

Achieving People's Control over

Land and Livelihood

Report from the first Meeting on
Global Movement 2012



**Published by
Ekta Parishad and South-South Solidarity**

Achieving People's Control over Land and Livelihood

Report from the first Meeting on
Global Movement 2012

New Delhi, 1st to 5th March 2011



South-South Solidarity
P-2A, Jangpura Extension
New Delhi 110014
www.southsouthsolidarity.org



Ekta Parishad
Gandhi Bhavan,
Shyamla Hills,
Bhopal 462 002
www.ektaparishad.com

Achieving People's Control over Land and Livelihood

Published by:

South-South Solidarity

P-2A

Jangpura Extension

New Delhi 110014

www.southsouthsolidarity.org

Ekta Parishad

Gandhi Bhavan

Shyamla Hills

Bhopal 462 002

www.ektaparishad.com

Designed and Printed by:

Systems Vision

systemsvision@gmail.com

Supported and sponsored by:

Oxfam Novib

Contents

1	Acknowledgements	1
2	Preface	3
3	Introduction	5
4	Welcome address	6
5	The Delhi Declaration	9
6	Challenges Ahead	12
6.1	Madiodio Niassa International Land Coalition	12
6.2	K.B. Saxena Council for Social Development	18
6.3	Rajiv Vora Swaraj Peeth.....	24
6.4	Praveen Jha Centre for Economic Studies and Planning, JNU	28
7	Agriculture and Forest Policies	32
7.1	Devinder Sharma Agricultural Analyst	32
7.2	Bina Agarwal Institute of Economic Growth, University of Delhi	40
7.3	Sanjay Upadhyay Enviro-Legal Defense firm	43
8	Human and Women Rights	48
8.1	Miloon Kothari Housing and Land Rights Network	48
8.2	Savio Carvalho Amnesty International.....	52
8.3	Annie Thomas Action Aid	55
9	Country Reports	58
9.1	Asia.....	58
9.1.1	Nepal: Roshan Chitrakar; Jagat Basnet Community Self-Reliance Centre.....	58

9.1.2	Indonesia: Muhammad Nur Uddin; Ika Nurillah Krishnayanti Indonesian Peasant Alliance	60
9.1.3	Sri Lanka: Lalith Abeysinghe Movement for National Land and Agricultural Reforms.....	62
9.1.4	Thailand: Jeff Wong Four Regions Slum Network.....	63
9.1.5	Bangladesh: Muhamed Kamal Uddin Association for Realisation of Basic Needs.....	67
9.1.6	Philippines: Nathaniel Don E. Marquez Asian NGO Coalition for Agrarian Reform and Rural Development.....	71
9.1.7	India: Ramesh Sharma Ekta Parishad.....	74
9.2	Africa.....	77
9.2.1	Senegal: Abdou El Mazide Ndiaye SONED Afrique	77
9.2.2	Kenya: Odenda Lumumba Kenya Land Alliance	80
9.3	Latin America.....	83
9.3.1	Cedenir de Oliveira Movimento dos Trabalhadores Rurais Sem Terra.....	83
9.3.2	Eloy Garcia Christian Peacemaker Teams Colombia.....	84
9.4	Europe.....	87
9.4.1	Fintan Farrell European Anti-Poverty Network	87
10	Appendix.....	90
10.1	Participants	90
10.1.1	Resource Persons	90
10.1.2	Country reports	93
10.2	Agenda of the Meeting.....	99

Acknowledgements

This publication is primarily a transcript of the International Preparatory Meeting on Global Movement 2012 that was held in March 2011. Therefore it is important to acknowledge the participants and resource persons whose presentations we recorded. These include Madiodio Niasse, Savio Carvalho and Flavio Valente who made excellent interventions on framing land as a global issue in a rights-based framework. Praveen Jha and Rajiv Vora gave us an alternative perspective from the framework of the left and Gandhian perspectives. K.B. Saxena, one of the leading governmental experts in India on land reform, spoke with a leading non-governmental expert, Sandeep Chachra, a long-time supporter and activist on the land issue; Devinder Sharma for his brilliant presentation on the state of the small farmer, Sandeep Upadhyaya; Bina Agrawal on the women's collective was an important intervention, as was Annie Thomas in the presentation on women and land programs through Action Aid. Miloon Kothari spoke on the UN system's response to land issues, and the mechanisms that can be used for international lobbying.

Eleven presentations from Philippines, Indonesia, Thailand, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka, Nepal, India, Kenya, Senegal, Colombia and Brazil. Also an excellent intervention from poverty groups from Europe.

I want to specially acknowledge Philippe Blanc for his meticulous work of transcribing each presentation and organising the entire text. His dedication to alternative thinking and community organising has been a great asset to both this

publication and to Ekta Parishad in general. A special thanks also to Paul Schwartzentruber for his editorial assistance and Altaï de Saint Albin who was a key support during the preparation and realisation of the meeting. Our thanks goes also to Manjula for her copy editing and Systems Vision for its printing.

Finally, the meeting would not have been possible without the generous support of Oxfam Novib. We are immensely grateful to Novib and the Oxfam family for courageously bringing the narrative of land and livelihood rights of the poor and marginalized to various national and global arenas.

Jill Carr-Harris & Rajagopal

Preface

The International Preparatory Meeting on Land and Livelihood held in Delhi on March 1-5, 2011 was unique. Thirty people came together from all parts of the world to discuss land rights and land-grab (and the common problem of poor people across the South who are losing their natural assets of land, forest and water). *But what made this meeting special was the deeper narrative that emerged as to how to bring non-violent tactics to the growing number of land and resource struggles that are now occurring worldwide so that structural change can be achieved.* This message is reflected in the Delhi Declaration that was put together by the participants.

The second reason why this meeting was unique was that it was built from 'the bottom-up'. The Jan Satyagraha, which is a campaign of the landless poor in India, was the context in which this meeting was located. Other friends brought other struggles from different parts of the world, whether the women and land movement in Nepal, or the farmers' struggle in Indonesia, or the MST in Brazil. Knitting together these actions at the grassroots gives a solid bedrock for advocating on land issues at the national, regional and international levels.

The meeting was punctuated on the 6th, 7th and 8th of March with a mass action of over 10,000 poor and marginalised people that came to a nearby ground for three days (from many parts of India) to pressure the government on its land reform agenda. Guests at the international meeting participated in this action. The international guests were astonished that so many

people could sit for six hours in front of Parliament waiting for a government response and spend three days with little food and water in a test of nerves with the government.

What our international friends gleaned from this mass action is that if civil society does not use non-violence in the struggle, this will give the government a chance to reduce democratic rights in the name of reducing violence.

The discussions and the action led the participants to conclude that only by training large populations in non-violence can equity and inclusiveness be brought into the development model. Without deliberate non-violence the state will help to perpetuate large-scale conflict which enables the players with the most brute force to supercede others, without having to listen to the *aam janata* (ordinary people), most of whom want to live in peace.

Jill Carr-Harris

Introduction

The first planning meeting for Global Action 2012 was held on March 1-5, 2011 in New Delhi. Convened by Ekta Parishad and South-South Solidarity, the meeting included representatives from five continents and a wide range of both rural and urban activist organisations as well as key speakers from the NGO and academic communities.

Gathered around the theme of 'land and livelihood rights' across the global South, this meeting was held to inform other activists about Ekta Parishad's planned march – Jan Satyagraha 2012 (in which 100,000 people will walk from Gwalior to Delhi during the month of October 2012). It was also intended to invite them to develop and participate in a coordinated global campaign to be promoted in conjunction with that action in India.

Several key foci emerged during the first part of the meeting, in which activists from various countries and continents shared their experiences. First, there was from all sides a recognition of the importance and negative impact of the massive land-grab that is occurring throughout the global South. Delegates spoke of how the problem of land dispossession is deepening rural poverty and also contributing to urbanisation in its worst forms, i.e., the migration of dispossessed labourers.

Second, there was a clear understanding that the struggle for land and livelihood rights among the rural poor is directly connected to the larger issues of food sovereignty. The corporatisation of agriculture which results from land-grab removes livelihood resources from the poor and at the same

time, makes them victims of the global markets and government schemes in which food prices are set for highest profit.

Third, from both of these issues, there was a unanimous recognition of the problem of government collusion with the corporate agents of this development model – to the detriment of the poor. On the one hand, there is a fundamental problem with the development model which promotes large-scale centralisation and corporatisation of agriculture and resources. At the same time, there is a collusion of many states with this development model. This collusion may be in the form of national/international development planning and/or in the form of regional and local corruption which favours the corporate over the popular.

Finally, it was recognised that many groups are now converging around this issue of land and livelihood rights – indigenous peoples who are being dispossessed throughout the global South and losing their traditional culture, women and youth who most often bear the brunt of landless poverty and low-income urban dwellers for the whom the resulting problems of climate change and food sovereignty are becoming more and more urgent.

The resulting impetus from the country-wide sharing was clear: the time has come for a global coalition focused on land and livelihood rights in the broadest sense. The rationale for this is also clear: since the problems are international in scope, pressure must be brought to bear on the international agencies which promote and support this development model. (In this sense, though the global South must take the lead, there is an important role for coalitions with activists in the global North.) At the same time, insofar as national governments are colluding in this process with the international corporate sector, the democratic space and process for people-centred development is being eroded and marginalised. Thus the global coalition should have its base in people's organisations working at the grassroots in each country.

Welcome address

We live in a world where a lot of wealth is being created – never before have technology and capital come together so well to do this. People often ask why we are so angry about it, since the resources are there to be exploited. My answer is that we have two concerns. One is that this wealth is being created at the cost of nature, culture and people. The other is that the wealth created is not ploughed back into the society from which it is drawn: it goes to some other place, some other country. So the wealth created, that too in a destructive way, is not being used to look after the people of the country.

How do we argue this with people who are in the running for creating wealth? They feel that anybody who is opposing this process is anti-national or anti-development.

People like us, we had a dream when we became social workers. The idea was to create self-sufficient and self-governed village communities. But in the kind of development model that we are following, people have lost their resources and their dignity.

A third issue we are debating now is the role of the state. We thought when we were young that a state is created to help people have access to resources and opportunities. That is how you create a just society. But what is happening is that the entire resources of the planet are given out to some people and the others are left out. While people like us keep on speaking about decentralisation of power and resources, decision-making power is getting centralised, so is the economy. We say that if resources and opportunities have to be given to everyone, the computer

should be given to the one who works on the computer, land should be giving to the tiller. Now what is happening is that the land and the computer, everything, is with one group of people. So I think the development model has to be challenged, and for this we have to come together.

The western world is trying to tell us again and again that this development model is not sustainable. If the ultimate result is insecurity and fear, why should one go for it? Why can't we think about a different model? That is where we need get back to Gandhi. He was opposed to big companies and big factories. He said, "What can be made by hand should be made by hand. What can be made in a village, should be made in village. What can be made in small industry should be made in a small industry. What cannot be made by hand, what cannot be made in a village, what cannot be made in a small industry should be made in a big industry". There are so many avenues where people can work with their hands, in the village, in small industries. We have destroyed all that in recent years. So if the West is telling us to forget about their model and to think about our own model, why are we in Asia, Africa or Latin America failing to look at our own model? Why this compulsion to imitate that which is failing?

This is the larger framework for this workshop. We need to look at how to reclaim the lost land and livelihood resources of millions of peoples across the globe. Billions of people, having lost their land, are forced to go cities, live in slums and ultimately take to violence. We have created a situation where people cannot be happy in the village and cannot be happy in the cities. Villages are no more liveable because of poverty and cities because of overcrowding.

The idea of reclaiming the lost land and livelihood resources and resisting this grabbing process is the agenda we need to look at in this meeting. We need to come up with an action plan.

Rajagopal P.V.
President, Ekta Parishad

The Delhi Declaration

The earth is a gift to humanity. Therefore all people's rights to land and livelihoods are fundamental. It is unacceptable that billions of human beings are suffering from hunger, deprivation and lack of dignity resulting from the imposition of the dominant neo-liberal development framework, in which land, water, forest, seeds and mineral resources have been commoditised and are hence increasingly controlled by corporations and financial institutions that operate with unrestrained greed.

In response to this intolerable situation, people at the grassroots level around the world must take urgent actions together to address the variety of challenges at the local, national and international levels that stem from lack of access to land, livelihoods and natural resources. Moreover, recognising the common origin of their problems, these actions should aim to link rural and urban peoples in a united struggle to achieve an alternative people-centred development that is just for all.

Acting upon this call for a Global Movement 2012, a non-violent campaign is being built among many organisations around the world in a combined effort to achieve people's greater control over land and sustainable livelihoods. Through Global Movement 2012, people are being brought together from different countries to undertake common, global actions.

In the spirit of genuine solidarity, Global Movement 2012 will bring people together from different countries to undertake coordinated actions aiming to achieve a concrete resolution to problems faced by the billions of people who today still lack

access to land and livelihoods. Some of the issues and responses are as follows:

1. Land-grab has become a common problem in many countries of the global South, creating increasing poverty, destitution and indignity. Both internal and trans-national land-grab are being carried out by corporations often using corrupt practices, and there are few regulatory mechanisms to prevent it. This trend has increased since the global crisis of 2008 and states with weak governments are being particularly targeted.

Response: Global Movement 2012 seeks to unite grassroots communities confronting the problem of land-grab around the world so that they can stand up together and defend their basic rights of land and livelihoods. In addition, Global Movement 2012 is advocating with international institutions to respond to land-grab by withdrawing support and resources if land rights are not provided to the poor. Transnational and national corporations need to be monitored and made accountable to people. This will lead to a more decentralised and sustainable form of land use and management.

2. Many governments are promoting market-led land reform, which continues to divest poor people of their basic rights over land and livelihood. In this view, land is a commodity but is not seen in terms of the dignity and livelihood that it brings to marginalised people.

Response: To counteract this trend, Global Movement 2012 is committed to working to defend community-based land rights by creating land use policies and legal frameworks which protect local people's rights; promoting a redistributive land reform agenda; and creating safeguards for collective and individual land entitlements for the poor and marginalised.

3. The commoditisation and the trade of essential food items are making food prices unaffordable for local populations. Governments are more interested in providing incentives to investors in futures markets and venture capital than

in creating an enabling environment for local agricultural production with the capacity to provide affordable food to everyone. While ordinary people are suffering from a food deficit, food traders are profiting.

Response: The Global Movement 2012 links the food crisis with the issues of land alienation, land acquisition and land profiteering, and recognises that the food crisis can only be resolved if access to agricultural land and an enabling environment for rural livelihoods are ensured for small-scale peasants around the world.

4. Small-scale agriculture such as household farms along with village-based industries are not getting sufficient government support; yet they continue to provide a more healthy, sustainable and productive livelihood base for rural populations.

Response: Global Movement 2012 is re-examining cooperatives, collectives, and other group formations in the course of developing a new sustainable rural-based development paradigm. Global Movement 2012 recognises the structural factors that bind together all marginalised people, including the rural and urban poor. Primary among these is the lack of access to land, whether for production, for settlement or basic identity. Any viable solution enabling the sustainable development of rural and urban communities must therefore involve the fundamental reallocation of land resources, both in rural and urban areas.

Challenges Ahead

6.1 Madiodio Niasse | International Land Coalition

I am happy to be here, to participate in this discussion on behalf of the International Land Coalition (ILC) Secretariat. As you know, Ekta Parishad is a member of the ILC. The ILC was established in 1995 to promote secure access to land for the poor. We have tried to carry out our mission through advocacy, dialogue, knowledge-sharing and capacity-building, and today we are engaged in a collective reflection on how our mission is being influenced by the current changing global context. Consequently, I think it is appropriate that I share with you some elements of the situation now and how it is changing our role of promoting access to land for the poor.

Observing it from various angles, today people are reaching the conclusion that we are facing a completely new context, a new world that is radically changing many aspects of our life. From an economic and geopolitical perspective we have entered what the Global Scenario Group of SEI-Boston calls the 'planetary phase of civilisation' (Raskin, 2006), which is characterised by an unprecedented level of interconnectedness. From a natural science and geological angle, Paul Crutzen, a Nobel Prize Winning Chemist, proposes the neologism of 'anthropocene' to refer to the geological epoch we are in today, and in which the magnitude of the effects of humankind's activity on the physical condition of the Earth is to some extent comparable to the impacts of previous major geological events. From an atmospheric and environmental point of view, there is now enough evidence to prove that

greenhouse gas emissions, resulting from human activity, are significantly affecting the climate of the earth and will continue to affect it for many centuries to come. These few examples underline the fact that profound and multi-faceted changes are taking place and need to be taken into consideration when examining the present and projecting ourselves in the future.

Let me now come to the land issue, which is the purpose of our meeting today. Land as a natural resource is being degraded to an extent not known before. Each year about 20 million hectares of farmland are degraded to the point of becoming non-viable from an economic point of view, while six million hectares are irreversibly lost for food production. This is very significant. For those people who already have access to land, it translates into reduced levels of crops harvested and of income generated from the land. In addition, we have noticed that globalisation manifests itself in a significant increase in demand for natural resources of all kinds to feed the world economy. We have witnessed and continue to see a global rush for minerals, for oil, for forest and wildlife products – to mention a few – as for many other natural resources of the world.

The current global rush for farmlands needs to be looked at in this context. Land-grab has taken place in the past, but what is emerging as a novelty is the fact that land-constrained governments are acquiring land abroad in order to respond to their own national food insecurity challenges, while states selling off their land claim to be motivated by their national interest: food security, rural development and employment generation. Another distinctive feature of this phenomenon is that in normal conditions a foreign investor is more attracted by countries where the investment environment is good, i.e. where investments are protected by solid governance laws and institutions. However, in the case of the current foreign investments on land, countries that are targeted are those with authoritarian regimes and weak governance. The paradox is that what is normally a disincentive for attracting investments becomes an asset, an enabling factor!

The overall context of natural resource scarcity needs to be taken into account. Often, we think that we have a land issue to deal with, not realising that the problem might not be about land itself. There are, for example, many investors in land in foreign countries that are from Gulf States and emerging economies. In reality, the real motivation of these investments is often water, and not land. In fact countries, like China are depleting their own water resources. In a country like India, the performance achieved during the Green Revolution has been paid with for with severe water depletion. In these countries, even in cases where the land is physically available, the water resources needed to develop are no longer there. With the decrease of these two strategic resources, land and water are now linked more than ever before. This imposes on us a paradigm shift in the way we look at land.

However, we should recognise that there is an investment gap in the agriculture sector in most of the developing world, which is a key factor explaining (not justifying) the land-grab phenomenon. The current context of climate variability and change combined with the lack of investment in agriculture – including in water control infrastructure – contribute to maintaining the small farming sector in a high level of vulnerability. In other words, owning a piece of land (even if it is of decent size) is not necessarily an effective shield against food insecurity and poverty. At the national level, the poor performance of the agriculture sector translates into high dependency of many developing countries on food imports, and therefore into greater vulnerability to food price volatility. It is therefore not a surprise that these countries were the hardest hit by the 2008 food price hikes.

Let me illustrate the investment gap with the example of large-scale water control infrastructure. The total number of large dams in Africa – the continent which accounts for more than 2/3rd of all reported farmland deals – is about 1,300 units (mostly irrigation dams), which is more or less the same as in South Korea! This is only one of the indications of the huge investment needs. Although domestic public and private sector

resources are sub-optimally mobilised, they are clearly not enough to respond to current investment needs. Foreign aid and philanthropic money can continue to play an important catalytic role, but their contribution to closing the agricultural investment gap will remain limited. Most governments in the developing world do not see alternatives to opening their countries' rural sector to foreign investors.

What are the implications for us, organisations mobilised to promote good governance of land and working toward securing access to land for the rural poor? The critical need for investment (including foreign investment) in the agricultural sector of the developing world can hardly be dismissed. The challenge we are confronted with is how to respond to the many threats associated with these investments (including the risk of dispossession of the poor), and how to deal with the fact that the countries which are the most actively engaged in these land deals are those with the weakest governance; are countries in which ruling authorities are not accountable to anybody; and where a president or simply a minister can give away hundreds of thousands of hectares of land without consulting land owners and users or any other relevant parties.

An important element worth mentioning is how the world has responded to the land-grab phenomenon. In the same way that economists could not predict the economic crisis, the land community was unable to predict the huge wave of land acquisitions abroad witnessed in the last 3-4 years. Why? One of the possible answers is the lack of proper monitoring of land resources. Because of our inability to recognise and consider the various key factors affecting land-related trends we are seeing today, our understanding of the 'land crisis' and its evolution remains so partial and fragmented that we are unable to predict the directions it is taking. We have also observed that once the phenomenon of land-grab appeared, the search for solutions was carried out in an uncoordinated manner. Several studies have occurred in parallel, without any mechanism or process for fostering a common understanding of the evidence gathered on

various aspects of the phenomenon. Similarly, various groups have come up with several proposals to respond to the phenomenon, ranging from outright rejection of any form of large-scale foreign investments, to codes of conducts and principles for disciplining these investments. As a result, despite the many workshops and conferences organised and studies carried out, we are not better prepared to respond to the challenges posed by the land-grab phenomenon than we were three years ago.

What can we learn from the way the world responded when other natural resources were targeted in the past? Take, for example, the rush for elephant tusk (ivory) or for forest products, diamonds, etc. Here too, countries where the resources are located are typically failed states with weak governance. The world responded by setting in place mechanisms such as the Kimberley Process Certification Scheme to prevent 'blood diamonds' entering the market and fueling civil wars and human rights violations. The world also reacted through the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES), including stricter rules for the trade of ivory, thereby protecting the dwindling populations of elephants. The Forest Stewardship Council was also established 20 years ago to address the rapid deforestation trend. There have been many global responses to threats to natural resources and the need to protect the rights and livelihoods of communities depending on these resources. The question is these responses can help discipline foreign investments in land, filter out bad investments, prevent those that are unduly taking advantage of weak governance systems in some poor countries, and avoid those that are likely to result in dispossession and impoverishment of rural communities. This question is open for debate.

The initiative led by Ekta Parishad to organise a global march in 2012 is taking place in a period when land is becoming a globalised commodity and an internationally disputed resource. It is clear that this trend calls for a global response. I do not see any meaningful, comprehensive global initiative in response to the issue at hand, apart from this initiative that Ekta Parishad is starting. The questions being raised in India are questions people

are raising in many other countries too. What Ekta Parishad did in the last big march in 2007, which led the government of India to take steps in formulating progressive land reform policies, is also relevant in the many other countries where governments are closing their eyes to the need for land reform. In India, as elsewhere, the real challenge is to ensure that effective implementation follows the enactment of progressive land policies and laws. In Africa, for instance, the adoption in 2009 by heads of state of the Africa Land Policy Framework and Guidelines was commended as the opening of a new era for improving land governance in the continent. However, despite the urgent land-related challenges facing Africa, there does not seem to be any real motivation from governments or, at least, any sense of urgency to speed up the implementation of the policy. Therefore, it makes great sense to have this global response aimed at pushing governments and all relevant parties to display stronger commitment to both land policy formulation and implementation.

There is a need to organise or influence the 'global system' so that greater attention is paid to the land issue and its linkages with poverty. Global alliances and platforms are necessary in order to influence the global governance system. We know that globalisation is resulting in the weakening of nation-states and the emergence of strong and highly influential non-state global actors and processes. The initiative being launched by Ekta Parishad is to be seen in this context. This is why I think we have a common agenda.

The ILC, as some of you know, is a coalition of different actors from all regions of the world. It consists of academic institutions, civil society and farmer organisations, as well as inter-governmental organisations. It is a neutral platform or more accurately a 'multi-perspectives' platform. It is also important to stress that one of the key missions of the ILC is to support civil society organisations in order to make their voices heard. All members of the ILC, including the inter-governmental organisations that are part of the Coalition, accept the principle

that we should support all civil society member organisations to amplify their voices. This emerges from the strong shared belief among our members that what matters, in the end, is to ensure that the complex but yet critical decisions to be made about the way land is allocated, shared and used are informed of the views and perspectives of all relevant parties, and are outcomes of open participatory societal deliberations.

Our mandate allows us, therefore, to be fully supportive of the Ekta-initiated process and to alert our members, especially our civil society members, so that they engage in the process based on the land challenges they face in their respective countries.

The next step is our Assembly of Members in May 2011 in Albania, where all members and key partners will gather together. We will share the information on the Ekta-led initiative. We will also consult with our regional platforms in Africa, Latin America and Asia on ways in which interested members could join the initiative. We will keep in touch to see how we can work together closely.

6.2 K.B. Saxena | Council for Social Development

In the context of India, the issue of land reforms has undergone a paradigm change since the onset of neo-liberal economic reforms. The policy pursued by the government since Independence emphasised effective implementation of land reforms for equitable distribution of land and increasing agricultural productivity. This was effected through two important programs. The first mandated that the tiller of the land should be its owner and therefore the tenancy arrangements between the owner and the cultivator should be removed. The second involved imposition of a ceiling on the ownership of land. The quantum of land in excess of the fixed ceiling was to be taken over by the state as surplus and redistributed among the landless rural poor.

The World Bank and the neo-liberal ideologues have delegitimised both these reforms. However, taking into account the popularity of land reform with the rural masses, it has been reoriented it to the market. They have been pushing for changes

in the two policies. According to their conception of land reform, there should be no restriction on the ownership, transfer and utilisation of the land. The land should be a fully and freely marketable commodity to facilitate its most efficient utilisation. This would develop the potential of the land market and promote economic growth. Therefore, they have been advocating the removal of all restrictions on tenancy so that land can be assigned to anyone who is prepared to cultivate it most efficiently. The cultivation arrangements should be settled by the land owner and the tenant, with no interference from the government. This implies that the cultivation arrangements and its conditionalities would be determined by the prevalent market norms. This would help poor landless persons to get land from the land owner for cultivation without any hesitation and help them in improving their income and alleviating poverty.

Similarly, the World Bank and the neo-liberal ideologues have campaigned against the imposition of ceiling on agricultural land holding on the ground that it obstructs development of land market and constrains efficient utilisation of land which can only be determined by unrestricted operation of market forces. Both these proposed changes would hurt the interests of the rural poor. The removal of tenancy restrictions would enable richer land owners to take land on tenancy from the poor people because they have access to capital and can invest in purchasing inputs and would be able to pay lease rent in cash, unlike the poor who neither have bargaining power vis-à-vis the land owners to get better terms of lease nor access to cash to purchase inputs and pay lease rent in cash. Worse, the poor would lose land also because they would be unable to get back their land for self-cultivation in such an arrangement due to the existing unequal power relations in agrarian society and lack of resources and knowledge to seek legal redress in such a case.

Similarly, the removal of ceiling – like the removal of restriction on tenancy – would lead to concentration of land in the hands of richer land owners, increase landlessness, widen economic inequalities and further impoverish the rural poor

due to loss of productive asset for employment generation. The World Bank also advocates the purchase of land from the market for distribution to the landless poor. This is an impractical suggestion because the demand would far exceed the supply and the price of land would increase enormously if the government were to undertake such a program. Also, the government would not ever have the resources to purchase land at market rates for redistribution. Since such land would be given to the poor on condition of repayment of its cost, the recipients of such land would become hugely indebted and would never be able to repay it. This suggestion would benefit the land owners at the cost of the government and the poor.

The neo-liberal policies supported by the World Bank and IMF are also promoting landlessness by pushing projects which require huge areas of land through compulsory acquisition for transfer to the investors. Millions of landowners have lost their livelihood and have been exposed to destitution as a result of this development model. The displaced persons have received no rehabilitation. While the land owners among the displaced receive meagre financial compensation, this has been denied to landless displaced persons. In the current scenario, particularly after the financial meltdown, land has become a very attractive object of acquisition as a safe and appreciating asset. Therefore, the corporates are acquiring huge areas of land directly through the market and indirectly through acquisition by the government. The advocates of this policy also oppose any restriction on the transfer of land so that the land is utilised in a manner which enhances economic growth and the potential of the land market is realised. These policies are leading to transfer of rich agricultural land for non-agricultural purposes and are increasing landlessness as well as affecting food security of the poor people.

The land reforms policy is also being negated by reforms pushed in the field of agriculture. These reforms involve:

- a) pushing people out of agriculture to urban areas so as to reduce number of persons dependent of land for their livelihood and also to accelerate growth of agriculture;

- b) shifting of cropping pattern from subsistence crops to export crops;
- c) exposing agriculture to the volatility of input and output global market;
- d) promoting unrestricted trade in agricultural commodities;
- e) reduction in public investment in agriculture, particularly by way of input subsidies and other supports to the farmers;
- f) privatisation of seed production, distribution and marketing and pushing genetically modified seeds;
- g) contract farming.

The objectives of all these reforms is to destroy self-sufficiency and self-reliance of the farmers and make them dependent on the market, thus exposing them to its volatility. This makes them losers both as buyers of inputs and sellers of produce. This has created an unprecedented agrarian crisis with huge farmer indebtedness, turning agriculture into an unsustainable vocation and forcing small and marginal farmers to leave farming. These policies are intended to facilitate entry of multinational corporates in the field of input supply, agricultural research, production and marketing of seeds and takeover land for corporate farming. In this manner, the pro-poor land reform policies of the earlier years have been completely reversed.

It is true that land reform in India has not been effectively implemented because of lack of political will, bureaucratic support and absence of organisations of the poor. The political and bureaucratic elite who control decision-making in the government come largely from the land owning classes and are therefore opposed to implementation of land reforms. Land owners in the rural areas are very powerful because of their dominance in the existing unequal land distribution of productive assets and unequal access to capital and educational and employment opportunities. They therefore control positions of power. This translates into disproportionate representation in decision-making positions and consequent skewed power

relations. This would explain why the land reforms laws enacted by them were weak and full of loopholes. The bureaucracy also sided with the land owners against the poor in the enforcement of these laws because of shared class interest. The poor were weak, unorganised, resourceless and powerless vis-à-vis the land owners. This was responsible for the subversion of land reforms.

Since the onset of neo-liberal economic policies, even the lukewarm commitment to implement land reforms has waned and this program has been eclipsed in the agenda of politics and governance of the country. But from the viewpoint of the landless rural poor, land reforms continue to be the topmost issue of political struggle and mobilisation. There have been a large number of peoples' movements for implementation of land reforms, including opposition to the acquisition of land for development projects and its transfer to the corporates. Today, almost one-third of the country is under siege by leftwing radical militant movements. These are primarily focused on the issue of land, its distribution and against policies which cause its transfer to non-agriculturalists, commodifying it. Ironically, as a result of these neo-liberal policies, widespread discontent has been generated among sections of the people and land reforms have acquired centrestage in the agenda of politics and governance. This is entirely due to the overreach of capital and the multinationals who are out to grab land and push peasants into destitute labour market.

Land has become not merely a national issue but a global issue as well because corporates are purchasing land in other countries also. Therefore, opposition to neo-liberal policies has also emerged in other developing countries. If we want to stop this growing conflict between state and people, we have to oppose neo-liberal transformation of economy and globalisation governed by its paradigm.

The land issue has also become very acute due to neo-liberal policies which are commodifying forest produce. Traditionally, forests have been the life-supporting system of the people through a mutually beneficial arrangement of sharing and

caring. This has been destroyed by diversion of forest land for mining, industrialisation, and commercial exploitation for meeting demands of the market and international tourism. This has taken away forest land and resources from the control of tribal communities who have been entirely dependent on them for their survival. Tribals have also been ousted from the longstanding occupation of forest land and habitat due to conservation programs for endangered wildlife species with no concern for the people. Tribal inhabitants of forest land are considered inimical to the conservation of wildlife although they have been living with them for ages. Millions of tribals have been relocated outside the forest by forest-closure policies and the setting up of wildlife sanctuaries and national parks. Access to forest resources has also been denied to these communities by management policies of the forest due to the commercial orientation of species planted in them to meet the needs of urban and industrial consumers.

Lately, this access of the tribals and other poor to forest as well as other common land has also been scuttled by the promotion of bio-fuel policies and the climate mitigation projects. Both of them are being pushed by corporate agencies and international financial institutions to capture forest resources. There was a huge protest against this injustice in India which led to the enactment of Forest Rights Act, 2005. The forest bureaucracy has, however, defeated its implementation and continues to retain control over forest land, denying forest rights to the tribals recognised under the law. This has added a new dimension to the conflict between the people and the state and therefore generated mass movements. These movements have articulated a new vision of development and natural resource management which is primarily focused on community control over natural resources for livelihood and life-supporting activities as well as a redefinition of Environmental Justice which makes local community an integral partner in activities geared towards conservation and utilisation, as different from the conservation policies promoted by World Bank and other donor agencies and implemented by the forest bureaucracy. These movements emphasise the centrality of management of forest

resources by the local communities rather than by state agencies. This alone would harmonise people's interest with preservation of bio-diversity.

6.3 Rajiv Vora | Swaraj Peeth

In the time of the British, the elite of our society slowly became masters and then oppressors. To extract the land revenue demanded by the British, they started oppressing their own peasants rather than go to jail and face torture. In this way, our own class of oppressors was raised. This is how the agent class in various areas of activities of modernising and westernising India was created. This story is relevant in land issues also.

My general observation about land issues is that there is a Permanent Settlement Act but it is more a permanent dispossession. This is how peasants, to whom the land traditionally belonged, lost the right to sell it. Land was not a commodity, it was common property and belonged to the village. They were dispossessed of this right and the state became the owner of the resources – land, water or forest. This is one major watershed in the nature of proprietorship and ownership that was transformed in favour of building the modern empire. In order to build it up, resources are needed – and where would you get it from peasant society? This was the history of almost of almost all the Asian, African and Latin American countries. We were never de-industrialised nations. During British rule, 28% of the population was engaged in industries like cotton, which served the purposes of the peasant society. Peasant needs were the dominant needs, with the industrial economy only supporting the peasant economy. The transformation that took place under colonial rule reversed this trend. Now the purpose of the modern industrial economy and its society is being fulfilled.

Small land-holding and food sufficiency have always gone hand-in-hand. If you don't have a small land-holding, you cannot have food sufficiency. This is the basic principle of a peasant economy. The problem today is how to make the small holding viable so that a rural society, which our society still is,

doesn't have to depend on a system of laws just for the sake of food.

Food should be naturally available to everybody, like it is to every animal in the forest. This is possible only when most of the people are engaged in agricultural activity, which is possible only if there are small holdings. In which type of economic and political order can small holdings become viable? That is a basic issue, a civilisational issue.

When we look at the history of our civilisation, we should remind ourselves of the ways and means of sustaining a society of small peasants who have food self-sufficiency and self-reliance. This is possible if the industrial sector is in the service of this small holding. But if a peasant's five-acre farm cannot afford a tractor, cannot afford pesticides and fertiliser, it brings us to what has been known in India historically as the principle of Swadeshi. Swadeshi is the name Gandhi used for giving primacy to the local. Its most profound definition is the use and service of the closest to the exclusion of the furthest. What does it mean? That human needs must be fulfilled from the neighbourhood – the neighbourhood which is accessible to you, the neighbourhood which has an empathetic relationship with you. This is a neighbourhood within which we can have moral supervision of each other. Where people know each other. The village was constituted by that kind of inter-relationship. What are these needs that must be fulfilled within the neighbourhood so that a community doesn't have to submit to the will of people they do not know, who have no relationship of empathy or love with them?

A human being has four types of needs. First, material needs. If we take care of the basic needs of poor people, then the rest of the needs will be taken care of in course of time. We know what are these basic needs, but with the passage of time we have forgotten.

Second, we have political needs, because an economic system cannot sustain us unless we have the power to make decisions. I must have a say over the things that affect my life, that govern my life. So whatever system there is should also have independent

legislative and judicial branches. Judicial functions should be conducted and power should be in bodies that are closest to people at the lowest unit of society.

Third, we have cultural needs, needs of our mind, of our intellect. Now our children don't learn about poets who come from their own community. They know all the names of creative people who fulfill our aesthetic intellectual need, of our rational faculty. Most of these names do not belong to our community but to the civilisation which conquered us. Even in British India, there was an ongoing debate on what should we do after we have conquered India. How can we keep it forever so that it fulfils the high resource needs of our modern civilisation? In 1917, Gandhi said that this is very much a centrifugal civilisation. It extracts power from the periphery and collects it at the Centre. Once they have abolished slavery from their own societies, they search for slaves from the world. This enslavement takes place at various levels. So they need a vast area to fulfil their resource needs. We can become a willing partner in this enterprise of enslavement only when our thoughts are transformed. This is the surest way of a sustainable conquest. So 1826 onward, for 30 years there was a debate on what education system should be imposed on India. There were several statements, some of them important. One was that an Indian class of agents should be created, brown-skinned but European in taste, intellect and opinion. This was the purpose of modern English education in India, a purpose which was achieved by destroying and dispossessing India's own educational system, which was very developed.

Fourth, our spiritual needs. They must also be fulfilled from our local culture. What is spiritual need? My quest to relate to myself. How do I relate to myself? How do I see the other person without the otherness so that there is a relationship of empathy and cooperation, not simply competition. In short, this is a cooperative society where one person paying is shared by the other also. Mahatma Gandhi calls this trusteeship. We need wealth. It must be created, but how do we use wealth? As a trustee or as an owner of private property? The two principles are different.

We can only have small holdings. If we have large holdings, we can only create a class of dispossessed people roaming around everywhere. Then we have increasing violence, disorder, unemployment, dehumanisation. That is why, when somebody asked Mahatma Gandhi, “What do you think about western civilisation?” he said, “It’s a good idea.”

Mahatma Gandhi also defines the word civilisation for the first time — western literature, even today, has been unable to do so. For them, sometimes civilisation means art and culture and buildings, sometimes civilisation is literature, sometimes civilisation is discourses and religious sects, sometimes civilisation is warriors. Mahatma Gandhi defines civilisation as that mode of conduct which points to other human beings as our duty. Duty and morality are convertible terms. You can be moral when you have control of your senses. This is the most important part of the definition of civilisation. So to say that you are moral means that you can perform your God-given duty. Moral means having control over your senses, your five senses.

This control has a lot of importance in the ideal of self-rule which Mahatma Gandhi calls Swaraj. This system of Swaraj or self-rule where justice and freedom both are synchronised, harmonised, that can only happen where a people are self-controlled. Control is not imposed from outside but developed freely from within. That possibility comes from education, from the environment, from mutual moral supervision. Therefore we have community-based societies where morality becomes a social concept, a social attribute rather than an individual attribute. In a large family, you become cooperative. In the life of large families, my activities, my wants, my desires, my expressions, my behaviour are restricted and restrained when I honour, when I respect, my elders who live with me.

Community life is possible where individuals have moral supervision. Morality could be maintained the best through internal education, cultivation of morality, and by supervision of the community – not by rules and regulation, and repression by law. This is a non-violent society. This is what Mahatma Gandhi calls Swaraj, based on the principle of Swadeshi.

By contrast, in modern civilisation all these structures are destroyed, and we are trained to ourselves become a participant in this destruction. This was achieved through the British education system. The idea of new science, new lifestyle was taught to us in such a way that we learned also the idea that we are backward, that everything we have is only a sign of our backwardness. This is what establishing modern British western education in India was all about. After independence, we have mastered that system instead of destroying it. Somebody asked Mahatma Gandhi in 1925: “When do you think British would go away from India?” Mahatma Gandhi said: “They will go away when they would have created a class of agents from amongst us”.

The point is that land is such a central issue, it is the issue of civilisation. The way you look at the land, the way you use it, the way you serve it, the way you fulfil your needs from the land, that defines your civilisation. And therefore, if we recreate our own relationship to the land, I think then it will become a much easier task for the generations which has to follow in the same footsteps. It is the work of generations, it has taken up to 10 generations for western civilisation to almost destroy that old civilisation, but so far the memory and the awareness and the older ways have not been destroyed and totally transformed.

There is no need to be frustrated or hopeless. There is hope. Responses to this injustice and this civilisational destruction are more important than the nature of the response. But we need a sign of the fact that the society and people are alive, that they are responding. Human dignity is what we need. People can and will make a greater sacrifice only to protect that dignity.

6.4 Praveen Jha | Centre for Economic Studies and Planning, JNU

In a famous essay written in 1930, John Maynard Keynes talked about the economic prospects for his generation’s ‘grandchildren’. Keynes said that if the world did not get into major wars, one could expect a decent future for everyone in about 60 years. He did a very simple calculation. He looked at the rate at which

capital was accumulating over the preceding decades and worked out overall economic growth in a compounded sense over the next decades: i.e., expected increases in quantum of goods and services that can be produced with new machines, capital, etc., assuming a given rate of population growth. Based on his calculation, he projected an increase of almost eight times in goods and services over the next half-century to 60 years. So there was reason to believe, according to him, everybody can have a decent economic existence.

In retrospect, we know that Keynes was wrong. In many ways the problem of livelihood today is as acute in many parts of the world as it was in the 1930s. Parts of the developing world have actually witnessed increased vulnerability and increased insecurity. Why was Keynes so completely wrong?

This is because Keynes fundamentally misunderstood the nature of capitalism. Unbridled capitalism necessarily destroys large sections of agrarian and petty production support systems. As the result, people are systematically dispossessed from something which can be the basis for their livelihood; and if they are not lucky enough, they are not integrated elsewhere into the economy so as to have a livelihood, or if they are, they may be integrated in a way that is peripheral and marginal.

There is no way that the problem of a decent livelihood in the developing world can be addressed without addressing the agrarian and land question and the needs of this sector. The global population is about 6.8 billion and the global workforce is about 3.4 billion. Of the latter, 500-750 million are simply surplus labour in the sense that if they are withdrawn from the global labour force, world production will not suffer. Capitalism keeps creating larger and larger labour reserves. This is something which is organically connected to the march of capitalism even while production increases dramatically. The total increase in goods and services in the last hundred years is more than the total increase of the preceding 2,000 years.

If we locate livelihood concerns in this kind of framework, it is immediately clear that unbridled capitalism is a recipe for

unbridled disaster. Once we understand that, there is no chance of running away from a certain kind of advocacy. We cannot fight the battle only on land issues but on the entire economic trajectory of development. Unless we are willing to question the current model of capitalist development, just talking about land will not take us anywhere. Neo-liberalism says the state must withdraw from production and regulation of any type because the market does this best. As land activists, we have to oppose the neo-liberal model of economic globalisation.

It is extremely important to keep in mind the larger canvas – also because rurality is very different in different parts of the world. The first thing we must do is to keep engaging with the trajectory of neo-liberal economic globalisation and confront that. While we are doing that, we hold hands with a whole range of fellow travelers.

What is the difference between the last decades and Keynes' time? After Keynes, there was an understanding that there must be a balance between the state and the market. During this time, many of the problems got addressed in a limited manner and a large amount of problems remained unaddressed precisely because the ruling elite did not rise up to the challenge of what a people-centric state could do and deliver. While around the globe more than 130 countries are counted as developing countries, only in a handful has there been any serious engagement with the question of land reform.

In India, for instance, while doing a few good things, we never addressed the questions of land reform seriously. Between the 1950s and the 1990s, of the total cultivable land in India, only 1.35% was redistributed. But look at South Korea and Japan: for very particular reasons, they had very significant land reform. These reforms happened under the influence of the US occupation army. There was a fear that without land reform, the country would go the Chinese way. The US was interested in blocking the so-called march of socialism in this part of the world. So Japan, South Korea and Taiwan are exceptional examples of land reform.

Land reform is indeed a very difficult question, but is there an option? In the next decades we cannot hope to have an economic transformation where more than 90% of the developing world can become fruitfully engaged in industry and in the services sector. No economic analysis can convince us that that will happen soon.

Let me conclude with this thought. In India alone we have some 600,000 villages and we have more than 3.3 million NGOs: but where do we stand? It is very important for land activists to put the struggles in the perspective of an engagement with the current trajectory of neo-liberal economic globalisation and confront the march of that particular trajectory. While doing so, we can build formidable kinds of alliances. For all who work on land issues, it is important to go to basics instead of remaining trapped in the periphery.

Agriculture and Forest Policies

7.1 Devinder Sharma | Agricultural Analyst

In 1996, the then vice-president of the World Bank and the chairman of the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR) Dr Ismail Serageldin said the World Bank estimates that in 20 years, the number of people who will be migrating from the rural to urban areas in India will be equal to twice the combined population of France, UK and Germany. Since that number is close to 200 million, the World Bank estimate was that 400 million people would be moving to urban centres in India by 2015. I thought that this was a warning, but when I started looking at the subsequent World Development Reports, I realised that this is what the World Bank actually wanted India to do. It was simply facilitating this process.

In the 2008 World Development Report, the World Bank mentioned very clearly that India should go in for land rentals. In its view, land is a very important resource which is in the hand of people (meaning farmers) who are using it inefficiently. The World Bank says that these people must be shifted away from those resources so that the land can go to people who can make efficient use of it – and this, of course, is the corporate sector. This process of shifting people off their land began long ago and is now at its peak.

With farmers being driven off their land, and the government pushing land acquisition at a frantic pace, the fundamental issue the world faces today revolves around food security. Unfortunately, we are given to understand that there is nothing

to worry on the food production front because food can be more efficiently produced by corporates. It is primarily for this reason that since the World Trade Organisation (WTO) came into existence in 1995 the effort has been to force open the floodgates in developing countries for imports of cheaper and highly subsidised grains from the rich developed countries. Subsequently, bilateral agreements in the name of Free Trade Agreements and regional trade pacts have exacerbated the process of facilitating the market of industrially produced food and food products from the developed countries.

Land and livelihood issues therefore have become central. It is not only India that will witness the biggest environmental displacement the world has ever seen – the entire South will be equally impacted. It is my estimate that India and China together will have some 800 million plus people migrating to the cities/towns in the years to come. The millions who are being forced to migrate are what I call agricultural refugees.

Do we even understand where the world is moving to? Do we even comprehend the socio-economic as well as political upheavals that such a massive displacement will cause? Instead, we are being told increasing urbanisation is an inevitable outcome of globalisation, of economic growth. We are also told repeatedly that globalisation has blurred the national boundaries. But I have a feeling that in the years to come instead of blurring of national boundaries we will in reality have more nations being carved out.

I am worried, I feel concerned. You should be worried too. Take, for instance, the extent and kind of farmland grab taking place in the developing world. To illustrate, one Indian company has got 3,000 sq km of land in Africa and Latin America. This is more than the land area of many smaller nations. One day, and don't be surprised if it happens, the owner of this land mass can simply put up a flag and declare it an independent country.

We have to be a little more cautious, a lot more pragmatic. Sooner or later, society has to come to grips with the realities pertaining to agriculture, food security and land resources. The sooner it happens the better it would be.

The problem is that we always try to look at all these crucial issues from only one angle: from the dominant perspective. But the ground realities are a mix of several perspectives and have to be viewed from different angles. Unless we do so we will fail to place a particular thought in the right context. This broader context is missing in many platforms that I go to. Perhaps this is the reason why we have not been able to really come to grips with the real issues in a manner that is insightful and meaningful.

Let us first make an effort to understand what is happening to land resources and the resulting global food security. China is a country where 500 million tons of food grains are being produced. Considering that India is producing around 230 millions tons of food grains and has a population that is about 200 million less than that of China, one would assume that China should be able to feed its population with what is produced domestically. But this is not so. Despite producing almost twice the quantity of food grains that India produces, China is a major food importer. It is also investing heavily to purchase or take on lease farmland abroad. It has invested more than \$24 billion in buying farmland in more than 35 countries. It aims to grow crops which can be shipped back to mainland China.

India also one of the big players acquiring farmland abroad but India's investment is still much lower than China's. India has only invested \$2.5 billion so far and almost the entire amount is private. Through these investments, globally an area equal to the size of France has already been bought (by not only China and India, but many other countries) and this is mostly in the geographical South – Asia, Africa and Latin America.

The race to acquire farmland picked up after the economic collapse of 2008-09 when hedge funds and other speculative money moved from the financial markets into the land markets. This is probably because the investors realised that land is the surest kind of profitable investment that one can make. Unlike most of the South, till now India has not allowed foreign companies to come and buy farmland here but there is a law that allows companies to come and get into 'contract farming'.

Contract farming is the first step to land-grab. The second step is leasing that land and, finally, acquiring that land. Interestingly, in the absence of any provisions to allow foreign companies to take over farmland, the deputy chairman of the Planning Commission Dr Montek Singh Ahluwalia has in a recent visit to Oman invited companies to do 'contract farming' in India and take the produce back home.

The fundamental cause for all such usurping of land resources and natural wealth is the emphasis on economic growth, driven by the quest to achieve higher rate of GDP. Somehow I find that the GDP is assumed to be a touchstone to development. But the tragedy is that as much as 99 per cent of the society is actually unaware as to what constitutes GDP. Even the educated do not know what goes into the making of GDP. They know the definition but can't explain it in simple terms. I have often asked them how would they explain GDP to their own mother or father who are not college educated. I have always come across blank faces.

In simple terms, GDP is the amount of money that exchanges hands. Let me explain. If a tree is standing, GDP does not grow. But if you cut down the tree, GDP grows. If a river is flowing clean, GDP will not grow (or grow marginally). But if you pollute the river, not once or twice, GDP grows three times. Let me illustrate. First, you allow industries to be set up along the river banks. GDP grows. Then you allow these industries to throw effluents in to the river water, thereby polluting the river. This necessitates a multi-million dollar project to clean-up the river. GDP grows. And finally you and I drink the polluted water. We fall sick and go to a doctor or are hospitalised. We pay hospital fees and this adds to GDP.

Is this the way we want to measure growth? If we really make an effort to understand the complexities behind growth we would realise that we are being taken for a ride by our economists and planners. The surest way to increase GDP several-fold is to bomb a city and then to rebuild it. But I am sure none of you would agree to do that.

Moving on from GDP, I think livelihood and food security issue too are not well understood. We have not been able to appreciate the challenge that lies ahead. In a country like India, land is a very important resource, more so given the population growth. There are 600 million farmers in India, including their families. Every fourth farmer in the world lives in India. Together with China, we make up half the farming population of the world. Compare this with America, which has around 700,000 farmers. In fact, with the number of farmers dwindling so fast, the US census no longer keeps a count of its farmers. So when America talks about agriculture, it is actually referring to big machines and corporations. When a country like India talks about agriculture, it is talking about the poor or subsistence farmers. This distinction needs to be kept in mind.

Agriculture has been so cleverly designed over the years that all odds are pitted against the humble farmer. It is designed to make farming unremunerative, turn it unviable. The emphasis over the years has been to ensure that with every passing year more and more farmers are moved out of agriculture. They are forced to either quit or commit suicide, whichever is the easier option. It began nearly a century ago when around the time of the Great Depression the US forcibly evicted some 30 million from agriculture. A hundred years later, India and China are following the same policies. We are also evicting the farmers by creating conditions they no longer want to stay back on the farm. You can see the similarity.

After World War II, America took advantage of the chemicals left from the war and utilised them in farming. The industrial farming model evolved thanks to the left-over chemicals. Since then the entire agricultural research and education system revolved around industrial farming systems. India borrowed its agricultural research infrastructure from the US, tailoring its universities to the land grant model of agriculture. Not only is India's farm research modeled on an alien system but its massive agricultural research force is programmed to support the spread of industrial farming as the only way to meet food

security needs. What is not appreciated is that the industrial farming structure is too cost-heavy and is highly unsustainable. And this is where the farm subsidies come in. Agribusiness is the biggest recipient of farm subsidies and that makes food cheaper and also exportable.

Over the years, countries like America started to pump in money to become self-sufficient. Subsidies in those countries have gone up phenomenally to a record level. WTO tells us that the rich industrialised countries pay annually more than \$375 billion by way of farm subsidies. In others, more than \$1 billion is pumped in as farm support every day. And yet, the bigger agribusiness companies have eaten up small farms and have in turn displaced and pushed farmers out of agriculture. In the European Union, which has the highest amount of subsidies given to agriculture, one farmer is quitting agriculture every minute. The same model of farming, which does not require farmers to produce food, is being pushed onto the developing countries.

I fail to understand why an industrial model of farming which has forced farmers to abandon agriculture in US/EU is being accepted by the developing countries. Why can't we realise that we do not need agriculture sans farmers? Instead, we need to make agriculture more sustainable and economically viable so that it is able to absorb a large workforce.

This is because we fail to see through the design. We miss the bigger picture. And because we fail to see through the flawed design, we actually lend support to policies and prescriptions which would only end up adding to the existing crisis and lead to further marginalisation of the farming communities.

The IMF/World Bank started the structural adjustment programs some 30 years back. And since 1995, as I mentioned earlier, the WTO began. All these policies and strategies that IMF/World Bank plus the WTO brought in were aimed at pulling the poor from abject poverty. These policies and approaches were also aimed at ensuring food security at the national and household levels. Now let us look at what has happened on the food security front.

There are about 150 countries which comprise the Third World. Out of these, 105 countries have become food-importing countries ever since the IMF/World Bank began the holy grail of Structural Adjustment. Five or six years after the Doha Development Round is completed, you will see that most of the remaining Third World countries too would become food importing. What is wrong in this? Well, everything is wrong. Importing food for these countries is like importing unemployment. And standing with a begging bowl in front of the rich industrialised countries can never address the issue of hunger and poverty. By destroying the production capacity in the developing countries, the World Bank/IMF has ensured perpetual economic dominance and thereby political control.

The answer lies in what Mahatma Gandhi had once proposed. Knowing that the more food we import the more unemployment we are bound to create, Mahatma had suggested a production system by the masses, and not for the masses. This recipe holds well any day. On the contrary, millions are being pushed out of their land in countries across Asia, Latin America and Africa. As I said earlier, this deprivation is also linked to the unviable agriculture design. Only agribusiness ends up making money, not farmers. Farmers therefore want to quit agriculture if given a choice. In India, 40 per cent farmers have expressed the desire to move out of agriculture. The reason is simple: agriculture does not give them anything. With the average monthly farm income hovering around \$40, where is the incentive to stay in farming?

Talking about food, the entire effort is to produce more food. The argument is that the population of the world is growing and the world would have to produce more in the years to come. But is it true? We have 6.7 billion people on the planet today and what we do not know is that we already produce food for 11.5 billion people. In other words, we already produce food for twice the existing population. In terms of calories, on an average, a person requires 2,600 calories per day. Against this, the world produces about 4,600 calories per person per day. In other words, there is no shortfall in food production. And still if nearly 925 million

people are going to bed hungry, it is because some people are eating more and some people are deprived of their requirement, which is a political issue of access and distribution.

At a time when we produce food for double the existing population, the entire focus remains on producing more and more. Why? Because this helps the seed-producing companies. It helps companies that produce inputs like fertilisers, pesticides and so on. And don't forget, the more the sales of these external inputs, the higher will be the GDP.

Agribusiness is giving an impression that countries like India (and China) need to move on to other countries to produce more food. They try to justify that India and China need to buy land abroad to produce more food for their domestic requirement. The need for producing more food justifies the massive farmland grab that is taking place. Today there is hardly a country in Latin America, Africa and Asia which is not being impacted by the land-grab. Again, all this adds to GDP.

In Ethiopia, a country known for hunger and starvation, there are 8,000 companies vying to get land. Ethiopia has already allocated 2.7 million hectares to some 2,000 companies, including those from India. These companies are not going to produce food for Ethiopia but for export. Ethiopian food production figures will never give us the real picture as to how much food Ethiopia is producing for itself. It is not clear if we will ever get to know how much food have been produced by these companies. In fact, the first food shipment from Ethiopia has already gone back to Saudi Arabia. But Ethiopia's poor and hungry will wait endlessly for food.

This brings me to a dark comparison from history. A few decades back, I attended in Cork the 150th commemoration ceremony of the Irish famine. Inaugurating the conference, the Mayor of this city wondered what kind of barbaric society existed at the time the famine happened. As he noted, people were dying of hunger and starvation and yet corn was being loaded and shipped to England. I don't think the barbaric nature of the society has undergone any change for the better. The time has

come when we will see a much more barbaric society at work. What is happening in Ethiopia by way of land-grab is no less barbaric. Companies have the legal permission to export food when people are dying of hunger within the country. This will happen more and more.

Is this is the world we are dreaming of? Is this the model of development for developing countries? Is this the GDP model that you enshrine? Will this bring in happiness?

The challenge before us therefore is to understand the complexities. We need to draw the bigger picture, and then find a way out. The way out has been shown by Mahatma Gandhi. The Mahatma said every country should have a production system by the masses, and not for the masses. That is the crux of the development process we need to have. Herein lies hope for a beleaguered globe.

7.2 Bina Agarwal | Institute of Economic Growth, University of Delhi

If there is one thing that the experience of civil society and grassroots action has taught us over the past 30 years, it is this: collective approaches work better than individual approaches. We know this in the context of people's efforts to obtain access to major resources such as land, forests and water. Today we have a large number of groups protecting and managing these resources. In the context of natural resources, a group approach is well accepted today.

However, we have not made the necessary leap in the context of agriculture. The classical model of peasant agriculture remains that of individual family farming. Even demands for land are still posed in terms of individual land titles, be it for women alone, or for both spouses. And the assumption is that the person or households getting the titles will cultivate it individually. This leaves many of them seriously disadvantaged and unable to obtain the production gains they could with a group approach to farming. What could be the advantages of a group approach? I have elaborated on this at length in my recent paper Rethinking

Agricultural Production Collectivities published in the *Economic and Political Weekly* (27 February 2010, 55(9): 64-78).

As I argue there, over 80% of farmers in India and in South Asia more generally, cultivate less than 2 hectares (ha) of land; in fact most have under 1 ha. And many agricultural workers are landless. To begin with, a group approach could increase access to land for the landless and land-poor. Those who have no land could pool their financial resources and take advantage of existing subsidised loan schemes to lease land. Those who already own small plots would enhance the cultivable area, since you would save the land currently lost in making boundaries of fields. In addition, both those leasing land and those owning small plots, could gain greatly by a group approach in cultivation. Collectively, they would be able to overcome shortages of peak labour needs; pool resources to obtain manure and other inputs; are more likely to get access to formal credit and extension services; afford crop insurance; invest in higher value crops since the risk can be shared; and undertake more effective marketing.

If poor farmers approach governmental offices as a group they are more likely to be attended to than if they went as individuals. Individual farmers also get exploited under contract farming. As a group they could get legal help to ensure that the contracts are not on exploitative terms. Soil improvement and rain water harvesting efforts also require a collective effort and would help deal with climate change.

To move from individual to group farming, however, we need to overcome existing prejudices and misconceptions. These arise because of the history of collective farming under early socialism, in particular the massive collectivisation undertaken by the Soviet Union and China which had disastrous consequences for people's welfare. The early socialist experiment was coercive in nature and forced farmers to join collectives. Farms were very large in scale and farmers had little voice in decision-making. The group approach I am suggesting is the exact opposite. It would need to follow certain principles: voluntariness, small size, bottom up, socio-economically homogenous, participative in decision-

making, women-inclusive and egalitarian in the distribution of gains.

Is this possible? I believe it is. In fact, it is already happening in many regions of the globe, including India. There are three types of examples that I know of. One example is from several transition economies in Eastern Europe, Central Asia and Latin America where, after the initial large-scale collectivisation during the 1950s to 1970s, there was de-collectivisation in the 1980s and 1990s. Families then had the option of moving to individual family farming. Instead, large numbers reconstituted into small groups (with friends, relatives or neighbours), pooled their land and resources and decided to farm collectively, on a voluntary basis. You can find examples in Kyrgyzstan, Romania, East Germany and Nicaragua. Productivity under group farming is significantly higher than on individual family farms since as a group they could overcome constraints arising from small land size, or labour shortages, or lack of access to machinery, and so on.

The second kind of example is from India. It relates to the initiative taken in the late 1980s and early 1990s by the Deccan Development Society in Andhra Pradesh. The government of Andhra Pradesh had started a loan-cum-grant scheme under which landless Dalit women who formed a group could apply to purchase land. DDS helped Dalit women come together and form groups of around 10-15 women to purchase land and farm it collectively. DDS also helped women form groups to lease in land and farm it jointly. These women's *sangams* undertake organic farming and multiple cropping for subsistence. They now have sustainable livelihoods. We can also find examples of women's lease groups elsewhere in India and in Bangladesh. The third type of example involves male farmers in the Punjab. Some of them have come together to pool their land to grow vegetables and fruits, and take advantage of cold storage facilities which they could not afford on an individual basis.

In these examples, as you will note, in some cases families have pooled land to form a collectivity; in other cases women alone have formed groups for subsistence cultivation; and in yet

others male farmers have come together to take advantage of opportunities for producing higher value crops. We do not need to have a single blueprint. There are many possible models. The important point is that we begin in a serious way to move toward a group-oriented approach to agricultural production. I believe this would provide the innovative institutional breakthrough that we need today for economically and socially empowering poor and disadvantaged farmers.

7.3 Sanjay Upadhyay | Enviro-Legal Defense firm

The figures vary but around 300 million people, especially tribal and marginalized communities, are dependent on forest land, which covers about 23% of geographical area of India. This area is similar to the mineral map of India, the tribal map of India and the poverty map of India. I always wonder – how does the government choose between one and the other? That is the real challenge that India faces in terms of its forest land context: whether to choose forest-dwellers' benefit, whether to exploit minerals in those areas, whether to get into tribal development and get them into the 'mainstream' – whether they want it or not – and remove their poverty.

The current debate in relation to the above choice centres around 'go' and 'no-go' areas in India. I still do not know what goes on in the Forest Minister's mind because he keeps 'going' and 'not-going' to such policy choices. When he came and took over the environment ministry, he was very much against the no-go areas for mining on forest land. Last month that suddenly changed. He has a 99% record of clearing most of the projects in forest areas. That is something that we are still struggling with. There is of course no legal basis to this whole 'go' and 'no-go' policy. Often there is at least a public spat between different ministries. We still don't know what goes on in that cabinet.

Another trend that is emerging in India in the last 20 years concerns the creating of exclusive zones. Of course it started in 1878 when the Indian Forest Act came into being. We created what is called reserve forest for industrial purposes catering to

the British empire. Now, it is said that such reserve forests were created for environmental services which is not historically correct. They were created for the production of timber. Large numbers of reserve forests are the legacy of the British. In the 1970s onward, we started creating these exclusive zones within forest land, including national parks, sanctuaries, tiger reserves, critical wildlife habitats or the special economic zones. I think this is creating a corporate entity within countries.

The decision to make 23% of our land mass extremely exclusionary is a very serious development. I think we need to really challenge that sort of model. We cannot manage 23% of our land mass by making it an exclusive zone without the involvement of people.

When we look at land resources, I have been very fascinated by the word 'public purpose' for which incidentally land is acquired in India and how the court sees this word. If you go into the history of this word it started very harmlessly with 'public utility', then it changed to 'public works' and then again to 'public purpose'. This happened in 1894 when the first Land Acquisition Act came. It has been more than 117 years since this law came into being but we still have not defined what 'public purpose' is. Yet this single word drives the whole acquisition process in this country. We need to be very careful of what kind of purpose we are calling 'public'. We have not really questioned why this word has never been defined.

The Land Acquisition Act was tweaked in 1984. Concepts like 'public objection' to questioning 'public purpose' were introduced but were never used effectively. With the new amendments, there is no talk about 'public objections' but rather about 'urgent acquisitions' or 'urgent public purpose'. These terms which have now been coined within the legal framework are very dangerous. There have been many legislative acts which acquire forest land and talk about 'deemed public purpose'. There is now no possibility to challenge that public purpose any more. It is considered to be in the interests of the larger people. Therefore you cannot challenge it in a court of law. This needs to be seriously questioned head-on.

I have looked at the Special Economic Zone Act, the Special Area Development Act the Highways Act, the Indian Forest Act and even some Social Welfare Acts. They all now talk about 'deemed public purpose'. If we do not challenge this, we are assuming that these things are to be considered as public purpose.

Then there is the whole question of land transfer. For instance, the way we are converting agricultural land to industrial land. Many State Land Revenue Codes have now been very stealthily amended to make such conversions legal which was not there earlier where we have strictly forbidden that kind of conversion of agricultural land. Now, in the so-called developed states like Maharashtra, Karnataka and others you will find that most of the Land Revenue Codes have been amended to convert agricultural land into industrial land. That is also considered to be a 'public purpose'. All our coalitions need to challenge this.

Land is being acquired in the name of national interest, public interest, economic growth. All types of terminology is used throughout the country for acquiring land. We have not really questioned this paradigm and this is a serious problem.

What do we get in return for this conversion? We get compensation. But what is that compensation? We never get land for land. It is highly contested. There is no robust framework for compensation if you look into our legislation. Even in the context of forest land we have coined two new terms. One is called the net present value of forest land. God knows what that means. How to define the true value of land? Nobody is there to monitor court orders and we are not questioning these basic concepts. They do not cover genuine rights or genuine dependence of forest communities. There is no debate on what these concepts should include. It is limited to landowners. Only that is compensated. This whole compensation regime needs to be challenged!

What can we do? We often frame the question well but do not know the answers. We should first of all have a national land use policy framework. Way back in the 1970s we created the National Wasteland Development Board and the State Land-Use

Board (SLUB) in every state of India. Not a single SLUB that I am aware of does any type of planning. To my mind, the SLUB should be the strongest body in every state so that, at least, we know how much land we have and for what purpose we are allocating it. We have created these institutions but have not given them any teeth. We need to strengthen these institutions to make real assessments.

The other important issue is that we do not have a framework of right-sizing. The question to be asked here is how much land is required for what. Microsoft has acquired four times more land in India than what it has in the US. We can ask whether that kind of land is required. I have seen cases where 100 times more land was taken over than what was required. There is no current area in which this type of right-sizing is happening. Here also we have to work on it.

We often tend to create new terms and new paradigms without really building on the old ones. I think there are spaces available within the existing framework that we need to use for strategic reasons. We need to turn concepts that the system and the state understand on their head to use against them.

There is a preliminary survey provision in the land acquisition law. We have never used this provision for assessing public purpose. We need to do that.

Another point is to develop criteria for diversion of land, especially forest land. We follow a very standard government system of general conditions and special conditions for diversion but there is now public debate on that. When you are acquiring land for mining in certain areas we have never questioned those areas. We normally follow some sets of general conditions made by some men in the government and never question that. As a civil society, we are not even developing a model to be followed.

In the Forest Rights Act, there are very clear provisions of reverting the land after five years if it is not used for the purpose for which it has been acquired. Then it can come back to the community. We have not worked on this. If we win such battles it will have a ripple effect. We also missed working on a strict

monitoring of the kind of land being diverted. We need to go to court and question these conditions because we do not have any mechanism within the bureaucratic system of the country or outside to monitor what kind of diversion is taking place and on which priorities this is being done. We need to strengthen our understanding on those points in order to take it back to the court and say that this type of violation will not be tolerated.

We need to really question ourselves after 117 years of a legislative framework on what is public purpose. Unless we do that and question that fundamental premise on which land is being acquired we are not going to get too far.

Human and Women Rights

8.1 Miloon Kothari | Housing and Land Rights Network

The UN has a very elaborate system of protecting human rights. Many of you are familiar with the UN special rapporteur on the right to food, Jean Ziegler and his successor Olivier de Shutter. But there are a number of other special rapporteurs who work on issues linked to land rights such as: Rapporteurs on Adequate housing, Human rights defenders, Violence against women, Rights of indigenous peoples, Rights of internally displaced persons, Extreme poverty and on Minorities. The Special Rapporteurs are uniquely placed to utilise the many facets of their mandates to highlight land rights. There is great potential for other mandate holders to also become engaged, individually and collectively, to highlight the importance of land rights. These mandate holders can certainly contribute to the protection of land rights as well as to the important step of establishing the right to land as a human right.

All of these rapporteurs represent the UN human rights council but do so in their independent capacity. Their annual reports to the UN human rights council primarily focus on obstacles to the relevant rights the special rapporteurs are mandated to protect. They carry out two to three country missions every year. These missions can have as a focus the situation regarding land rights. They make very specific recommendations. Because they are independent, you will often find a rapporteur taking very similar positions to what all of us would take as civil society. For example, Jean Ziegler represented very much what

Via Campesina was saying and the current rapporteur on the right to food actually is learning from Ekta Parishad and other groups. Individuals can be very good allies in your struggles – both in terms of utilising the UN system better but also by holding governments accountable. One of the lasting contributions made by SRs is in the area of standard-setting. Such development of ‘soft law’ can significantly contribute to a more precise understanding of state obligations on land rights. There are already in existence two such instruments that can be useful to states contemplating policy measures to protect land rights. These are the Guidelines on Internally Displaced Persons and the UN Basic Principles and Guidelines on Development-based Displacement and Evictions.

The rapporteurs are very easily accessible. They carry out specific communications on particular issues. These communications can address specific violations of human rights or can address policy and legislative questions. Such communications, either individually or jointly, could address land rights issues. In the last five years there has been an attempt by the rapporteurs to identify gaps. One such gap that we have identified was on land rights. The rapporteurs are working on understanding the situation more but also to develop standards. Special rapporteurs often also issue public statements and address regional and global conferences. These public statements point out violations of human rights but can also recommend necessary policy or legislative measures to protect rights related to land consistent with State obligations to the international human rights instruments. The media attention such statements obtain can also be very useful and can often provide an independent affirmation of positions taken by civil society groups, including land rights campaigns and movements.

In addition to the above outlined potential activities, special rapporteurs can also contribute through research and through participation in expert meetings to highlight how land rights impact upon the specific rights they are mandated to monitor and protect. The collaborative dimension of special rapporteur work can also result in fruitful work with civil society groups

and national and regional human rights institutions and mechanisms.

The other reason I want to stress the importance of utilising the UN Human Rights System is that for the last three years, there is for the first time at the UN something called Universal Periodic Review. This is a peer review where each government member of the Human Rights Council reviews the human rights records of the other members. This presents some major opportunity for civil society groups to ensure that their government is accountable. The initial experience shows that governments are very sensitive to what happens when their Human Rights Record is reviewed in such an inter-governmental process. Governments generally do not want to be shamed internationally. They would prefer to demonstrate progress they have made in realising human rights.

The third reason I am stressing this is that in my own experience of human rights work over the last 20 years, I have found civil society organisations (networks, movements, grassroots organisations) are increasingly using a human rights framework to articulate their struggles and to demand accountability of states. These groups are also increasingly using the UN human rights system to highlight their struggles. The advantage of this very strongly rights-based approach is that you can also utilise national institutions, such as national and regional human rights commissions, which we very often not do. Human Rights institutions do not only look at civil and political rights but also do look at what I have called economic social and cultural rights. Land rights obviously address both these sets of rights.

The UN treaty bodies have a key role to play in monitoring state compliance with treaty obligations on rights related to land. The treaty bodies can contribute in the different ways. They can request states to include in their reports information on steps they are taking to protect land rights in a post-conflict phase. This can be done by revising state reporting guidelines to include questions on land rights; by including specific questions in the

'list of issues' prepared by treaty bodies; during the course of the review that takes place when state parties appear before the treaty bodies and through reference in the 'principle areas of concerns' and 'recommendations' contained in the concluding observations prepared after the review of state party reports. The concluding observations can call for specific policy and legislative measures to assist the relevant state party in protecting land rights and countering phenomenon like forced evictions and land-grab that cause people and communities to lose their lands. The concluding observations can also provide direction to obligations of 'international cooperation and assistance' for states, other than the one being examined. These can be useful to counter the role played by international donors and financial agencies that lead to violations of land rights. Specific treaty bodies can focus on the impact of non-recognition of land rights on particular groups. The CEDAW committee, for example, can develop a focus on the critical importance of the recognition of women's rights to land in post-conflict phases.

Treaty bodies, in particular the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, could consider adopting a General Comment on land rights in the context of the human rights protected in the Covenant. Such a general comment can include specific provisions on policy and legal measures to be taken by countries in a post-conflict phase.

There are a number of existing optional protocols to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (yet to be put into force), the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination against Women and the Convention on Rights of the Child) that could be utilised by sending test cases to the relevant treaty bodies.

The special rapporteurs and treaty bodies can carry out joint work through standard-setting; elaboration of indicators and benchmarks to assess progress with mitigation and adaptation measures; joint statements at global conferences, joint public statements and joint reports.

Finally, I wanted to stress the importance of good documentation. We need to develop skills to have a culture of documentation of violations. I give you one example of a tool which is currently being developed. This is something called Eviction Impact Assessment Tool. This is a tool that has come from the UN guidelines on development-based displacement and evictions. The tool is being developed to contribute to the struggle that thousands of groups around the world in rural and urban areas are involved in to effectively stop displacement. One of the reasons is the inability to accurately document displacement. Nobody actually does eviction impact assessment which can then determine whether one should go ahead with a project or not. This tool is looking at material and non-material impacts of evictions. If we use a tool like this and then present it before an official body, that makes our case to halt displacement or to obtain adequate rehabilitation and compensation more convincing. The elaborate UN Human Rights System that I have spoken about is very much under-used and under-utilised. If we can join hands with the many possibilities offered by this system we will certainly add to our collective struggle to claim land rights across the world.

8.2 Savio Carvalho | Amnesty International

Amnesty International's Demand Dignity campaign is working to stop human rights violations that drive and deepen poverty. This campaign is a global human rights journey which aims to empower and enable people living in poverty to claim and exercise their rights, specifically focusing on communities living in the South, particularly addressing discrimination and gender equality. Demand Dignity is about making human rights real. It is about amplifying the voices of poor men, women and children, making them heard and influential – whose voices are often most ignored, most excluded by decision-makers.

Many states around the world have signed on human rights conventions and treaties. Demand Dignity is about enforcing those legal obligations, about making them real in the lives

of the poor. There are states that still do not legally recognise economic, social, cultural rights (ESCR) i.e., the right to water, the right to health. We will campaign to ensure governments make this a priority.

Our campaign works to address and strengthen gaps in three key areas: ACCESS to human rights and services, which are essential to human rights; ACCOUNTABILITY for implementation of human rights obligations; and ACTIVE PARTICIPATION of poor people to support their claiming and exercising of ESCR.

Accountability: Though there are strong international standards in many areas of human rights protection, there continues to be a lack of accountability of governments, international institutions and companies when they violate/abuse these rights. This accountability gap is compounded by the fact that adequate mechanisms are not in place for many rights violations and also because people living in poverty often do not know their rights or face particular barriers accessing justice when their rights are denied or violated. India is a good example. India has signed up to nearly all of the international human rights treaties, there are Parliament functions, elections, etc. But what access do people have to remedy and accountability when their rights are violated? There are courts and laws but in many instances not everyone can go to a court of law, so in many cases accountability and remedy for violation is simply denied to people.

Access: we will work to ensure that barriers to access rights are removed for people living in poverty (e.g., discrimination against indigenous people, people of different castes and ethnicities) – they must have equal access to essential services, i.e., right to water, right to health.

Active participation: The State has to empower and enable poor people (who have often endured historic discrimination) to actively participate in decisions that impact their lives, so that they can claim and exercise their ESCR. States/local governments must ensure that people are consulted, that laws, policies and processes are in place to enable people living in poverty to have

access to information to participate in decisions; people living in poverty must have the information and the support necessary to enable them to participate effectively, e.g., translations in relevant languages, advice centres to seek support and assistance on government entitlements and schemes.

How does this campaign impact people living in India? Let's take the example of the extractive mining company Vedanta. This example clearly illustrates that the indigenous people/communities living in south-west Odisha – already one of the poorest areas of India – are under threat from expansion of a new bauxite mining project. They have been excluded from the decision-making process that directly impacts their lives: their rights to livelihood, their homes, and the very land these people live on will be used to make profit for others. Local communities did not have access to information on decisions which were being taken. Their ESCR were not being fulfilled, respected or protected. The Vedanta example also highlights abuses that are committed by corporate companies – in this case a corporate company not even registered in India, but the UK.

Vedanta posed many questions: How do we ensure that non-state actors (influential decision-makers such as corporations) respect and protect human rights? How do we make them accountable when these corporations abuse human rights? How do we ensure that communities most affected have access to meaningful information? Amnesty International worked at a number of different levels: in collaboration with the communities and local lawyers, we researched and filed right to information (RTI) applications to access information, we conducted detailed research of human rights abuses, including taking testimonies from local communities affected and used this to mobilise local and international human rights activists to campaign and lobby decision-makers such as the Indian government and Vedanta (UK) to uphold its human rights obligations. (Further details: *'Don't Mine Us Out of Existence: Bauxite Mine and Refinery Devastate Lives in India'* Amnesty International report at www.amnesty.org)

To conclude: I would like to pose three questions concerning the RTI Act. First, it would be useful to file a RTI application and inquire how many of the commissions and committees that have been set up, have actually delivered according to their terms of references. This would ensure that we are holding the government accountable for its own processes and mechanisms of accountability. Second, how do we ensure that human rights are recognised by national laws of countries? How do we make them more legally enforceable so that people can access protection in their everyday lives? Last, how do we unite, mobilise and strengthen our human rights community, how do we continue amplifying the voices of our people living in poverty at the village level to the national level and then take these voices to the global level?

Finally, it is crucial that we continue working together with urgency, commitment and in solidarity in order to find creative solutions to ensure the rebalancing of power structures between those that currently possess power and the millions of poor people who do not.

8.3 Annie Thomas | Action Aid

We need to have a special focus on women's rights to land when we talk about land rights because we are living in a patriarchal society where violence against women is increasing day by day all over the world. Land is power and life and it ensures dignity. The large majority of poor women depend on agriculture for livelihood. Studies show that a key factor linked with rural poverty is access to land. Land is a wealth-creating and livelihood-sustaining asset. Where women are concerned, the land question remains far from resolved. The area of women's land rights therefore opens up a space to work simultaneously on oppression and injustice.

Women's right to access and control land are central to the goal of poverty eradication and a rights-based approach to development. Independent land access could create an enabling environment for women, thereby setting in motion a process for social and political empowerment. As of now, women have a very

small percentage of land in their name. At this point of time we are discussing how to get land from the rich to the poor and how to fight against the state but if we do not focus on this women's aspect now, maybe the next generation has to sit like this and discuss: *we have got land in our hands but we couldn't attain a society which we aspire to, women are so behind.* Let us not make the mistake of talking about land rights in general and passing the ball to the future generation, worsening the situation.

Action Aid is an international donor organisation working in more than 40 countries. Recently, we received a multi-country project from the European Commission which is implemented in three countries in three regions: Guatemala (Latin America), Sierra Leone (Western Africa) and India (South Asia). This project focuses on Woman's Rights to Land. The wording of the project title – Enhancing poor and excluded women's access to and control over land as a strategy for empowerment and fighting hunger – is very important. Rural women's empowerment is closely linked with land. Giving land in the name of women is just the first step, having access to and control over the land is very important, otherwise having land in their name may not make much sense. In India, a few states are saying in different schemes that land should be given in joint title to husband and wife or in the single ownership of women. Many times, women are not aware of these and even if the policy or Government Order exists, it is not implemented. Women want power, decision-making power, nothing less than that. We believe that a woman should have equal access to land as a man just because she is a human being. During this three-day discussion on land rights, only a few mentioned women

Many times, men represent women, assuming women can't represent themselves. So there are many things we need to keep in mind while planning for the future on land rights.

The project targets very poor and excluded groups of women: Dalit, indigenous women and those living with HIV/AIDS in remote rural areas. In addition, it aims to generate new knowledge and differences that relates women's access to land to other

empowerment indicators. The proposed action will enable the collectivisation process of women that enables them to wield power. This project increases capacity of women's groups to develop and lead advocacy on women's rights to land, increases participation of landless women's movements in policy and legal frameworks development at local and national levels. It also increases awareness of rights and use of the justice system. The program also focuses on inter-regional alliances. This is a big issue: many of us are doing work on land and livelihood rights, something here something there, very fragmented and it becomes very difficult for us to come together. Through this project we want to show empirical evidence of linkages between land access/control and women's empowerment.

We will be doing research with these partners in different countries. At the end of the project we want to show how women are getting land and how they behave when they get land. What concrete change happens when the women have the power to decide? How is the income utilised for the family? When we say woman's right to land, all these things are coming together. It is a difficult task, because we live in a male-dominated society and there will be many people, customs, traditions, laws, etc., which will influence negatively the outcomes of the project. The five partners who implement this project have been working on this issue for many years and we hope they will successfully implement this project as well.

Country Reports

9.1 Asia

9.1.1 Nepal: Roshan Chitrakar; Jagat Basnet | Community Self-Reliance Centre

For 104 years we had the Rana regime in Nepal. They were Prime Ministers by birth. This was a very feudal society. Land was distributed free of cost – not to farmers but to those who pleased the rulers. So if you had land, you exercised power.

The historical context must be explained first. The first revolution occurred in 1951. Nepal had people's government at that time but after 10 years the king became very active and absolute monarchy prevailed for about 30 years till 1990, when big people's protests brought a multi-party system in place of the one-party system. This held from 1990 until the turn of the century when another revolution occurred: the king stayed as the constitutional monarch but played a political role again. In 2006, we had to remove the king.

In Nepal, 29% of the rural population is absolutely landless, according to UN data, while a few families control land. The same people remain in power despite the three major political upheavals described above. They did not make the ruling class more accessible to the general public.

The contribution of the agricultural sector to GDP is 34%, with 65% of the population depending on agriculture for a livelihood. Over 58% of the rural population are fundamentally landless and over 85% of the farmers are land-poor, owning

less than a hectare. The tenancy system decrees that those who are registered can claim the land they till but not those who are unregistered. It's the Dalits and indigenous people who are mainly landless. In Nepal, land certificates are also connected to availing of government services so poor people are effectively shut out. Those who have land use it to strengthen social and political power but not to provide a livelihood to the people.

There is no consensus among political parties on the land question because five issues are contentious. One, is land a property or a natural resource? Second, is the national or the federal government responsible for land? Third, should there be a land ceiling? Fourth, should land reform be revolutionary or scientific? Fifth, what should be the compensation paid when land over the ceiling is acquired?

We are demanding re-distribution of land because the elite class still holds land but they were never farmers. Of course, public land or forest land is excluded. The land issue is related to national development as land reforms would help mobilise human resources. It would enable equitable growth and social justice.

In the land rights movement started in 1994 with the support of Action Aid Nepal, we are working in around 50 districts. We are expanding this movement across the country. We have successfully educated, empowered and organised landless farmers. Already 96,000 households have been organised. We are generating power from the grassroots so we have gained recognition from this sector. Government and political parties are also listening. Political parties themselves are asking that the movement for land reform should be strengthened. The parties have no basic disagreement about the agenda. If we invite them, they speak and show solidarity.

The donor agencies are not all in one basket, in my experience. Some want to stay out of it, saying this is a political agenda. Some are supporting the landless movements.

The powerful media is established by the elite group and has no interest in supporting land reform. They are basically looking for profit.

On Women's Day, 1,000 women will come to Kathmandu to pressure the political parties to translate their commitment into action. They will come with their own food and blankets from 50 districts. Several politicians will join the event. We have planned to bring 2,000 women in 2012, so it will increase every year.

The common action related to Jan Satyagraha is already announced: 200 people will participate from Nepal and a memorandum will be submitted to the Indian embassy in Kathmandu.

9.1.2 Indonesia: Muhammad Nur Uddin; Ika Nurillah Krishnayanti | Indonesian Peasant Alliance

In Indonesia, which is composed of five big islands, the land part of the country is only 22.98%. There are 20 million landless people. There were 7,491 land dispute cases in 2007 covering 607,886 hectares. The loss caused by land disputes is approximately Indonesian Rupee (IDR) 146.8 billion. Based on BPN estimates, considering the price of land which was equal to IDR 15,000/m², with the interest rate of 10 percent per year, the potential loss of Indonesia in five years was IDR 146.8 billion. Land disputes not only have implications on society and politics, they also appear to affect social gaps, poverty, and security disturbances, and the economy.

In 1950, a map of vegetation showed that around 84 percent of land (162,290,000 ha) was covered by primary and secondary forest including all types of plantation. The decade of the 1970s was the era of deforestation. Illegal logging was rampant.

In 1970-1990, the deforestation rate was estimated to be 0.6-1.2 million ha per year. The rate of deforestation in 1985-1997 was at an average 1.7 million ha per year, with Sulawesi, Sumatra and Kalimantan being worst affected. By 1997, Indonesia had lost 72 percent of its original forest (Source: World Resource Institute, 1997).

In the period 1997-2000, it was the fact that deforestation escalated to 3.8 million ha per year, making Indonesia one of the countries with highest forest degradation in the world. Based on

the analysis of Landsat Satellite images in 2000, of 101.73 million ha degraded land, 59.62 million ha was in the forest areas.

Rights of the people to access and manage forests through the program of people-based agro-forestry (HTR), Social Forestry, Indigenous/Customary Forest and Village Forest is confined to 500,000 ha. This area is very small compared to concession rights awarded to big companies which covers 29 million ha of forest, industrial forest which covers 7 million ha, and forest managed by Forest State Company which covers 2.4 million ha. The state limits the people's right to access forests since the state claims itself as the single owner of forest area which covers 133.57 million ha, even though up to now only around 10% of those forests have been measured and declared forest area. In fact, there are thousands of villages in the forest areas, whereas only 9,754 villages (in 17 provinces) have been identified.

People who enter and till the land inside the forest area can be jailed for up to 10 years and fined up to IDR 5 billion. Those who desire the right to manage the forest (through people-based forest/HTR), have to face 19 units of forest task force and get 54 types of permission, starting from the district to the head office at national level. Four peasants were shot dead by the state apparatus, forest policemen, and police mobile brigade in 2008-2010.

With the environment also under threat, Nature is no longer able to play its role of provider, and people have to experience crisis every day. Disaster is everywhere. According to WALHI, in 2009, the total number of disasters in Indonesia was 1,713. At least 1,940 people died and 10,576 houses were damaged.

The development of palm oil plantation was started in the 1970s (30 years ago). In Indonesia, especially in Sumatra, there was only 250,000 ha of palm oil plantation in 1979. Now, it is more than 7.3 million ha, producing at least 21.5 million tons of crude palm oil (CPO) per year. The expansion of plantation creates conflicts between companies and people – 663 such conflicts were on a large scale. At least 106 people, one of them a peasant woman, fell victim to violence by the security apparatus in 2010.

Abandoned or unused land covers around 7.15 million ha. In five years, the potential loss of abandoned land economically is IDR 491 trillion. The land occupation movement began with the Reform Order in 1998 when peasants occupied land from the state and private plantations, and state forest company which covered more than 500,000 ha. Indonesian peasants' organisations and national NGOs are fighting for abandoned and unused land to be part of land reform or genuine agrarian reform.

Changes in the global financial architecture and international geo-economic is driving multinational corporations to invest in agriculture and food, which is a form of land-grab. Indonesian National Political and Economic Systems adopts and plays the role of a neo-mercantilist for exploitation and global slavery. We wish to sustain the struggle of the movement at local and national level and to leverage and intensify it in the global struggle and solidarity. To bring about more socially just North-South relations, we argue for strengthening South-South social solidarity.

9.1.3 Sri Lanka: Lalith Abeyasinghe | Movement for National Land and Agricultural Reforms

Agriculture in Sri Lanka can be divided into two sectors: one focused on domestic food production that accounts for 76% of the cultivated land, and the plantation sector. Land area with poor farmers declined 64% in 40 years. The agricultural sector declined from 39% in 1960 to 19% in 2000. This means that agricultural livelihood is discounted.

We have two significant land-related laws. One, made in 1840, is called the Crown Land Act. Under this, all the uncultivated land was taken over from the king by the British. In 1971, there was a massive armed struggle by the youth in which 6,000 were killed. The Land Reform Act was brought in to limit the ownership of land to 50 acres per person.

This tiny island is governed by geo-political factors. From 1974 to 2008, there was a massive armed struggle in Sri Lanka led by the Tamil people in the North under the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam. What they were claiming was their traditional homeland,

but they were defeated militarily. There is another group of people brought from India in 1820s, one million plantation workers. Out of one million, only 10% have their own land.

Sri Lanka's land problems can be categorised in six categories 1) The first problem is that of illegal occupants who don't have ownership rights 2) Land distribution is very much a political act. Since independence, only 800,000 acres have been distributed to the people. 3) Government created colonies in the Tamil areas and settled Sinhalese people there. But in these colonisation programmes, for the second generation, there is no plan, there is no land for their livelihood. 4) Land acquisition by the government for massive major infrastructure and hydro projects 5) Sale of land to multinationals for sugarcane projects, for tourist programmes, for hotels. 6) Finally, there is the problem of ethnicity. If the government distributes land among the Tamil population, there would be a lot of protests. Many other nationalities – Indians, Chinese – are now coming to Sri Lanka to grab land.

The Sri Lanka land issue has become very international, very global. We cannot succeed here if Indian people do not agitate against their own government not to grab land in Sri Lanka. We have opened an international harbour built by the Chinese. Thousands of Chinese businesses are here. With international help, we have just started building an international cricket stadium. This indicates what kind of development the government has in mind.

In Sri Lanka, we need a global campaign and global action to make the poor people the owners of the land. It has to go beyond our boundaries.

9.1.4 Thailand: Jeff Wong | Four Regions Slum Network

The organisation and movement I represent – Four Regions Slum Network – has as its members urban poor slum dwellers and homeless people. We have roughly 100 member-communities around the country, most of which are in Bangkok.

When I talk to people from other Southeast Asian countries about slums and the urban poor in Thailand, the reaction I

sometimes get is surprising. For many, Bangkok, compared to their own capital cities, is a very developed city in terms of infrastructure. The visibility of the urban poor in Bangkok is much lower than it is in other places in Southeast Asia. Nevertheless there are many slum communities in Bangkok, and there are an estimated 1.14 million slum families, or around 5 million people, living in slums in Thailand.

Slums have come about as a result of policy. They have been created. It is not a natural occurrence that people just choose to live in slums. With the first National Economic Development Plan in 1961, the Thai government listened to the advice given by the World Bank and American economic advisers to choose a development path that emphasised industrialisation. Incentives and benefits were given to foreign investment in industry. This required a pool of cheap labour which did not exist in Thailand at the time. So the government needed to crush the agricultural sector by destroying small-scale subsistence farming in order to push people off the land and into the cities, so that there would be a labour force available. When poor people migrated from the countryside to the city, they could not afford housing. This, in simple terms, is the policy origin of slums.

Since that time, there has been more and more migration into the cities, largely through the continual destruction of small-scale agriculture. Indebtedness of peasants leads to landlessness. This is because of the heavy reliance on expensive agricultural inputs in the central plains area of Thailand, where the irrigation infrastructure is located. This infrastructure has made it possible to do as many as five rice crops or sometimes more every two years, but because of the reliance on expensive chemical inputs, peasants have to borrow money in order to produce. They often borrow from informal moneylenders at very high rates of interest. Once the harvest comes in, they are forced to sell immediately to middleman in order to pay back the moneylenders. But this also means they have to go back to the moneylenders again when the time comes for the new production cycle and they have to borrow money to buy the fertiliser and other chemical inputs. This

indebtedness is causing landlessness, which in practice is pushing more and more people off the land and into the cities.

When you settle on land that you do not own in Thailand, you are not entitled to household registration, an official document issued by the government. If you do not have this document, you cannot apply for a legal water connection or a legal electricity connection. You also cannot send your kids to school. These are basic problems of slum dwellers. Obviously, if you do not own the land you live on, you face a huge lack of land security that can manifest itself in the form of forced evictions. Forced evictions were a real problem in Thailand in the past, but because of the organising work that has been done with slum dwellers over the past 20-plus years, they are no longer a problem on state-owned land. However, in the case of private land, violence is still sometimes used against slum dwellers to force them to move.

Four Regions Slum Network relies on community organisers who live in the communities or work very closely with them in order to listen to the people, find out the important issues they are facing and work with the people to find solutions to their own problems. Generally, the tactics used to achieve these solutions take the form of collective action to pressure decision-makers into solving the problems that the people face.

The first stage in resisting evictions is to find out exactly what is going on. There is a real problem of lack of transparency, of information. There are always rumours flying around in informal settlements. Usually, the first sign that an eviction will take place is that someone comes and puts up a sign saying they have to get off the land. If this happens in an organised community, they go in a large group to the authorities to find out more.

There are also development activities that must be organised in communities, often in parallel to resisting eviction, in order to show the public that slum dwellers are responsible and wish to improve their conditions of living. In Bangkok, for example, there are several communities located along the canals facing evictions because they are on public land. It is important for these communities to prove to the public and the government

that they are responsible and can take care of their environment, and there is no need to displace them.

Sometimes we use merit-making ceremonies to bring communities together. This has a religious importance but also plays the social role of bringing the community together in collective action. For instance, building a children's playground also bring the adults together. It is a way to reinforce solidarity in the community.

The fight against evictions is finally a physical defence of communities. In some ways it is almost like a military action to defend your community and the land that you occupy. Arson attacks are often used to burn people out. When this happens, you have to be prepared the same night to rebuild. Otherwise the landowner can come in and put up a fence around the area and say this is his or her land. Another lesson learnt by many urban poor communities is that when the eviction crew is coming, women and children form the front line. When the police, the soldiers or the demolition crew show up, the chance of violence breaking out is much greater when men are on the front line. With women on the front line, there is a greater likelihood of de-escalation rather than an escalation of violence. Tactically, to defend your community, you have to close off all the entrances except one and at that single entrance put all your people with the women in front. Women in general show a greater resolve to defend their community than men. I think it is because of women's greater understanding of the importance of their home as not just a physical place of residence but as a place of community, where your family and neighbours are.

Coordination with other communities is also essential in resisting evictions. You need to amass people, so coordination with allies, meaning other slum communities, is important. Four Regions Slum Network has been relatively successful in fostering this kind of solidarity, which has come about as we have tried to build up our network. We have also developed a coordination mechanism with external allies. Media is very important, as are academics, professionals, and even sympathetic politicians. They

can influence public opinion and the way of thinking of the politically influential middle class.

Besides working with the urban poor, Four Regions Slum Network also has links with the rural poor, with whom we advocate together for land reform, both rural (for production purposes) and urban (for settlement purposes). One of the main issues we are advocating for now is the implementation of a new form of land ownership just recently endorsed by the Thai government. In the latter part of last year, the Council of Ministers approved in principle community land title. The problem has been that five ministries refuse to use the new mechanism of community land title to resolve land conflicts with communities located on land they own.

From February 16, Four Regions Slum Network together with a coalition of predominantly rural poor groups in Bangkok came under the umbrella of the People's Movement for a Just Society. Our demand was genuine land reform and access to natural resources. In response, Parliament was blocked off and the Internal Security Act invoked. We demonstrated at a location about 500 metres from Parliament with 6,000 people sleeping on the street in the initial phase.

9.1.5 Bangladesh: Muhamed Kamal Uddin | Association for Realisation of Basic Needs

Nepal, India, Sri Lanka, Pakistan, Philippines and other countries of South and Southeast Asia have a legacy of alien rulers for centuries. When we threw them out from our soil, agents of the foreign rulers started ruling in the so-called independent countries, depending on the structures and bureaucracy built to continue their misrule and subjugation. So, there were no fundamental changes in the oppressive basic structure to meet the needs, desires and demands of the people of independent countries. Changes in the superstructure were just replacement of alien despots by the local ones. Because of the continuation of the same rules, land and livelihoods issues have not been solved that concern the landless poor, marginalised

peasants and professionals, indigenous peoples, Dalits and the dispossessed.

That is why even today, well into the second decade of the 21st century, we are still discussing pertinent issues of development like land, forest, water bodies, etc.

Bangladesh, fortunately or unfortunately, fought its war of independence twice. My father dreamed of a Pakistan where his aspirations, demands and basic rights could be fulfilled. That is why he participated in the war of independence in the 1930s and 1940s against British rule. In those days, East Bengal (as it was then called) had a population of 40 million. The so-called creators of Pakistan could lure millions of innocent and illiterate Muslims of Bangladesh by propagating a rich and rosy Pakistan where there would be no dearth of resources, no famine, no poverty. Farmers, peasants, share-croppers and landless labourers would get land to live a dignified life with honour.

I was born just after Pakistan was founded. When I was in secondary school in the village in the early 1960s, I joined student politics and took part in the democratic movement against the military rulers for socio-political and economical autonomy. Democratic movements over 23 years culminated in a nine-month armed struggle in 1971, giving birth to Bangladesh.

When Pakistan was created, the number of landless people in Bangladesh was roughly over 12%. During 23 years of Pakistani rule, the number grew to 30%. The population of Bangladesh grew from 40 million in 1947 to 75 million in 1971. We are now about 165 million people in Bangladesh in a geographical area of 56,000 square miles. After 40 years of independence, the number of functionally landless living in both rural and urban areas has gone up to about 65%. They are landless labourers, share-croppers, marginalised peasants and professionals, indigenous people of the hills and plains and minorities living in inhuman conditions in rural areas and urban slums.

Unfortunately, genuine development has not yet taken place although the republic is 40 years old. Poverty, malnutrition, deprivation, dispossession, de-peasantisation, corruption, misrule

and malgovernance persist. As a result, the number of poor people is increasing day after day. Dhaka, the capital, is home to about 15 million people, more than 4 million slum-dwellers living in hazardous and inhuman conditions.

The industrial revolution in the western world put their agricultural workers into the industries and factories. But in Bangladesh and elsewhere in the South and Southeast Asian regions, we are creating conditions that force poor farmers and marginalised rural poor to come to the city centre and throw them into slums where basic amenities are non-existent. Poverty-stricken people can be seen on the pavements, bus terminals, launch terminals, train terminals, roads, highways, everywhere. Poor people cannot be kept hidden from donors, visitors and tourists.

On the question of land, all the efforts over the last 40 years by the government, UN bodies, NGOs and others failed. Bangladesh is branded as one of the poorest, least developed countries in the world. On the other hand, it is also one of the most corrupt countries of the world. So, projects and programs and schemes do not trickle down to the poor or do not benefit them. Many documents show that the benefits of all such developmental projects and programs are appropriated by the donors, national and international researchers, consultants, bureaucrats and NGOs.

More than 3 million girls and women in the age-group 15-30 years are working in the garment industry, living in the slums of Dhaka, Chittagong and other cities. The garment industry gets orders from the European and North American markets and garments are stitched according to the design and orders given by the world market. Garment exports bring about \$12 million a year. But the salary of the garments workers and their working conditions are very poor. The minimum salary of Taka 3,000 (\$43) per month committed by the government and owners is not being paid to the workers despite their working 12-16 hours a day. Nor are they paid for overtime.

Similarly, landless labourers in the agricultural sector keep the wheels of the economy of Bangladesh moving. They produce

food grains, fish, potatoes, cash crops, tea, sugarcane, pulses, vegetables, lentils and seasonal fruits which could feed the whole population of Bangladesh. So, why are 65% of our mothers and sisters malnourished, giving birth to underweight and stunted children? Unfortunately, we export rice, fish, vegetables, fruits and garments for the people of the world, keeping our own millions hungry, malnourished, anaemic and naked.

What is to be done? In the rural areas, there is a need for radical land and agrarian reform. Land has to be given to the tiller and at the same time necessary conditions created so that farmers can cultivate their land profitably. The indigenous people of Bangladesh are to be guaranteed their traditional right to ownership of land. Their traditional practices of cultivation, their right to forests and water must be protected from encroachers. The fisherfolk communities of Bangladesh should be given the right to fish in the water bodies and necessary equipment should be provided to them.

There are hundreds of micro-credit operators and NGOs in Bangladesh. The income generated from micro-credit operations is eaten up by exponents of the free market economy. The market must be oriented in support of poor consumers of both rural and urban areas. Many people question what would have happened to the poor people of Bangladesh had there been no NGOs in Bangladesh.

We must overhaul the social structure which is oppressive and exploitative and protects the oppressors, exploiters, ruling elites and their corporate interests. These structures are dehumanising, dispossessing and exclusivist. They deprive majority of the people in order to serve the interests of the few. Therefore, we need to organise collective action at local, national, regional and global levels to question the age-old anti-people and anti-nature socio-political and economic structures. A more inclusive and humane society must be built that looks after its citizens equally, irrespective of caste, creed, colour, belief and ideology.

9.1.6 Philippines: Nathaniel Don E. Marquez | Asian NGO Coalition for Agrarian Reform and Rural Development

The Philippines is an archipelago of 7,107 islands. About 48 million people draw a livelihood from forestry (30% of the population) or agriculture. About 10 million ha is under agriculture. Unfortunately, around 31 million poor people live in the rural areas.

The poorest of the poor are the indigenous peoples, numbering about 14.1 million. They are illiterate, do not have access to basic services such as health and are not included in governance.

Because of the agrarian structure, there are small peasant farms in large plantations. Private land ownership was first introduced during Spanish colonial rule. In 1986, it was estimated that about 20% of the families owned 80% of the land.

There are a number of laws which promote access to land. One is the Comprehensive Agrarian Reform Program (CARP) which was instituted in 1987. This happened after the first 'people power revolution' in which the masses confronted the government. Agrarian reform targeted 8.1 million ha of agricultural land to be redistributed within 10 years. It also has other components for support services and agrarian justice because land distribution is not enough. There is a need for training, marketing, credit, basic infrastructure, among others. The initial years of CARP covered lands that were either owned by the state or those lands that were voluntarily offered for sale by private owners. Those lands were easily covered by the law.

The CARP program was extended for another 10 years until 2008, given that the targets have yet to be achieved. Now we are looking for a six-year extension until 2015. The main focus will be to distribute the remaining balance and to provide support services to the land that has been distributed.

Another resource reform measure our government has been implementing since 1987 is the Indigenous Peoples' Rights Act (IPRA) to recognise, promote and protect the rights of indigenous people. IPRA promotes self-governance, cultural integrity and the concept of free, prior, informed consent (FPIC). However

more than 10 years after the passage of the IPRA, only 20% of the targeted area (slightly more than half a million hectares) have been awarded to Indigenous People (IP) and very limited development activities in support of the Ancestral Domain Management Plans have been undertaken in IP areas. Poor government performance in IPRA implementation is rooted in conflicting policies, implementing agency capacity gaps, and a questionable commitment to give priority to the empowerment of indigenous communities over the entry of large-scale foreign and local commercial interests into resource-rich IP lands to establish mining and agribusiness enterprises.

The country also implements a number of laws that enhance access to land: the Urban Development Act, the Forestry Act, the Mining Act and others. While these legislations have noble objectives, however, a number of implementation concerns still arise. For instance, a significant amount of resources are needed to finance CARP, i.e., funds to acquire the lands. How will the government be able to sustain the program so that it can be completed? Another concern is data interpretation. While the Department of Agrarian Reform reports that so much land has been distributed to farmers, a number of farmers do not actually till the redistributed land as landowners have gone in appeal to court and have barricaded their lands. Limited resources are provided for training, marketing, processing. On the other hand, for the indigenous people, the process of getting their ancestral claim has been tedious and expensive. There are turf battles within government agencies and conflicting policies and tenurial instruments have created bottlenecks and conflicts with the basic sectors.

So what are the challenges? A major one is the institutional capacity of government agencies to implement key legislation. Implementing agencies are generally perceived as lacking the resources, expertise and political will to implement decisive tenurial reform.

Lack of political will also manifests itself in bilateral economic agreements and executive issuances that disregard the social

justice policy of the state and hinder further the access of basic sectors to land and water. The larger forces of globalisation and modernisation are also at work, threatening national sovereignty, compromising ecological integrity and placing varied and new demands on the nation, its people and natural resources. For example, the previous government's policy favouring large-scale commercial mining has affected all social justice and ecological programs, threatening the integrity of the land and water used by farmers, fisherfolk and IPs. Clearly, the issue of land and water access and tenurial security for the basic sectors cannot be divorced from the dominant development paradigm and mainstream economy of the country.

There is a need for a national land law to regulate the interests of the different stakeholders (particularly the basic sectors). Specifically, the National Land Use Act shall: (a) address conflicting land use in different laws; (b) provide for rational land use taking into consideration the land to be protected, the land to be used for productive purposes, settlements development and infrastructure development; and (c) be participatory in nature. Congress should ensure adequate funding for the National Land Use Act, particularly for the resolution of disputes and delineation of land.

Another challenge for the extension of the agrarian reform program as well as other resources is finance. Civil society organisations (CSOs) need to demonstrate that such reforms reduce poverty. That has always been questioned by policy-makers and the private sector.

The IPRA should be strictly implemented, the implementing agency (i.e., National Commission for Indigenous People) should be capacitated and held accountable, and funding should be assured for the implementation of Ancestral Domain Management Plans. The procedures of the current revised free prior informed consent (FPIC) process should be reviewed and changed to conform to the traditional decision-making processes of the tribe(s) concerned. Tribal decisions based on the new FPIC process should be implemented strictly, particularly with regard

to decisions involving mining and other extractive activities in the ancestral domain.

There is a need for inter-sectoral dialogue for indigenous peoples, farmers, forest dwellers, fisherfolk and urban settlers. Given the limited resources, they should have a common understanding of the different perspectives.

Another challenge is monitoring the budget of these programs. CSOs also need to continue the monitoring of human rights violations. Another related policy advocacy is the Right to Information Act. With the absence of such act, it is difficult to monitor the implementation of these laws.

CSOs have to examine the impacts of climate changes on the lives of small farmers, fisherfolk and indigenous people. They need to continue the alternative reporting to monitor the implementation of laws. They should act as a watchdog to government as reform is an ongoing political act.

9.1.7 India: Ramesh Sharma | Ekta Parishad

Ekta Parishad's mission is about poor people's dignity. As social organisations like ours challenge the neo-colonial paradigm of development, we try at the same time to reinvigorate our 'receding' democracy here in India. The land rights campaign is being carried out by grassroots communities around India. It was on this subject that I wanted to say a few words.

The costs of our current development are high. About 220 million people are completely landless without any roots; 380 million live a life of acute poverty; 65 million have been displaced in the last 60 years without rehabilitation. About 350 million people or one-third of our country faces Maoist or Naxalite-sponsored violence. Finally, from 1996 to 2000, about 120,000 farmers have committed suicide and about 12,000 every year thereafter. These are daunting facts.

The process of moving people off the land is occurring very quickly. In India, 8 million people have been displaced because of new National Parks or Wildlife Sanctuaries. The conservation of forests has been a 150-year old legislation set up by the British

to legitimise their encroachment on forest areas; and this does not fit the conditions today. The general attitude of the Forest Department is that they 'own' the forests. Ekta Parishad is one of the many organisations in India that have been challenging the government, saying that the government is encroaching on people's forestlands rather than vice versa. Because of people's pressure, the government passed the Forest Rights Act, 2006, to provide forest-dwelling communities with rights over the forests.

In India, 11-12 million of the population consists of nomadic communities. This is a small part of the population but if you combine this with the population of indigenous people (80 million) and with Dalit communities that are about 16.5% (165 million), you have about 25% (250 million) of mostly deprived people. They are the main group that suffers continuous displacement and eviction.

Some of the policies that are responsible for creating landlessness among the forest dwelling communities in our society are:

- Production of bio-fuel on 3.2. million hectares of land;
- Commodification of biodiversity, and the control of genetic matter through intellectual property rights, leading to large agricultural industrialisation;
- Eco-tourism, clearing forests of people for animal life;
- Maintaining carbon stocks for climate mitigation, another inroad of those living in forest areas;
- Big dam projects;
- Mining projects..

In the years after independence, the government has distributed about 1.2% of land compared to China's 44%, Japan 37%, Taiwan 35%, and Korea 32%. Millions of people are still waiting for land that they were promised. Many have their land entitlement but they do not know where their land is. On the other hand, the people who cultivated the land for ages do not know whether

they will get their land entitlement for the same piece of land or not.

This has led to growing insurgency. About 220 districts are recorded as most violent. These are the districts which are very rich in bio-diversity and are inhabited by indigenous people. The result is the militarisation of society. In Chhattisgarh, 35,000 people have to live in shelter camps.

India as a democratic, socialist republic was set up to give rights. Gandhi at the time of the independence movement was working on strategies to give power to people who live at the grassroots level, but people feel that their space for voicing opinions is not expanding but shrinking everyday. Private companies are appropriating all the resources including land at a rapid rate. In spite of clear opposition to these policies, the government is not willing to do anything.

In this whole situation, Ekta Parishad is trying to establish the vision of Jan Satyagraha. Satyagraha means a fight for truth and justice. We feel that non-violence is a major tool in our hands. Our last big march, Janadesh in 2007, was seen as one of the historical campaigns in India, where the whole thought of non-violence was again re-established. Being a non-violent organisation, we always believe that there is a space for dialogue. The mass action through declaration of disobedience is a major element of satyagraha. Ekta Parishad is known for supporting the people to occupy land peacefully. The estimated area that is occupied by Ekta Parishad and its supported village organisations is about 50,000 ha.

We are a people's movement through people's resources. In each of the village units in Ekta Parishad, we have our own grain bank and village funds. That is the main resource. People put in their own money for their own campaign.

There was a series of campaigns and since 2000 EP has already walked more than 15,000 km across India in different states. These foot-marches created a lot of enthusiasm and results. About 1 million indigenous people got land entitlement after the year 2008 when the Forest Rights Act was announced. The joint land

entitlement of women is an important agenda in the campaign. For the first time in history, the land entitlement is actually issued in the name of men and women together. About 80 million people have space to register their claims for the common property land and for common property resources. The whole focus of our future action is for women's land rights through agrarian reform. What we are looking for is a non-violent economy.

9.2 Africa

9.2.1 Senegal: Abdou El Mazide Ndiaye | SONED Afrique

Land should not belong to anybody. It should remain a property for those who have been, for those who are and for those who are coming. I came to understand this because I had a problem understanding why Karl Marx wanted everybody to go from primitive communities through feudalism and other steps to reach socialism. Vera Zasulich asked Marx: "Why in Russia, where we are in a rural-based country, should we go through all these difficult states? Why should we not use this as a capital and go directly to communism?" Marx tried to answer five times. The first answer was 10 pages long. The last answer was only one page long. This means that he could not really give an answer to that question.

So in Senegal I went to see how our community could move to communism. I visited many villages. I saw that the first problem will be religion, which has created differences between people. Land was not a problem at all because everybody could have land. The African tradition says that there are two main ways to get land. Either you go and you cut it yourself, which in traditional religion is said to be a process of making a contract with the spirit of the space. You are considered the manager of the place, with no right to exclude anybody. You are the one who will distribute land to everyone who wants it. This is in conflict with the view of the modern world. In this world, everything has a price and it should be sold in a market. Nothing should ever be given free to anybody.

I know that from Kenya to Senegal, the traditional rules are the same. But the English and the French methods during colonisation were different, so we changed a little. After independence, land was not immediately sold to everybody. There was a law saying that all that belonged to the community now belongs to the state and no one has a right to sell land. This law is there till now. Every government tries to change it but as soon as they start thinking about it, the struggle starts because the people didn't want to change anything.

They divided the country into 14 regions and 430 community-based decision-makers. Senegal is a very small country and it is very divided. Every small area has a council to decide on land and distribute it to a demanding person or not. It is a very poor country. So those councils have also no money to function. If they have to take taxes from the poor people around them they will never collect enough money to pay even one person's salary. They are weak so they prefer to give land to those who have money and to companies. The state can also take land, but only for national reasons. After independence we had a socialist government which wanted that to continue, even though we were pushed by the World Bank to change that and give property and land to the people who, in their view, can exploit it. Those owners could give land to the bank. The Bank would give them money to buy equipment and do modern farming.

In 2000, we had a liberal government which decided to move toward a free land market. That means everyone can sell everything and the state also can sell land to the market. The liberal government started selling land to countries like Libya or Saudi Arabia. But people started protesting. In 2009, when there were elections, they lost all those positions. There was no way for them to sell land any more. Those who won the elections are those who promised to recuperate the land. Most of the communities have recuperated their lands. At some places, 5,000 ha were sold to one person, dispossessing 15,000 people. After the change, this land returned to the old owners. They were supported by the new president of the community.

People are not interested in parties. They prefer to concentrate on what is going on in their fields rather than the general ideas of politicians because they have seen many politicians changing from party to party. The leaders of parties are just businessmen. They use their audience as a capital to gain some positions.

The Arab Emirates, South Korea, China, Japan, Saudi Arabia and Libya – all those countries have taken 5,000-100,000 ha land. All this land is around the rivers. Now they are losing it because those who gave them land have lost power. Without any violence, we can recover our power. But something remains. All the governments wanted the land to be exploited. But most of the people who own the land have no means to produce enough. They are weak financially and they have no money to invest.

My company is now the main owner of an engineering company. We won a program of Millennium Challenge to improve rice production in Senegal because we are importing 600,000 tons while we have the land to raise it. If the peasants had a title proving that they are the owner of this land, then they are accountable to a bank. If 100 together hold the same land they can have the same capacity to borrow. Now our engineering company is identifying all the peasant parcels by a GPS system. In order to group them and give them the insurance that their land is not lost but identified. Now we have to lobby the Bank for them to accept.

We need to mobilise the population to understand their rights and to be ready to fight for that. When they do not accept anything for their land they just let anybody take it. Just because they do not know what to do with their land they tend to leave the land and go to the city. If you sell, you never sell the land itself. It is always the use of the land, because the next generation can always recuperate the land. The World Bank is criticising this system. It says the result is that nobody will invest a big amount on land because people know that they may have to move away from the land at one time. In most African countries, they use the land for three to five years then they leave it to the bush to exploit another piece of land for a new period and again leave it

to the bush. After 15 years, they can come back to the first land. With this system the land regenerates itself from year to year. Now because of the urban situation and need of productivity they use the same land but have no money to buy the fertiliser. At the end of this process the land is destroyed.

Except from the north, where religion created changes in the culture, this is how the use of land works – all through Sub-Saharan Africa the traditional way of taking land is the same. We have the same roles. The main rule is that the land should never belong to anybody.

9.2.2 Kenya: Odenda Lumumba | Kenya Land Alliance

Africa, like the rest of the globe, faces a land crisis. In Kenya, the issue is of massive land-grab. The land that is being given away to investors is land that belongs to communities. Kenya suffers from the dual system of land ownership and management where on the one hand private individuals with titles have their land securely protected by the laws of the country and yet on the other hand land that is communally owned is not securely protected. The government has made such laws that communal land can be acquired for public interest purposes and for the purpose of private acquisitions. Therefore, from time to time, communities find that their land is being taken over to create national parks. Land is also acquired for mining purposes or exploration of mineral and oils.

The other element has been the issue of river and water bodies mainly for the flower industry. Kenya is one of major exporters of flowers. Thus, rivers and other water bodies are colonised by flower farmers excluding community land users.

We now have major production of high quality crops of beans and vegetables destined for the European markets. This is a booming business. What has really happened with time is that communities have been raising the issues of ownership and have been competing for usage of that space and eventually this has boiled down to the issue of access. These issues have presented themselves as issues of historical injustice. The denial started

with the colonial regime that was passed over to the Kenyan independence regime. People are saying they can no longer fight it through the labour system. This can only be contested within the human rights discourse together with the Kenya National Land Policy. The Constitution of Kenya, 2010, has provisions for redressing historical land injustices.

The other scenario that has come up is to revisit the land issue from a gender perspective. As a dweller, a woman can own land but she has to buy it while men inherit it from their parents. Women seem not to benefit from the right of inheritance. Therefore the gender inequity in access to land has been acknowledged as a policy and constitutional issue of redress.

Finally, there is a fourth element: the minorities and marginalised groups. Minorities basically were pastoral communities that occupied big territorial space. They are few in number but their mode of usage is not settled usage. This big area has also been used for wildlife conservation, marginalising the communities, to help the tourism industry.

Kenya Land Alliance sees the issue as lack of political will. We have brought back the issue of the legal framework and revisited the institutional framework. KLA has been trying to put on the table the fact that Kenya has never had a national land use policy. We have been fighting for the last seven years in order to come up with a national policy to guide the process of land use. We were successful by December 2009 to emerge with a national land policy document. What is now challenging us at that level is the implementation. It is one thing to have it written on a paper as a blueprint but it is another to implement what is stated in the policy. Therefore we have to re-look and revisit some of these laws.

We also have been fighting for constitutional provisions around the land laws. The new Constitution has a full chapter on land and environment, separate from the property clause which has always been assumed to be the clause that governs land matters in Kenya. I think it is the first constitution in the world that expressly deals with land and environment exhaustively.

The majority of countries hide land behind the property clause. We are now fighting very hard to establish a new institutional framework that will help us to implement the policy and the Constitution.

In Kenya, the President has been de facto the owner of the state that is Kenya, the allocator of land and the one who determines who is rendered landless. We have now said, Mr President, enough is enough. In Kenya we have a very clear land distribution pattern. Kenya like a lot of other countries has been allocating land for foreign direct investment to produce food for export (which is not the food that we eat in Kenya). Initially, companies did the investing in this but eventually it has now come to a state-to-state land pressure. Qatar, Libya and Saudi Arabia have been investing in Kenya, besides the European Union. Another state grabber is China. The Chinese have now entered at the stage of looking for land to do their agriculture and oil prospecting. The other element that is coming is from North America. We have the US and Canada coming in for bio-fuels.

So land-grab has come to Kenya and with those kind of interests created a land crisis. Conflict over land matters has led to internal displacement yet land is available to external groups. Right now the alarm has been raised because we have hit a food crisis. Drought is back with us. In part of the dry areas of the country, people and animals are dying. Food insecurity comes with water crises. When there is drought, the rivers dry out and therefore Kenya cannot afford to supply food to its people. The important thing to know in this matter is that Kenya contributed 60% of the water of the Nile that flows to Egypt and beyond, yet Kenya is a water crisis country too.

If we are talking about a global crisis in terms of land, Kenya becomes a typical epicentre but I must say that our crisis is not in isolation. It is not unique and this takes us back to the South-South partnership to address the whole issue of land vis-à-vis livelihood of poor people.

9.3 Latin America

9.3.1 Cedenir de Oliveira | Movimento dos Trabalhadores Rurais Sem Terra

MST, the landless workers movement, operates in all parts of Brazil and has a lot of ties with other networks in Latin America. Founded in 1984, it was in the beginning closely linked with the movement against the dictatorship. Our commitment is very linked to the struggle of the indigenous peoples, the struggles of the slaves and the African people in Brazil.

Originally, the struggle of MST was against individual large holdings called *latifundios*. These holdings are the result of years of oppression. In the recent past, there have been different positive developments in Brazil but the situation of the poor and landless population has not changed much and remains unsatisfied. Currently, the struggle involves initiatives against big transnational corporations who are now occupying and owning large tracks of land. The movement evaluates the situation based on changes in the situation in the country. It has also reorganised itself in view of the new forces of privatisation. Often we have taken over unproductive land of large land owners. There is a provision in the Constitution that allows land to be redistributed if it is not needed. Now with companies on the land, the struggles become much more complicated. The private companies affect the relations between agricultural workers, villagers and rural people in Brazil.

Two other important issues that MST is working on are monoculture agriculture and the massive use of chemicals, fertilisers and other toxins in agriculture. It is a struggle against the hegemony of large agricultural companies and judicial power and the bourgeois control over agricultural production. MST is not only working on redistribution of land and fighting against *latifundios*. It is also challenging neo-liberal ideology and seeking alternative models of development.

The forces against which we fight have radically changed. The struggle for land rights becomes more and more difficult.

To face, this MST has build up alliances with other movements to take on these new forces. It is evident that a strong grassroots organisation is necessary for success but also knowledge creation and dissemination is decisive. Informed people keep the struggle moving forward.

MST has historically organised settlements. In this way, we have resettled 370,000 families on 7.5 million hectares of land. The government has recognised these settlements as legal. The settlements are organised as political entities. MST ensures a model of agriculture ruled by the farmers which will allow them to live a life with dignity by having rights over clean water, environment, land, housing and healthy food.

Large effort is put into youth training. Here, MST works with a holistic approach. To take this goal forward we opened a school outside Sao Paulo. It is interesting that the school is based on occupied land and the people built it for themselves. In addition, MST works with universities on land rights and human rights. There are about 5,000 students from MST who go to these universities. Through these channels, MST runs regular conferences on agriculture, production and alternatives. It is not enough to question the paradigm of agriculture, development and neo-liberal policies. It is very important to construct an alternative reality. Towards this, MST is training people on how to take up sustainable agriculture and how to fight for their rights. Actually the settlements are a way to live these alternatives. The settlements are providing experiences and are leading the movement of agrarian reforms in Brazil.

Finally, MST focuses a lot on equal participation of all members of the family. There is a lot of effort on women's issues. The equal participation of women on all levels of the organisation is a high priority.

9.3.2 Eloy Garcia | Christian Peacemaker Teams Colombia

We have all been talking about the land issue in Latin America. There are some basic themes that we need to talk about: one is the distribution of land. In Colombia small elites control a large

percentage of the land. Less than one percent of the population owns about 60% of the land. The armed conflict in Colombia is a direct result of this inequality. We have been in an armed struggle for over 60 years in Colombia and the struggle will continue until there is land reform. Big land owners have heavy influence in the country. The large landowners ally with transnational interests who are also allied with the government.

The interest of the larger land owners and the transnationals are in constant tension with the landless *campesino* small farmers and indigenous tribes. In Colombia, one of the biggest problems is large-scale palm production to produce bio-fuel and other palm oil-related products, and large-scale mining interests which displace the native subsistence farmers. The same thing is taking place in Brazil. This leads to problems with food sovereignty issues because the *campesino* and the indigenous tribes are forced off their land or are forced to work on palm or sugarcane plantations. They now do not have land to produce their own food for subsistence. Large-scale agriculture and mining not only leads to human displacement but also leads to the destruction of the environment. Large plantations and mining operations destroy local habitat, killing the fauna, fresh water resources and ultimately the biodiversity of the region. In Latin America, some of the most bio-diverse lands and largest fresh water resources of the world are in danger due to this tension between large landowners and their unsustainable development plans that do not take into consideration the livelihood of the *campesino* or indigenous tribes.

All Latin America shares the same problem about access to land and control of natural resources. There is a need to fortify the base communities by unifying locally, regionally and globally the different entities affected by the lack of access to land and control of its resources. We need continuous alliances with the *campesino* small farmers, with the indigenous groups, with the trade unions, etc. This is what we are trying to do in Colombia. Unfortunately, over the last 50 years, the social network of Colombia has been almost destroyed through the select assassination of leaders and organisers. Colombia continues to be one of the most dangerous

places to work as a social activist. The most important thing we can do right now is to strengthen our progressive alliances for change at all levels.

We also have the luck to have some heads of state in Latin America who could help our movement. For example, Hugo Chavez in Venezuela and Evo Morales in Bolivia have been supporters of land reform and have supported the plight of the worker and the marginalised. Unfortunately they are under pressure from the United States and the other imperial powers trying to stop this wave of social activism throughout Latin America. The United States claims that one of the biggest threats to their interest is what they call 'radical populism', the movement of the people.

Unfortunately, Colombia still struggles with a very right-wing government which appears to be against any substantial type of land reform. As far as actions in the future, we in Colombia have seen a lot of international support, but we are still in isolation as far as this bigger international land reform movement is concerned. In Colombia, there is a movement called *Minga* with its origins in indigenous circles. It has grown and now looks to comprise all the different sectors in Colombia that have interests in land, justice and a life with dignity. This non-violent civil resistance movement of *Minga* has had some large-scale mobilisation over the last 10 years including *campesinos*, indigenous tribes, labour groups, women, students, etc. The movement is growing and gathering popularity.

One of the biggest hopes for future land reform in Colombia is through this collective initiative of solidarity where all are joined together and working for progressive change for all of Colombia. This is where our hope lies as we try to rebuild the social network that has been selectively destroyed over the years. In future, it would be helpful to invite some key leaders from India, Africa, etc., to come to Colombia to understand and connect to the international struggle. To build a continental and global movement. The interest is there. The problems are all the same. All we need to do is unite.

9.4 Europe

9.4.1 Fintan Farrell | European Anti-Poverty Network

We are primarily working in the European Union countries, with 27 networks in 27 countries and 23 European organisations. We take one member from each of these countries. So the network is bringing together lots of different types of associations. Primarily, we are working on poverty and social exclusion issues within a wealthy part of the globe, within the European countries.

One of the things we say is that the fight against poverty within Europe and the fight against poverty globally are part of the same fight. The sort of mechanisms which create poverty are similar across the world but the impacts on some parts of the world are more drastic. With that understanding, we can learn from each other and that's why this kind of cooperation is so important.

While the member-organisations are doing different things (advocacy, training, participation work, service provision), together the work we do is often in the area of advocacy and lobbying. It is quite political. While doing that work, we realise that in fact the situation is going backward. So we need to have a bigger campaigning approach about why we end up in poverty rather than just try to work with the reality of poverty and social exclusion.

We gain courage from just hearing about the mobilisation that is happening in the South to organise the first public street event. For us it was big when only 3,000 people managed to form a human circle around the EU Parliament to draw attention to our issues.

The question of land seems like a question of so long ago in the EU context, because so much of society is urbanised, including many of the poor people who are living in urban areas. So the land question is not the first question that we talk about in the European context. It's very interesting to think about why we have forgotten about land. One area that we are entering more which is bringing in this question of land is the question

of food sovereignty which has definite links to the question of land use.

One of the first survival strategies is the question of direct participation of people experiencing poverty. They should define the agenda. We are trying to develop this approach. We have each year now a European meeting of people living in poverty, which brings together around 200 persons. That process is trying to increase the space for direct participation. The chance for people to get together to understand their situation and form their own analysis is a first step to change society and eliminate poverty and social exclusion. So hearing from social movements, trying to get courage from what is happening in other parts of the world, is very important for us.

Then there is a whole set of strategies that people living in poverty have to use to survive in a rich society. It is a cash society. If you do not have some cash you cannot engage this society. The welfare systems help to some extent in this regard. A very important part of this survival can be the informal economy. Of course all this has pluses and minuses. It helps with survival but it does not give the sort of protection that is needed in the longer term and it can ultimately undermine the base for decent social protection systems which are needed to assist when people have a bigger crisis.

The official figures show that there are more than 80 million people who live in poverty and exclusion within the European Union countries. This can range from people who have difficulties leading a decent life to people who are really struggling with basic things like having enough food or a basic sanitary system.

We try to have much more discussion about wealth and inequality and not just keep talking about poverty. You can't speak about poverty and remain silent about wealth. As Gandhi said, there is enough for everyone's need but not for anyone's greed. Considering the enormous wealth in Europe you know it is not a question of scarce resources. There is enough for everybody if you manage it sustainably and equitably. Having said that, we also would acknowledge that it is not easy to do. Particularly in

a globalised context where wealth can escape very easily into tax havens and tax avoidance.

We heard a lot about western culture and what it has done to the rest of the world and continues to do to the world. But I suppose one of the things within the western system that I still think we could be proud of is the social protection and social welfare systems. These systems have managed to deal with poverty and social exclusion in a way that has been more effective than many other approaches. So a lot of our strategy is trying to look at how to have a decent social protection and social welfare system within the current context.

The last thing I want to flag is how we can connect to the Jan Satyagraha March. The question of a more social and more sustainable model of development is certainly a question within this context and also a question of the European context. We will try to find a way to raise awareness of the 2012 campaign which is happening globally but we will also try to show that it also has implication within the European context.

Appendix

10.1 Participants

10.1.1 Resource Persons

Madido Niasse and Seema Gaikwad **International Land Coalition**

The International Land Coalition is a global alliance of civil society and intergovernmental organisations working together to promote secure and equitable access to and control over land for poor women and men through advocacy, dialogue, knowledge sharing and capacity building. Secure and equitable access to land, control over land reduces poverty and contributes to identity, dignity and inclusion.

Flavio Valente **FIAN**

FIAN India is a network of various independent FIAN chapters in different federal states of the country. FIAN India is a non-profit organisation and affiliated to FIAN International, a Germany-based Human rights organisation that works for the implementation of economic, social and cultural human rights (ESC rights). The main vision of FIAN India is full realisation of the human right to adequate food so that the community can enjoy ecologically, socially, economically and culturally appropriate and safe food in dignity.

Devinder Sharma
Agricultural Analyst

Devinder Sharma is a distinguished food and trade policy analyst. Trained as an agricultural scientist, Sharma is a noted Indian journalist and outspoken critic of industrial agriculture, genetic engineering, globalisation and free trade.

K.B. Saxena
Council for Social Development (CSD)

CSD is one of the leading institutions working in the area of development research in India. Apart from carrying out pioneering research on developmental issues and concerns, CSD has played an influential role in voicing social concerns among planners and policy-makers throughout the 35 years of its existence.

Bina Agarwal
Institute of Economic Growth, University of Delhi

Bina Agarwal is Director and Professor of Economics at the Institute of Economic Growth, Delhi University. Educated at the Universities of Cambridge and Delhi, she has held distinguished positions at many universities in the USA and UK and lectured world-wide. As an economist with a keen interest in interdisciplinary and inter-country explorations, Bina Agarwal's publications include subjects like land, livelihoods and property rights; environment and development; the political economy of gender; poverty and inequality; law; and agriculture and technological change.

Sanjay Upadhyay
Enviro-Legal Defence firm

Enviro Legal Defence Firm, India's first environmental law firm (ELDF), aims at mainstreaming natural resource law, resolving conflicts over resources and strengthening environmental jurisprudence. ELDF is an independent team of erudite legal professionals which provides services to anyone who approaches

it including governments, NGOs, educational institutions, individuals, private and external agencies engaged in areas of natural resource law. It endeavours to ensure that the service provided is free from all biases and prejudices and speaks frankly about legal aspects as we understand them.

Rajiv Vora
Swaraj Peeth

Swaraj Peeth Trust, a Gandhian centre for non-violence and peace, works for Mahatma Gandhi's vision of Swaraj through building a community-based non-violent social force called Gandhi Shanti Sena; organising public dialogues, training in non-violence and education programmes for creating swaraj awareness in various areas of life.

Miloon Kothari,
Housing and Land Rights Network

The Human Rights Council is an inter-governmental body within the UN system made up of 47 States responsible for strengthening the promotion and protection of human rights around the globe. The Council was created by the UN General Assembly with the main purpose of addressing situations of human rights violations and make recommendations on them.

Praveen Jha
Centre for Economic Studies and Planning, JNU

Praveen Jha is Associate Professor at the Centre for Economic Studies and Planning at Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi.

Savio Carvalho
Amnesty International

Amnesty International is a global movement of more than 3 million supporters, members and activists in more than 150 countries and territories who campaign to end grave abuses of human rights. Their vision is for every person to enjoy all the

rights enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other international human rights standards.

Sandeep Chachra and Annie Thomas

Action Aid International

Action Aid is an international anti-poverty agency whose aim is to fight poverty worldwide. It helps over 13 million of the world's poorest and most disadvantaged people in 42 countries worldwide. In the country programmes, it works with local partners to make the most of their knowledge and experience.

10.1.2 Country reports

BRAZIL

Cedenir de Oliveira

Movimento dos Trabalhadores Rurais Sem Terra (MST)

The MST is a mass social movement formed by rural workers and by all those who want to fight for land reform and against injustice and social inequality in rural areas in Brazil.

The MST was born through a process of occupying *latifundios* (large landed estates) and become a national movement in 1984. Over more than two decades, the movement has led more than 2,500 land occupations, with about 370,000 families – families that are today settled on 0.5 million ha land won as a result of the occupations.

COLOMBIA

Eloy Garcia

Christian Peacemaker Teams Colombia (CPT)

Christian Peacemaker Teams (CPT) offers an organised, non-violent alternative to war and other forms of lethal inter-group conflict. CPT provides organisational support to persons committed to faith-based non-violent alternatives in situations where lethal conflict is an immediate reality or is supported by public policy. In Colombia, CPT works with CAHUCOPANA,

the Community of Garzal and Nueva Esperanza, the Community of Las Pavas, FEDAGROMISBOL and Network of Initiatives and Communities of Peace.

SENEGAL

Abdou El Mazide Ndiaye

Société International d'Ingénierie et d'Etudes de Développement en Afrique (SONED Afrique) Réseau Africain pour Développement Intègre (RADI)

The network was formed in 1985 to promote development in Africa. Its goal is to network with human rights and development NGO's to promote community outreach activities. It aims to help people know their rights and duties, and offer legal help to those who do not have access to a lawyer. RADI has a Legal Assistance and Information Centre that provides legal advice and services to organisations and individuals regarding workers' rights, family law, and the rights and duties of tenants and landowners. RADI has trained paralegals working in rural areas, and organised courses in Wolof and French on legal issues for school teachers, women's groups and other NGOs. The RADI centre is developing an adult education curriculum to reduce Senegal's 75 per cent illiteracy rate and encourage participation in the country's emerging democracy.

KENYA

Odenda Lumumba

Kenya Land Alliance (KLA)

Kenya Land Alliance is a non-profit-making and non-partisan umbrella network of civil society organisations and individuals advocating for formulation and implementation of land and natural resource policies and institutional reforms in Kenya. Their vision is a society in which all people are assured of sustainable livelihoods through secure and equitable access and utilisation of land and natural resources.

NEPAL

Roshan Chitrkar and Jagat Basnet

Community Self-Reliance Centre (CSRC)

CSRC is an NGO affiliated with the Social Welfare Council. The idea of establishing CSRC was conceived in 1993 by a group of young and energetic schoolteachers from Sindhupalchok district in order to change the existing pattern of elite-dominated power relations by organising and mobilising marginalised groups of people, especially tenants and farmers who have no, or nominal, land.

INDONESIA

Muhammad Nur Uddin and Ika Nurillah Krishnayanti

Indonesian Peasant Alliance (API)

Indonesian Peasant Alliance (API) is an organisation of peasants at national level. API was established based on the agreement among independent peasant organisations in Java and Sumatra. The urgency of this establishment was based on the necessity of the peasant movement to be a pressure power against unjust policies that have marginalised millions of Indonesian peasants' lives.

SRI LANKA

Lalith Abeyesinghe

Movement for National Land and Agricultural Reforms (MONLAR)

Movement for National Land and Agricultural Reform (MONLAR) was formed as a network of farmer organisations, NGOs and people's organisations in other sectors at the beginning of 1990, in response to the serious socio-political and economic crisis that emerged in Sri Lanka at the end of 1980s. Efforts made in integrating Sri Lanka's economy into the globalisation process resulted in an unprecedented increase in rural poverty, breakdown in rural small farmer agriculture, malnutrition among children, high rate of anaemia among mothers, low birth weight babies, large increase in income disparities, loss of livelihoods.

THAILAND

Jeff Wong

Four Regions Slum Network (FRSN)

The Four Regions Slum Network was established with the goal of being an independent people's movement that would push forward the issues of housing rights, developing the quality of life of slum dwellers, and seeking social justice together with the people's movement and other civil society groups. At present, the Four Regions Slum Network has 10 member networks, consisting of 110 communities with around 7,000 families.

BANGLADESH

Muhammed Kamal Uddin

Association for Realisation of Basic Needs (ARBAN)

The Association for Realisation of Basic Needs, a development NGO, concerned with fundamental rights and the basic needs of the people, was founded on 18 February 1984. ARBAN believes that all development projects and programmes designed and implemented by the government, NGOs, international Organisations, UN bodies and others should be directed towards the fulfillment of the basic needs and fundamental rights of the people who live in perpetual poverty, famine, malnutrition, disease, deprivation, indebtedness, injustice and exploitations.

PHILIPPINES

Nathaniel Don E. Marquez

Asian NGO Coalition for Agrarian Reform and Rural Development (ANGOC)

ANGOC is a regional association of 20 national and regional networks of NGOs in Asia actively engaged in food security, agrarian reform, sustainable agriculture, participatory governance and rural development. ANGOC member networks and partners work in 14 Asian countries with an effective reach of some 3,000 NGOs and community-based organisations (CBOs).

INDIA

Ramesh Sharma

Ekta Parishad

Ekta Parishad is a non-violent Gandhian organisation built up over 20 years, growing from the local to the international level. Displacement, landlessness, marginalisation are the key concerns that affect, forest dwellers and poor peasants. Ekta Parishad binds them into a movement in order to put pressure directly on their governments. The main goal is to see India's poorest people gain control over livelihood resources, especially land, forest and water. It works for the application of the Gandhian principles of non-violence, self-reliance and responsible local governance to ensure respect for the fundamental rights of the most vulnerable and marginalised communities.

EU

Fintan Farrell

European Anti-Poverty Network

The European Anti Poverty Network (EAPN) is an independent network of non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and groups involved in the fight against poverty and social exclusion in the member-states of the European Union, established in 1990.

SWITZERLAND

Liliane de Toledo

Ekta Europe

Ekta Europe and the Groupe de Soutien de Genève are standing in solidarity with the Indian people's movement, Ekta Parishad. Their primary goal is to acquaint people with the work of Ekta Parishad and promote international solidarity with its Jan Satyagraha 2012 campaign.

FRANCE

Odile Puget

Gandhi International

Gandhi International is a French NGO which brings together motivated individuals and various non-violent organisations working for social change in the cause of justice and peace. Among its partners are: Lanza del Vasto's Communities of the Ark, Université Terre du ciel, Pax Christi International, the association Shanti, Church and Peace, Femmes Internationales – Murs Brisés, Génération Non-violente, the Colibri network of Pierre Rabhi. It is also supported by the Catholic Committee against Hunger and for Development (C.C.F.D.) and Survival International.

BELGIUM

Jacques Vellut

Volens - Mercy Home

The project is based in Louvain-la-Neuve. It is a place to promote citizen initiatives to ensure sustainable future for the planet. The project is led in a collaboration between the *Université catholique de Louvain* and the city of Ottignies-Louvain la Neuve.

UNITED KINGDOM

Ivan Nutbrown

Action Village India

Action Village India (AVI) is a UK-based charity working for non-violent change in rural India. AVI works with six partner organisations across India. All these projects are devised and managed by local people and work in the Gandhian tradition of non-violent change and self-organisation to right economic and social injustices.

CANADA

Paul Schwartzentruber

Ekta Canada

Ekta Canada is an organisation standing in solidarity with the Indian people's movement, Ekta Parishad. Our primary goal is to acquaint people with the work of Ekta Parishad and promote international solidarity with its 2012 campaign.

10.2 Agenda of the Meeting

DAY 1 – Tuesday, March 1, 2011

3:30 pm – 4:00 pm	Registration and Tea	
4:00 pm – 4:15 pm	Welcome	
4:15 pm – 5:00 pm	Introduction	Rajagopal, P.V. (Ekta Parishad)
5:00 pm – 6:30 pm	Panel Discussion “Crisis of Land & Livelihood in a Globalising World” - PART 1	Savio Carvalho (Amnesty) Madido Niase (ILC) Flavio Valente (FIAN)
6:30 pm – 7:30 pm	Cultural Program	Famous Choi Dance – A Sequence from the Mahabharat
8:00 PM	Opening Night Dinner	

DAY 2 – Wednesday, March 2, 2011

9:30 am – 10:00 am	Second Registration	
10:00 am—10:15 am	Recap and Introduction to Day 2	Jill Carr-Harris (Ekta Parishad)
10:15 am – 11:30 am	Panel Discussion “Crisis of Land & Livelihood in a Globalising World” - PART 2: Framing in a Geo-political context	Devinder Sharma (Agricultural Analyst) Sanjay Upadhyay (Enviro-Legal Defense)
11:30 am – 11:50 am	TEA BREAK	
11:50 am—12:15 pm	Presentation on Jan Satyagraha 2012	Ran Singh Parmar (Ekta Parishad)
12:15 am – 1:30 pm	Country Presentations	Asia (5)
1:30 pm – 3:15 pm	LUNCH BREAK	
3:15 pm – 3:45 pm	Respondent	Bina Agarwal (Inst. of Economic Growth, Delhi University)
3:45 pm—4:30 pm	Country Presentations	Africa (3)
4:30 pm – 5:00pm	TEA BREAK	
5:00 pm – 7:00pm	Country Presentations	South Asia (5) + India (5)
7:00 pm – 7:30 pm	Respondent	K.B. Saxena (CSD)
7:30 pm – 8:30 pm	Free Time	
8:30 pm	Dinner	

DAY 3: Thursday, March 3rd, 2011

9:30 am – 10:45 am	Country Presentations	Latin America (4)
10:45 am – 11:05 am	TEA BREAK	
11:05 am – 12:35 pm	Country Presentations	Europe / North America (6)
12:35 pm – 1:50 pm	How to scale up to a Global Action?	International Networks: ILC, FIAN, Ekta Europe & Action Aid
1:50 pm – 3:15 pm	LUNCH	
3:15 pm – 4:30 pm	Respondents	Rajiv Vora (Swaraj Peeth) Miloon Kothari (Housing and Land Rights Network)
4:30 pm – 5:30 pm	Continental Sub-Groups To work out strategies for 2012	Each group meets in their sub-groups, broken down by continent.
5:30 pm – 6:00 pm	TEA BREAK	
6:00 pm – 7:00 pm	Continental Sub-Groups to work out strategies for 2012	
7:00 pm – 8:00 pm	Film premier of Gandhi's Children.	Film directed and produced by Arjuna Krishnaratne
8:00 pm –	Dinner	

Day 4: Friday March 4th 2011

9:30 am – 10:30 am	Round-table Presentations	5 groups
10:30 am – 11:30 am	Interactive Discussion: People's Struggles and the Problem of State Oppression	Praveen Jha (Economics, JNU)
11:30 am – 12:00 pm	TEA BREAK	
12:00 pm – 1:30 pm	Interactive Discussion: Developing Coordinated Advocacy with International Institutions	Mazide N'Diaye (SONED)
1:30 pm – 3:00 pm	LUNCH	
3:00 pm – 4:30 pm	Developing an International Media Strategy	
4:30 pm – 5:00 pm	TEA BREAK	
5:00 pm – 6:30 pm	Planning a Program of Action	Jill Carr-Harris (Ekta Parishad)

Day 5: Saturday, March 5th, 2011

9:30 am – 11:00 am	Presentation of Program of Action,	Rajagopal P.V. (Ekta Parishad)
11: 00 am – 11:20 am	TEA BREAK	
11:20 am – 1:00 pm	Approval of Draft Declaration	
1:00 pm – 2:00 pm	CLOSING and LUNCH	

“Land should not belong to anybody. It should remain a property for those who have been, for those who are and for those who are coming.”

*Abdou El Mazide Ndiaye
SONED Afrique*

“Billions of people, having lost their land, are forced to go cities, live in slums and ultimately take to violence.”

*Rajagopal P.V.
Ekta Parishad*

“The struggles become much more complicated. The private companies affect the relations between agricultural workers, villagers and rural people.”

*Cedenir de Oliveira
Movimento dos Trabalhadores Rurais Sem Terra*

“There is a need to organise or influence the 'global system' so that greater attention is paid to the land issue and its linkages with poverty.”

*Madiodio Niasse
International Land Coalition*

"If civil society does not use non-violence in the struggle, this will give the government a chance to reduce democratic rights in the name of reducing violence"

*Jill Carr-Harris
South-South Solidarity*



Ekta Parishad

2/3-A Jungpura, Second Floor

New Delhi-110014, India

Phone: 91-11-24373998/99

E-mail: info@ektaparishad.com

www.ektaparishad.com