot of money saying 'we would like to develop a particular enterprise in this particular place'. Some states are very tempted to accept that money and forget about the people who may be inconvenienced by it.

I do not have any magic answers for what can be done about it, but it seems to me that part of the strategy for addressing it has to do with education, communication and political representation. These are processes that have to work both ways: Educating pastoralist children so that they can speak for their people, but also educating government people so that they understand the benefits pastoralists are bringing to the national economy and the price that they will pay if those benefits are lost.

Secondly, if there is a strong understanding locally within a pastoralist group and between neighbouring pastoralist groups of this problem and if there is also a strong understanding at the international level, then the national government is somewhere in between and they will start to hear from both sides.

Perhaps there are also some possibilities for change and development within the pastoral system. There are some changes affecting the whole world at the moment which may impact on this. First of all, there are major economic changes affecting the whole world which will affect tourism numbers, they will affect the possibilities for investors to come and pay large leases for agro-businesses. Climate change is another global change, which could make conditions harder for farmers, but may open up opportunities for pastoralists. It is very difficult to predict, but what we do know is that very often economic changes, environmental changes open up opportunities for people who are well placed. People who are not well placed may suffer. It is important to be in the right position to take advantage of these opportunities.

Malicha Loge, Head of Zonal Rural and Pastoralist Development Office, Borana Zone, Ethiopia. I would like to present what the pastoralist production system looks like and what kind of problems the pastoralists of the area are facing nowadays. Then [I would like to] maybe brainstorm on the types of solutions we can think of as a way forward out of this problem.

This site here used to be a good rangeland, supporting pastoralist production. But now the rangeland is experiencing pressure from different land use types which are competing with pastoral land use, such as farming. People actually opt for farming as a response to, sometimes, poverty. Those who may lose their livelihood for different reasons, such as raids, disease and for different other reasons, may resort to farming. The ecological condition of the area does not suit crop farming. It is like gambling – sometimes you may harvest, but most of the time there is total crop failure. The bad thing is that these competing land use types are really making life difficult for pastoralists, because farmers are impinging upon pastoral rangeland.

When people fail to be successful in pastoralism they try other alternative livelihood means [strategies] such as maybe engagement in micro enterprises and/or small business in addition to farming. The increase of human and animal population is exacerbating this.

Another major threat affecting the rangeland is bush encroachment. This rangeland used to be a very productive, but now there are different Acacia species that are encroaching on the rangeland and they are reducing the quality and productivity of this rangeland.

There are competing paradigms with regards to what may work for pastoralism. On the one hand, there is a suggestion that mobile pastoralism should be maintained because given the ecological conditions, it is only when we maintain mobility that pastoralists will be able to survive and to produce their food.

On the other hand, there is a thinking being promoted as policy that pastoralists should be settled. It is often said that unless they are sedentary, it is very difficult to provide social services, marketing services and physical infrastructure. It is true that it is more difficult to provide social services to mobile pastoralists. But it is possible to adapt those services to the lifestyle of pastoralists.

In this particular Zone, a problem is emerging. There is a process of diverting labour from pastoralism into other services or other activities. The government is trying to organise unemployed people in the rural areas and tries to support their livelihood. That has already shifted labour from pastoralism to these activities. All of a sudden, the people find they are short of labour to look after their livestock. In order to fill this gap, children who go to school are leaving school to take care of the livestock. This is why in this particular year school enrolment rates have dropped in this Zone. On the one hand, there is an effort to support development; on the other hand this is bringing about unforeseen constraints.

Pastoralists are trying to respond to changing livelihood and to changing ecology through diversification. In this area, for example, we are adopting camel pastoralism. But there is confusion between different livestock species. The land which is frequently used by camels loses its suitability for grazing, for the cattle and sheep.

I am requesting this gathering to discuss this issue. Pastoralists are currently at a crossroads in terms of livelihoods and ways forward. On the one hand, there is a need for mobility. There is also the tendency to settle pastoralists. And both of these have their own advantages and disadvantages.

Homewood: This question is extremely interesting and extremely important. Pastoralists everywhere are experiencing diversification in order to survive, in order to manage their interests. Everything that Malicha said, I consider important and I agree with. I am keen to learn [about] people's experience about land issues. It should be two ways.

Boku Ganale [Borana Zone]: We are pastoralists. We move from place to place. Normally we stay in one area during dry season and if the rains meet us there, we move to another area. That is how our life is.

As mentioned by Malicha, way back there was no tree coverage. Now there are a lot of trees growing which inhibits the growth of other vegetation. There is also high population growth, both of livestock and human beings. These are important issues. And there is one good thing about them, which is that people are integrating with each other more now. But people from different backgrounds are in strong competition over resources because of this increase in animal and human populations. When they move from a certain place and they meet in a certain place, conflict occurs and people even fight over resources. We as pastoralists own land together and although it is becoming smaller, we own land communally. Land is becoming smaller because of other types of competition – not merely due the rise of livestock and human populations. And this may also cause conflict.

Even if land is owned communally, there is this fear that when people move from place to place and a certain area is left idle, others consider it as being empty land. And then that land may be given to a private individual. Even the land we are on today is already given to someone.

Ugass Mohamed Ugass Gurra, Gurra Domole, Ethiopia: I have seen the land use system [at Koor, Kajiado district] in Kenya. The land use system is divided between the rainy season and the dry season grazing land area. It was a good lesson for me. When we talk about Ethiopia, Ethiopia has got different regional states. Somali Region has nine zones and [approximately] 85% of the population are pastoralists. There are different land use systems within the region itself.

Unfortunately, we do not have a refined system like the Kenyans of using certain land in dry season, and other land in the wet season. Within the region, within the zones and within the districts, land use is based on clan systems. When you want to move from one zone or district to another clan area, you need to approach members of this clan and seek permission for grazing in this land. Within the zone, you also need permission from the elders.

The discussions between the elders are mainly focused on preventing conflict as pastoralists often fight over pasture and water. In order to avoid that, prior discussions should be conducted with the clan inhabiting the area and after the rain or after the pasture has recovered, the pastoralists who moved to the other grazing area should return to their clan land.

Once the decision is made, the information is communicated to all pastoralists in the area so that the decision is know and heard by everybody.

Q. Utukana Mallo, Hagaremariam, Ethiopia Ethiopia has many tribes. All these many tribes have no rights to land ownership. We started experiencing the recognition of pastoralists around 11 years ago. All arrangements of land are tribal based. It is the tribe or the clan who discusses how to manage the land, where to graze and where to farm. All tribes own the land communally. There is lot a lot of land division in Ethiopia, so every tribe manages its own land according to their traditional system.

According to the constitution of Ethiopia, the land belongs to state. It is only that we traditionally say that this land belongs to a certain tribe, but according to the

constitution, the land belongs to the state. Since the land belongs to the state, even if we say the land belongs to us traditionally, the government can decide any time to allocate the land to any other person or investor at its own will. We even fear that the government one day says you do not own the land here; you must move somewhere else.

Khadija Hussein, Warder Zone, Somali Region.

Within the Somali community, we help each other and work together. Whenever there is rain in one area, and there is no rain in our area, we are forced to move to other areas. The other communities welcome us. We communally use and we communally graze our land together. According to the Ethiopian constitution, land belongs to the state. We know that. But according to our tradition, the land belongs to us. The issue of recognising pastoralism in Ethiopia is at an infant stage.

Comment: This area where we are is called Borana Zone. Both the previous regimes and the current one called it Borana Zone. They named it after the Borana tribes. In other places too, the land is named after the tribe, like Afar, Gujji etc. We do not know why the land is named after these tribal names, as we do not have any rights. Any other person can come from a place as far as Europe, and can have access and rights to the land. Or someone born in Ethiopia, who is Ethiopian, can own land, as long as he is wealthy. They can say ‘This area belongs to wildlife, don’t go near!’ or ‘This is an area for oranges, don’t go near!’ or ‘This is an area allocated for sugar, don’t go near!’ The government just allocates land at will. When they name the areas after the tribes - it looks like it belongs to us, but it is just the name.

We fear two groups. We fear the wealthy group, the investors, and we fear the government people. Even after allowing us to have associations and accepting the name ‘pastoralist’, they still give away land at will. That is the government; that is the state. Even since the current government took power, the land is being given to foreigners and investors. We are even afraid when we see foreigners, because when they go around and talk to us they can get information and the same information might be used to evict us from our land. Although they are looking for ways, their main target is to evict us from our land and take everything. Whether Afar, Somali or Oromo – according to us, we all own the land together!

We have no rights over our land. We normally govern ourselves and our land through our traditional system. But this traditional system is not being recognised. This stick is mine. It belongs to me. But someone who is stronger than me can just come and take it away from me.

Murha Abekari, Afar, Ethiopia. There are two types of land ownership in Afar, two types of land use systems. When there was the Sultan in place, the land belonged to the Sultan and nobody else had ownership rights.

Outside the Sultan’s territory, people have control over land and ownership rights. As mentioned before, constitutionally the land belongs to the state and to the public. But that does not work in Afar.

There are private investors coming into the area and arrangements and negotiations are made according to which 70% of the income that is generated from the land

belongs to the investor, while 30% goes to the clan [who inhabit the land]. Or, maybe 300-400 ETB per hectare are given to the clan leaders, while the rest goes to the investor.

The Afar people force the government and investors to accept these conditions because it is a state or a private farm and there is no benefit sharing, the investor or the state know that the Afar will not allow them to develop the area for farming if they don't negotiate. They state cannot unilaterally give the land to investors in Afar.

For example, the government of Ethiopia wanted to develop 120,000 hectares of land for sugar cane plantations. Around 90,000 hectares were supposed to be taken from Afar region, and 30,000 hectares from Oromia. They gave money to some clan leaders, one received 1 Million ETB, while other clan leaders in Afar received some 300,000 ETB. But people realised that this was going to be bad for them and for their land use systems. They created problems and the Prime Minister came and tried to persuade people to accept those project ideas. This problem is still there. Around 90,000 hectares of land have been taken from the traditional land use system in Afar region, and 30,000 in Oromia.

In Afar, there is also an element of clan territoriality. Under normal circumstances, a specific clan resides in a specific area and uses pasture and water in the clan territory. During emergencies and droughts, people move across clan boundaries.

Molu Kullu Galgalo, Bubisa, Kenya. The situation in Kenya is not very different from Ethiopia. The beginning of our problem began when the colonial administrators came. Land arrangements in Kenya. There is a portion of land in the constitution called Trust Land and all of Northern Kenya is under that tenure system. But this system is losing its meaning in different ways.

The land is being reduced through the expansion of urban settlements; by conservation (national parks and game reserves); by oil and mineral exploration and [ultimately] exploitation.

But the main problem of this land tenure system is that it is our own educated sons who putting us at a disadvantage by siding with those who have commercial or other interest in the land we use. According to the Kenyan constitution, trust land is under the control of each county council and the local authorities, as well as [under the control of] the councils of each tribe. And these are often staffed by our sons. When investors or any other interested group want a certain portion of land, they sit with the councilors, without involving the community, and agreements are made. Even the ones having interest in conservancy (national parks; game reserves) liaise and collude with the councilors and the MPs. That is how we lose land. The government only signs what these people have agreed upon. We are losing land, but we are losing it through our own people.

Ahmed Mohamed Umar, Wajir, Kenya. We, the pastoralists from Ethiopia and Kenya, need to fight for our rights. We must discuss and reach consensus on how we are going to get out of this problem.

The way of the government policies are such that there is no way for pastoralists to own land – if you are not a farmer, you are not allowed to own land. As pastoralists, we must make sure that we make our governments understand that pastoralists have rights.

Mohamed Wako, Merti, Kenya: If land is ours, people should plan with us and consult us. If people do not involve us, it shows that the land is not ours. We all concur with what Mollu said. All our problems lie with our own leaders, with our own people not even the state; the same leaders that were elected, no other person. All these mineral and oil explorers consult our elected leaders and came to us. It is not about the issue of the state giving land away or the state disturbing us. It is all about our own people. The problem of Kenyans is that their own leaders are the agitators.

Ugass Hamud Sheikh, Madogashe, Kenya: Kenya is divided into two parts. There are some areas that are owned by the people, that is Central Province, Western Province, and parts of Coast Province. Those farmers have entitlements showing that the land is theirs. People with land problems are only pastoralists. The Government recently grabbed the pastoralist Tana Delta District to give to private people to plant sugar cane there.

In 1968, after independence, there was an amendment to the land tenure system which favoured farmers. The other amendment was made in 1992 and that only favoured the people in parliament, who have power. If I go back to Kenyatta's time, there are people who migrated from their land to other people's land. And that has caused a lot of problems. Those people with problems like this are pastoralists and we fear that the land we use is going to be grabbed because 30% of Kenya's land is farmland and 70% is being managed by pastoralists. Now, because population is growing, the farmers don't have enough space to cultivate, so they will come and grab the land we use. That is how the situation is in Kenya.

Comment. The Ethiopian constitution says that pastoralists have land rights and may not be evicted. Is it possible for a community to receive a certificate that shows they have rights over a piece of land? I have heard of this and know that farmers are given titles to land, but I have never heard of a pastoralist receiving a land title.

Ugass Hamud Sheikh, Madogashe, Kenya. In Kenya we have land that is not for farming for which titles are given. We have ranches. You can send in an application for the title to a large area of land and receive entitlement as a group or as an individual. This is not for farming land – it is for rangeland.

Tumal Orto, Maikona, Kenya. There are also group ranches in Kenya. To obtain a group ranch, a community can receive the title to a piece of land. But to obtain it, an act of parliament must be passed first, which is very difficult.

Katherine Homewood. I think the solutions lie with you. We have heard about possibilities of forcing a share from the returns to come to the pastoralist community. We have heard about possibilities of negotiating a communal lease. We have also heard about the issues of maybe regulating your own leaders. These solutions are coming from you.