



CONCORDIS PAPERS I

**Land Use and Tenure:
A Key to Sustainable Peace in Darfur**

May 2007

Introduction

Rt Hon Viscount Brentford

Since we started our Sudan peace-building programme in 1999, a host of consultations have been held on a wide range of themes, each with its own unique set of presentations, discussions, conclusions and recommendations. In keeping with Concordis International's overriding objective to build sustainable and just peace in areas suffering from war, these meetings have sought to address the root causes of Sudan's conflicts. They have built upon the peace-building work conducted by Concordis over the past eight years, which has focused on the facilitation of low-profile, inclusive and research-based dialogue in support of formal peace processes.

Participants have attended the consultations in a personal capacity and have included a wide range of key individuals linked with opposition groups and the government, civil society and women's groups, as well as academics and international consultants. The views expressed therefore represent a broad consensus of Sudanese viewpoints and are not necessarily the opinions of Concordis International.

This paper is the first in a series which seeks to build on the strengths of the Concordis approach through spreading the benefits of the multilateral consensus we have developed via our consultations. We proactively shared the conclusions of the three consultations on Darfur (summarised in Concordis Papers I, II and III) with negotiators, mediators and other interested parties at the AU-led talks in Abuja. Our aim here is both to summarise the presentations made and to draw together participants' discussions and recommendations into a succinct and readable form.

The Concordis Papers are available to be downloaded from our website and will be disseminated to Sudanese and international policy makers, practitioners and centres of learning. I hope you will find them to be a useful resource.



Executive Summary

Although the consultation on which this paper is based took place in September 2004 - prior to the signing of the Darfur Peace Agreement (DPA) - the continued elusiveness of peace in Darfur makes its content just as relevant and important today. When considering the issue of land use and tenure in Darfur, participants were quick to emphasise that the humanitarian crisis in the region must be resolved and conditions of security restored before meaningful progress can be made on addressing some of the root causes of the conflict.

Nevertheless, the question of access to land has been a significant factor in the development of the current conflict, and it requires concerted attention after any successful peace agreement is forged in the future. Indeed, participants agreed that it is not too soon to explore practical and administrative ways of dealing with the pressure on land, in order to prepare for sustainable peace in Darfur in the future. In outline, the consultation established that:

- Like many of Sudan's regions, Darfur has been culturally, politically and economically marginalised for several decades;
- The breakdown of traditional systems of land tenure and land use is an important underlying cause of conflict in Darfur;
- In recent years Darfur's agricultural production has been adversely affected by climate change, market failure and ethnic conflict, although a peaceful environment and appropriate technical improvements can reverse this decline;
- There is no uniform government policy on land tenure in the Sudan. In some areas land is private property; in others it is government property; in Darfur it has tended to remain under tribal control, but this has been challenged in recent years under national legislation;
- The traditional local administration has been weakened in recent decades, meaning that it can no longer intervene to resolve disputes over access to land as it could in the past;
- Land reform is not necessarily needed, as this implies redistribution, yet there is a need for clarification of the various types of rights and responsibilities of different population groups with respect to land.

A series of recommendations on the theme of land use and tenure in Darfur deriving from the consultation can be found on pages 4-5.

Proposals for Possible Solutions

We recommend to those responsible that the following measures should be undertaken:

Immediate measures

1. Put in place security conditions and essential services so that displaced people are able to return with confidence to their land, and be reunited with their families. Resettlement is essential and the international community should help with rehabilitation, repatriation and reunion.
2. Rehabilitate and repair water sources (including wells and boreholes).
3. Assist in rebuilding and, where appropriate compensating for, loss of and damage to property.
4. Address the issue of appropriate mechanisms for tracing missing persons and for compensation for loss of life.

Short-term measures

1. Encourage the Government of Sudan to make a firm commitment that land from which people were forcibly expelled should be returned to the displaced former occupants.
2. Encourage the Government of Sudan to make a firm commitment that traditional forms of land tenure in Darfur (tribal dars) will be respected.
3. Examine ways of protecting those who have been displaced due to exploitation by those who offer to buy their land.
4. Seek ways of improving the balance of animal populations, e.g. through the development of markets and through encouraging the possession of animals as an economic commodity rather than as a sign of social status.

Long-term technical improvement of land use

1. Improve water supply and retention through:
 - i. increasing the number of wells and water boreholes.
 - ii. irrigation (especially small and micro schemes, water harvesting, drought-tolerant crop and tree varieties).
2. Examine ways and means of improving the situation of pastoralists whose traditional homelands have become less productive.
3. Take appropriate measures, in co-operation with neighbouring countries where necessary, to reduce the net immigration of pastoralists to Sudan.
4. Implement a full programme of civil registration.

Land tenure issues

1. Establish, through broad consultation, a transparent, nationwide government policy on land tenure that takes into account regional variations in practice (in which the Land Commission envisaged by the Naivasha Protocols - provided it has wide and representative membership - could play a leading role).
2. Establish a Darfur Convention, which would include tribal leadership, civil society and regional government and would form and determine the membership of a Darfur Land Commission.
3. Within the framework set by national government and with access to national and international expertise where appropriate, task the Darfur Land Commission with the following:
 - Recommending restitution and compensation for those who have been displaced.
 - Agreeing on a land use map for Darfur, taking into account the differing potentials of the various agro-ecological zones of Darfur and the needs of different population groups.
 - Clarifying and modernising the laws governing land use rights and responsibilities (not only ownership), on the basis of traditional custom.
 - Establishing land tenure administration systems which are accessible to and affordable for the local people.
 - Making recommendations to improve balanced economic development.
 - Developing sustainable land use farming systems for crops and livestock.

Other issues

We recognise that the land issue is only one part of the complex range of issues that has led to the current conflict. The following areas also need to be urgently addressed:

1. Investment in infrastructure, such as communication and transport facilities, to redress the chronic under-development of Darfur.
2. Further devolution and delegation of power to regional government in Darfur.
3. Improvement of education and health services.
4. Good governance, accountability and transparency.
5. Encouragement of increased activity in the private sector and civil society.

Land Use and Tenure in Darfur in the Past: a Factor in Conflict
Remarks by General Ibrahim Suleiman (Darfur Forum) and Dr Faroug al-Bushra (Council for International People's Friendship)

Darfur has a small population and significant natural resources. Traditionally, land in Darfur is considered a secure resource in which the culture of each tribe is deeply rooted. It is not so much lack of land, but a conflict between the interests of tribal leaders and modernists that creates the current problems. The balance was upset by the drought of 1973 to 1984 which, in conjunction with the inherently uneven distribution of resources and increased cultivation and pastoralism, led to competition for resources and mass migration. The introduction of modern concepts, such as political leadership, into traditional communities resulted in problems caused by non-Darfurian decision-makers. The lack of a national vision in Sudan, as well as political instability in neighbouring countries and the lack of a civil register, added further difficulties. While Darfurians claim their region is marginalised, the figures are not clear on this matter and it is very difficult to obtain reliable statistics.

The conflict in Darfur can be categorised into three types: traditional tribal disputes, ethnic conflicts and civil war. While there have been a number of important catalysts that helped to trigger the current situation in Darfur, competition over resources, identity and political factors have been identified as root causes. Alliances were formed with the Arabs to provide arms and funds in order to implement the creation of an Arab belt. The Sahelian drought of the 1970s put a stop to pastoral nomadism, resulting in tribal conflicts. These conflicts were exacerbated in 1984 with a further drop in rainfall, as the land reached its capacity to support farmers. Pastoralists cleared the farms and burnt them to the ground, creating an Internally Displaced Persons (IDP) issue. In order to address this problem several steps need to be taken: the native administration should help to maintain law and order; there needs to be a transition to democracy, i.e. a multi-party system; the nomads have to be settled and stigmatisation must cease.

Discussion

The priority must be to establish peace: the native administration cannot be restored without a ceasefire and the disarmament of the militias. After the fighting has stopped changes need to be made. Confusion often clouds the role of the native administration, which is to maintain law and order. It would be unacceptable for the administration to be restored as it was; they must restrict their function to that of a neutral civil service.

With the end of the colonial period came a change in the structure of the tribe, from a cultural to a political system. Previously, the advisory council in each tribe resolved internal problems. However, the new competition of political parties unsettled tribes, creating problems which were then compounded by the slow

pace of economic development. Although the tribal leaders (representing the traditional native administration) do recognise the government, the government is not representative of the people of Sudan. While abolishing the traditional leaders is not the answer, neither is simply re-instating them. It is a problem of power distribution and wealth sharing.

Land in Darfur is owned on a communal basis, so it follows that the power of distribution resides with the tribe or the community. However, the allocation of land to a tribe did not equate to land ownership, but rather, administration of the land for the benefit of the tribe. In southern Darfur, southerners were encouraged to settle, thereby strengthening the social and economic ties of the area. Anyone who was eligible to settle in Darfur was allocated land for cultivation, whether or not they were a member of the local tribe. The people decided who would settle in the region. At present, there is a mixture of many tribes in the area and historically, the tribes have had very good social relationships. The problems in Darfur are not caused by ethnic conflict, but by marginalisation. The ethnic tensions are controllable because of the historical agreements between tribes.

The problems in Darfur not only relate to land, but also to a lack of national identity. Is Sudan an Arab or an African country? While each citizen has a right to move around, the establishment is more worried about immigration from African countries. Relations between Sudan and Chad created a lot of unrest during the Nimeiri regime resulting in refugees who fled to the Sudan. The majority of these did not settle in Darfur, but passed into the centre of the country. There is a need to accept these Arabs from Chad as first-class citizens, but the problem of giving people rights and allowing them to live together remains – the issue of occupation clearly needs to be addressed. The Arab Alliance initiated the conflict against the negroid tribes in 1972. Perhaps the most important question to be answered is why this conflict is still not settled. The flow of cattle herders from across the borders into Sudan, accompanied by farmers using more modern means of cultivating that require greater areas of land, has further added to the marginalisation of periphery groups in Sudan.

The ease with which firearms are accessible is illustrated by the large number of young children who carry them. Such weapons, originating from within Sudan or Chad, are one of the most serious problems of the Darfur region. The Government of Sudan should disarm the militias, but the people need protecting if they are to hand over their weapons. Clarification is required on arms proliferation so that effective disarmament can take place. The international community could advise on how to control the vast borders of Sudan.

Political problems need to be reconciled before progress is made on land issues – marginalisation must end. Sudan could learn about stability from the example of Malaysia, where the election of the King rotates between the five kingdoms.

Sustainable Systems of Land Management in Arid Areas: Application to Darfur

Remarks by Dr Eva d'Adrian and Brian Kerr (HTSPE Consultancy)

Sudan is a microcosm of what is happening elsewhere in Africa. The people of Darfur have been largely ignored by successive governments and the international community throughout the droughts and famines of 1973, 1980 and the present disaster. The land issue is at the core of the problem, since ownership of land is a necessity for economic development. During colonial rule, the land was shared between nomads and farmers and conflicts were solved by the native administration. More recently, uneven regional development has led to the creation of peripheral regions, especially in the south. This sustained under-development and racial discrimination has poisoned inter-tribal relations. The water and soil resources of the three main African tribes have become targets for nomads, as they moved down from the north into Darfur. From 1986 to 1989 nomadic tribes moved indiscriminately into farmland, overpowering indigenous farmers with weapons supplied by the Government of Sudan. Communal land is now being taken over by settlers where indigenous farmers have been moved on. In the Nuba Mountains much of the land is no longer farmed by tribal groups, but is owned by investors. The Sudanese Government encourages large-scale commercial farming, such as seen at Gezira. However, in order to maximise existing natural resources, desertification must be countered. Water is a critical resource and is at the centre of this conflict. The Government currently has no clear water policy: the natural environment must be used to conserve fresh water.

A radical reform of customary land rights is required. Sudan can learn from other tenure regimes in Botswana, Kenya and Eritrea. For example, productivity can be increased by using genetically modified seeds, or by changing the type of fodder animals feed on. It may be possible to modify the old system of administration, as has been successfully achieved in Botswana, where the native administration has been empowered only to resolve conflicts in its area. Institutional capacity-building is also necessary, which can be encouraged by giving more responsibility to the local administration for solving local problems. The decision-making has to be carried out by people who have a direct stake in the issue at hand. Private and foreign investors could be invited to participate in the rehabilitation of the land. However, any sustainable system depends on addressing the land tenure insecurity.

One of the more recent problems affecting Sudan is the decline and unpredictability of the rainfall. The economic booms over the past decades corresponded with high levels of rainfall, although the population is resilient and knows how to manage drought. This is a marginal environment where effects are magnified. Rainfall is the key to subsistence and the last three decades of the twentieth century were very dry. There does not seem to be any appetite for greater land tenure regulation, but when there is conflict, land becomes a

weapon in the dispute. It is possible to cope with environmental problems, but not with security breakdown and economic decline – especially in an era of decreased rainfall.

Discussion

Unsuccessful implementation of several technical solutions aimed at solving the problem in Darfur can only highlight the need to find a resolution to the conflict. For without security it is impossible for research to take place. When the political troubles are over in Sudan there will be a need to enthuse people to take an interest in issues of land management. The relationship between economic and political development concerning settlement and irrigation schemes needs to be clearly defined to stakeholders. It is crucial that the economic and political solutions go hand in hand – the participation of the local people being critical to success.

Drawing from international experience, it is encouraging to note that both Mali and Egypt have successfully limited the spread of desertification. International expertise has been offered by the Indian Army, who are specialists in land restoration. Underground water is a potential means of transforming arid areas and there is currently a company in northern Darfur who are looking into the possibility of boreholes so that cattle grazers can stay for longer in the north. However, this is not a renewable resource and in southern Darfur the water table has dropped so low that this is no longer feasible. In north and west Darfur there is no lack of water – they are just lacking a water policy. In addition, the nomads must be settled and small towns set up with services such as electricity and hospitals. A national scheme should be set up to address these issues.

A land use map would be a useful addition when trying to decide where to re-settle the nomads since without this land reform is very difficult. The lack of planning in the Jebel Marra region remains a central problem. Due to conflict, the carrying out of a study or project in Darfur has been severely hampered over the past twenty years and so it is now very difficult to say which farming system or crop would succeed there. Some twelve species of tree exist in Niger that can survive in very dry conditions and yet are financially viable. However, specialising in one activity has considerable inherent risk – it is much wiser to diversify. This will be facilitated by the capability of the Sudanese people to adapt to change, but investment from the Government of Sudan is also required.

International Experience of Land Reform

Remarks by Dr Camilla Toulin (IIED) and Dr Adam Azzain Mohamed (University of Khartoum)

Technically, the Government of Sudan owns and manages the land, although this is not played out in practice, which results in conflicting jurisdiction. There is recognition of the need to devolve power to local structures, but such structures need to recognise the past system of customary rights. Civil society has to be consulted and a multi-stakeholder approach adopted. Titling the land will increase security and investment, as well as create more efficient farms, as has occurred in Ethiopia and Kenya. However, land titling often only benefits the educated and rich and it is important that the land administration structures work at the village level.

Underdevelopment in the Darfur region began in the mid 1960s. The diaspora brought to the world's attention the problems in Darfur. Various consultations have since been held, all of which concluded that development is the key to lasting peace in Darfur. For the government any development would be top-down, but experience has shown that this is not real development. A bottom-up approach bringing together the people of Darfur and Darfurian intellectuals would be an effective approach to handle land reform. This process necessitates an accurate land-use map if land ownership is to be changed legitimately. The Land Registration Order of 1970, previously under customary law, rules that all unregistered land be considered the property of the government. This law worked in favour of absentee landlords but was never implemented in Darfur, which created conflict between Darfurians and newcomers. Many nomads, confused over the land ownership rights, gave up traditional nomadism and settled down. The Sudanese government is not consistent in its approach to land ownership.

Discussion

Land reform frequently involves redistribution of land and land rights. In Darfur, involuntary land distribution is taking place – this must be regularised. Darfur is unique in Sudan in that 80% of the land is owned, so what may appear to be land reform is, in fact, land confiscation. The government has undertaken policies intended to confiscate land, but has labelled them 'land reform'. The government needs to implement a genuine land reform program involving civil society, including tribal leaders. There is a lack of clarification concerning the rights and agreements of land allocation as well as the structure and official procedures for dealing with land issues. Land boundaries need to be clarified in terms of chief jurisdiction. Problems arose in Sudan because no one was nominated to be in charge of land issues; in the absence of clear leadership, there was anarchy and resource and land grabbing. The native administration needs to have the power to preserve the right of the local people and the nomads. Currently, anyone can enclose land without any restrictions.

The priority must be to sort out a process of restitution for those who have been dislocated from their land before worrying about land use and land reform. A general principle of land reform to follow would be to link compensation to market prices. In Darfur there has been loss of livelihood and loss of life. The people have a right to be compensated, but the difficulty will be identifying those who are eligible for compensation. The loss of property rights in Ivory Coast resulted in long and complicated settlements. Experience there has shown that it will first be necessary to test the claims in the public arena.

Land reform itself cannot create peace. Resettlement can only take place as part of a post-conflict scenario. Since there is no clear policy regarding land, people have become very suspicious. The IDPs are not prepared to go back to government-designated areas. Land reform cannot be addressed until the government changes its policy and improves its transparency. The success of the 1991 talks where the Sudanese government proposed a solution that included Sudanese at the grassroots level is a model that could be followed. However, the facilitation needs to be carried out by an independent body. Urgent measures to manage the current crisis are a key to sustainable peace and have to be a priority. The government talks about the need for the resettlement of nomads, yet it has displaced local people as part of that process. Recently, it has been uprooting and evacuating people in the Nuba Mountains and the Upper Nile region (supposedly because of the presence of oil fields) which only adds to the land issues facing Sudan. The government should have respected the status quo they inherited from colonial rulers with regard to land. Any changes to the land system must involve the people of Sudan – if their land is taken from them people are forced to take up arms.

Impartial tribal leaders from other areas could act as mediators since they cannot be accused of having ulterior motives. Local administrators should maintain law and order, resolve political conflicts and must be politically neutral mediators. The role of the local administration must not be undermined. Currently the elites in Darfur are polarised, yet if they are brought together then they can influence their tribes and will support a peaceful solution. Most of the native administration are pro-government and are able to visualise the problem in its entirety. In Botswana, the national government relies on the large ranch owners to liaise with the tribes. The ranch owners help the tribes to establish water holes and find pastures to graze their cattle. In Kenya, the Masai are paid compensation if they limit the movement of their herds. International aid can enable the rehabilitation of services and institutions.

With regard to land, there needs to be a clear vision at the regional level. The problem requires international expertise to develop a strategy for land use. Any land settlement should be instituted by a more federal structure set up with a proper division of powers. At the state level, there is a need for more devolution, accountability and transparency. To give up control of land means to give up power and patronage.

Future Land Use Management in Darfur

Remarks by Hon Ahmed Diraige (SFDA)

The Government of Sudan has failed to live up to its responsibility throughout the latest troubles and has indeed exacerbated the problems in many areas. In 1982 there was an unsuccessful attempt to resettle nomads. Rather than tell the nomads that they need to find a new livelihood, provisions must be made to supply suitable areas for them to roam. There are deserted areas near Nyar Kas that are well suited for this purpose. Pastoral nomadism is a way of life, yet alternatives can be found. In Botswana, the government successfully settled nomads by introducing them to ranches and setting up farms with veterinary centres and agricultural banks. With further education, nomads can benefit the economy. However, Darfur has very low rates of education – there is not even a school in each village. Investment in education would remove the burden from the land. In Sudan, good quality decorticated groundnuts are exported to Europe and the remainder are used for oil extraction in Khartoum. Oil extraction could take place in Darfur, rather than Khartoum. With increased education, the nomads will be able to reduce the burden on the traditional economy and could develop export markets in soap, margarine and oil.

An imbalanced economic development policy, favouring the north and the south of Sudan, has created distinct peripheral zones. This imbalance has been sustained by the lack of a comprehensive regional policy. Although Sudan's economy is achieving positive rates of growth, there are several huge disparities, such as those seen in the health and education sectors. Darfur has only ever had two development projects, both of which collapsed when problems arose and the funding dried up. There is no initiative to devise rural development plans based on providing comprehensive development projects to pastoralists. Large grazing areas and clear economic development plans would contribute to easing tensions. Desertification has been occurring in northern Darfur, forcing people to move to southern Darfur and increasing the competition for local resources. This issue could have been partially resolved if the government had provided services (such as boreholes and dams) in north Darfur. Tensions will be eased by the adoption of sound rural development projects that take into account the needs of the pastoralists and the farmers.

Discussion

Pressure on the ecosystem can be reduced in many ways: by improving seed technology (thus increasing crop yields and requiring less land under cultivation), by implementing natural forest protection systems and by improving water storage and distribution facilities. Water is as important as land in this context. Nomadic leaders must be consulted and be ready to relocate without bringing conflict to others. The camel herders could be used for a pilot project where they receive funding to dig a borehole to make fodder.

It is clear that the international community needs to commit resources to post-conflict development. There is lack of domestic and international investment, with only one international project in Nyala (the UN refused to work in Sudan). There is not enough electricity to power the cities and so Darfur cannot industrialise due to a lack of energy. If generators are provided then oil can be processed locally, thus creating jobs. However, education needs to be geared to change people's lifestyles and can be used to modernise the farming system. Many rural children who receive education no longer want to go back home, but choose to migrate to the cities. The private sector must also be attracted to invest in Darfur. In the past commercial development of projects such as fruit and vegetable stands has failed and there is no experience of public-private partnership in the country.

There has been no evaluation of the multi-sectoral rural development projects in Sudan. Camel herders need grazing rights, but they must also know that the land belongs to the tribes. The traditional farmers should be allowed to return home as soon as possible to continue with their lives. The Sudanese government has created a problem by allowing Arabs to enter Sudan without a visa, which has changed the balance of the population. Since land is power, the people of Darfur need to have the power to control their own development. In short, the government must listen to its people and improve accountability, transparency and transport.

Access to Land in Darfur

Remarks by Dr Adam Azzain Mohamed (University of Khartoum)

Land ownership, access to land and managing land, are governed by two sources of legal systems: customary law and modern state law.

Customary law governing land dates back to the time of the Fur sultanate (1460-1916). Sultans issued charters granting land to individuals or identity groups (i.e. tribes). These were mostly fallow lands and the region was thinly populated; newcomers were encouraged to settle on lands and develop them.

The colonial government (1916-1956) sanctioned the tribal homeland system, locally known as tribal 'dars'. They used the tribal ownership of land on which other legislations were based: native administration (1922-1932) and local government councils (1937, 1951). Native administration was a type of local government whereby a tribal leader would be designated as a 'Chief' or 'Paramount Chief' for maintaining law and order within his territorial domain (tribal dar). Minority identity groups (i.e. tribes) were normally made followers of the 'Paramount Chief', sometimes against their will. They were normally granted the positions of 'Omdas' at the middle of a hierarchy, and village and camp headmen at the grassroots level. The system was supported by 'native

courts', with the Paramount Chief sitting at the top of the ladder to whom lower court rulings were appealed. All courts applied customary law to resolve conflicts rather than the modern state law. The system proved successful in maintaining law and order and in conflict management until weakened during post-independence. In 1964, a resolution was passed by the October radical government for the dissolution of native administration. In 1970, another radical government actually dissolved the system. Although subsequent governments tried to reinstate the system, it has never been as effective as it was prior to 1964.

Native administrators were not only responsible for controlling their followers; they were also responsible for the management and disposing of the tribal land. They were the ones who granted access to land to newcomers and resolved disputes over land.

In 1925, the colonial government legislated the Land Registration Ordinance which, in fact, affected only the irrigated agricultural land in the riverain area. Peasants were able to register their lands. Other land remained unregistered and therefore, by default, government land. In 1970, the 1925 ordinance was strengthened by legislation of the so-called Land Registration Act. The act aimed at expropriating land from small farmers and herders in favour of large, mechanised farms (mainly in central, east central and eastern regions). Darfur land disposition remained governed by customary law during the 1970s and 1980s. African Sahelian droughts hit the region and changed the balance between the land carrying capacity on the one hand and the increasing number of human and animal populations on the other. Dar owners started to resist granting newcomers (those forced by the drought to migrate) access to land. The Zaghawa settlers – the camel nomads of the north – were the ones who needed access to land resources in other people's dars. Violent conflicts resulted from disputes over access to land. The newcomers wanted access to land as a citizen right (based on the provisions of the 1970 act). The dar owners, however, denied their claim to this right, citing customary law.

The camel nomads eventually decided to form an Arab alliance and fought against the Fur, causing them to flee their homeland, which was then available exclusively for herding. They managed to do this having the advantages of possessing superior firearms and, allegedly, government support for their actions. Attacks on the Fur villagers began in the early 1980s and have continued unabated to date. Since the 1990s, the Massalit dar, to the west of Fur's dar, has also become a target of the pastoral nomads. When, in 2003, the Zaghawa, to the extreme north of the Fur, came to the assistance of the Fur militia, their dar also became a target for the pastoral nomads.

It appears untimely to talk about land reform in the region before resolving the intra-regional conflicts, which are partly ethnic (Arab/non-Arab) and partly civil (against the government).

ABOUT CONCORDIS INTERNATIONAL

Concordis International is a British non-profit organisation that seeks to achieve long-term transformation of relationships across conflict boundaries, by engaging all constituencies of a country or region in sustained examination of issues of common interest. These systematic and well-researched discussions move beyond the lines of confrontation to build on shared purpose and explore new possibilities for peace. Rather than becoming involved in official peace negotiations, we aim to build relationships of trust that pave the way for peace or contribute to post-conflict nation-building. The work is underpinned by values – such as justice and equity – that are shared by those of many faiths and traditions.

Concordis International's primary methodology involves a series of informal, low-profile consultations, held in a neutral venue and attended by key individuals linked to their respective leaders and constituencies. As they attend the consultations in a personal capacity, participants are not under pressure to maintain a particular party line. The consultations take place away from the public and media eye, and are carefully constructed on a solid foundation of in-depth research into the structural causes of conflict and consideration of the economic and social factors necessary to sustainable peace. Our wide network of academic contacts ensures that the preparatory research is of high quality.

Under the name Newick Park Initiative (NPI), the Concordis International team was instrumental in South Africa in establishing confidential dialogue between leading members of the ANC and the white establishment, contributing to the peaceful ending of apartheid. In the aftermath of Rwanda's 1994 genocide, NPI played a critical role in resolving issues of agriculture and justice, successfully bringing together senior Tutsis and Hutus to consider Truth and Reconciliation Commissions and traditional *gacaca* courts. In 1999, at the invitation of senior Sudanese, the Concordis team and the African Renaissance Institute launched the Sudan Peace-Building Programme and together ran six consultations. Subsequently, Concordis International has responded to requests from senior Sudanese to remain engaged, through facilitating informal dialogue aimed at developing consensus on post-conflict priorities for Sudan and contributing to the resolution of regional issues like Darfur and Eastern Sudan.

In addition to informal consultations, Concordis adopts other means of furthering peace processes – such as publications and capacity-building workshops – though always adopting a non-partisan approach. Peace-building work in countries other than Sudan – including the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Israel/Palestine and Afghanistan – is currently in a development stage. The work of Concordis International is funded through contributions from private individuals, community groups, NGOs, grant-giving trusts and foundations, and government agencies.

Concordis International is grateful to
The Worshipful Company of Girdlers



for sponsorship of this edition of
Concordis Papers



Concordis International
Jubilee House
3 Hooper Street, CAMBRIDGE, CB1 2NZ
United Kingdom

Phone: +44 (0)1223 341281 Fax: +44 (0)1223 566359
office@concordis-international.org

www.concordis-international.org

Concordis International Trust is a non-profit UK company limited by guarantee (No. 4930461) and a registered charity (No. 1105697)