

Journal of Sudanese Studies

Volume 27, October 2021

A Scientific Refereed Journal Issued by the Institute of African and Asian Studies - University of Khartoum



مجلة الدراسات السودانية

المجلد السابع والعشرون، أكتوبر 2021م

مجلة علمية محكمة يصدرها معهد الدراسات الإفريقية والآسيوية، جامعة الخرطوم



مجلة الدراسات السودانية

Journal of Sudanese Studies

ردمّد: ISSN: 1022 - 3525

مجلة علميّة محكمة

يصدرها معهد الدراسات الإفريقية والآسيوية

جامعة الخرطوم

المجلد السابع والعشرون

أكتوبر 2021م

مجلة الدراسات السودانية

ISSN: 1022-3525
Title: مجلة الدراسات السودانية
Imprint: الخرطوم: معهد الدراسات الإفريقية
والآسيوية - جامعة الخرطوم، 2010
Frequency: Annual
Type of Publication: دورية - Periodical
Language: Arabic and English

هيئة التحرير

رئيس التحرير: بروفيسور / الأمين أبو منقة محمد
سكرتيرة التحرير: دكتورة / منى محمود أبوبكر
أعضاء هيئة التحرير:
بروفيسور / يوسف فضل حسن
بروفيسور / أحمد عبد الرحيم نصر
بروفيسور / منزل عبد الله منزل عسل
بروفيسور / يحيى فضل طاهر
بروفيسور / سامية محمد علي البدوي
بروفيسور / الصادق يحيى عبد الله
دكتورة / محاسن عبد القادر حاج الصافي

إدارة التحرير:

ضبط اللغة: الدكتور / عباس الحاج الأمين
التصميم: المهندس / خالد عبد الله محمد
سكرتيرة المجلة: السيدة / نهلة محمد عثمان

قواعد وشروط النشر

مجلة الدراسات السودانية مجلة علمية محكمة تصدر عن معهد الدراسات الإفريقية والآسيوية، جامعة الخرطوم، وتقبل البحوث في كل مجالات العلوم الإنسانية ذات الصلة المباشرة بالسودان، إضافة إلى عرض الكتب المتعلقة بالسودان.

يرجى من مقدمي البحوث لهذه المجلة مراعاة الآتي:

- 1- ألا يكون البحث المقدم للمجلة قد نشر أو قدم للنشر في مكان آخر.
- 2- تسلم نسخة ورقية مطبوعة على الحاسوب مع نبذة عن الكاتب، ونسخة في قرص مضغوط (CD) لرئيس أو سكرتير التحرير، أو ترسل عبر البريد الإلكتروني على العنوانين التاليين: abumanga1951@gmail.com, ssbulletin@uofk.edu
- 3- أن تكون صفحات البحث باللغة العربية بين خمس عشرة وثلاثين صفحة (بنط 16 Simplified Arabic مسافة واحدة بين السطور single spacing)، أو لا يتجاوز الـ 8000 كلمة. وأن تكون صفحات البحث باللغة الإنجليزية بين خمس عشرة وخمس وعشرين صفحة (بنط 14 Times New Roman مسافة واحدة بين السطور single spacing)، أو لا يتجاوز الـ 9000 كلمة. وأن يرفق مع البحث مستخلص باللغة العربية وآخر الإنجليزية في حدود 150 كلمة لكل مستخلص.
- 4- أن يوثق البحث المكتوب باللغة الإنجليزية داخل النص وفقاً للنظام السائد في الدوريات العالمية التي تصدر باللغات الأجنبية، فيكتب بين قوسين/هلالين: الاسم الأخير للمؤلف (أي اسم العائلة)، وتاريخ المرجع، ورقم الصفحة (عند الضرورة)، كما في النموذج التالي: (Hugo 2021:89)، وتثبت المراجع والمصادر بكامل معلوماتها في نهاية البحث بالكيفية التي وضحتها والنماذج التي نوردها أدناه بالنسبة للبحوث المكتوبة باللغة العربية.

5- أن يوثق البحث المكتوب باللغة العربية عن طريق الهوامش (وليس داخل النص)، وتكتب الهوامش في نهاية البحث، ثم ترتب المصادر والمراجع التي اعتمدها الباحث ألفبائياً في نهاية البحث، مع اتباع أحد المناهج الحديثة في ذلك، وفقاً للنماذج التالية:

كتاب:

عون الشريف قاسم (1989): الإسلام والعربية في السودان، دار الجيل، بيروت، ص...
Greenberg, J. (1966): *Languages of Africa*. The Hague: Mouton, p....

مقال في دورية

عشاري أحمد محمود (1988): "أزمة اللسانيات في العالم العربي"، المجلة العربية للدراسات اللغوية، العدد الأول، ص3.

Hurreiz, S.H. (1978): "Arabic as a national and international language: Current problems and future needs", *West African Journal of Modern Languages* III, p.13.

مقال أو فصل في كتاب

Qasim, Awn Sh. (1975): "Sudanese Colloquial Arabic in social and historical perspective", in *Directions in Sudanese Linguistics and Folklore*, ed. by S.H. Hurreiz & H. Bell. Khartoum: Institute of African and Asian Studies, University of Khartoum.

الأمين أبومنقعة محمد (1992): "العلاقات السودانية النيجيرية في إطار المهديّة"، علاقات السودان الخارجية، تحرير حامد عثمان وممدني محمد أحمد، الخرطوم، دار جامعة الخرطوم للنشر، ص7.

6- تعبّر البحوث المنشورة في المجلة عن آراء كاتبها.

7- لهيئة التحرير الحق في إدخال التحرير والتعديل اللازمين على البحوث.

المشاركون في هذا العدد

القسم العربي

بروفيسور بابر علي ديومة، قسم اللغة الفرنسية (زميل)، جامعة الخرطوم.
دكتور المكاشفي إبراهيم عبدالله، أستاذ مساعد، قسم اللغة العربية، كلية التربية،
جامعة الخرطوم.

دكتور محمد البدري سليمان، أستاذ مساعد، قسم الآثار، كلية الآداب، جامعة
الخرطوم.

دكتور خالد محمد فرح، سفير بوزارة الخارجية السودانية.
دكتور الأصم بشير التوم بشير، أستاذ مساعد، قسم اللغة العربية، كلية التربية،
جامعة الخرطوم.

دكتورة سمية محمد الزين أحمد بدوي، أستاذ مشارك، مدرسة العلوم الإدارية،
جامعة الأحفاد للبنات (السودان).

دكتور الصادق محمد سليمان، الأمين العام السابق لمجلس تطوير وترقية اللغات
القومية، الخرطوم.

القسم الإنجليزي

Prof. Abdel Ghaffar M. Ahmed, Anthropology Department, Faculty of
Economic and Social Studies, University of Khartoum.

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

افتتاحية

أعزائي القراء

السلام عليكم ورحمة الله تعالى وبركاته. يسرنا أن نقدم لكم المجلد السابع والعشرين من مجلة الدراسات السودانية، ونحمد الله أن أعاننا على إعداده رغم ظروف عدم الاستقرار التي تشهدها الجامعة منذ عدة أشهر. وقد يلاحظ القارئ ظهور هذا المجلد بعد زمن وجيز من صدور المجلد السادس والعشرين؛ وهذا نتيجة لسعيينا في تقليل الفجوة الزمنية في تواريخ صدور المجلدات الأخيرة من المجلة، الناتجة عن توقف إعدادها لقراءة العامين (2018-2020)، حيث شهدت البلاد في تلك الفترة الأحداث السياسية المصاحبة لثورة ديسمبر (2019)، وتلى ذلك مباشرة انتشار جائحة كورونا (COVID19).

بما أن المجلة أصبحت تصدر باللغتين العربية والإنجليزية، فقد تقرر، بموافقة كل أعضاء هيئة التحرير، إجراء تعديل طفيف في اسمها باللغة الإنجليزية، وذلك باستبدال كلمة Bulletin بكلمة Journal ليقرأ: **Journal of Sudanese Studies** ويختصر في: **JSS**.

نرجو أن نذكر - كما نفعل كل مرة - أن النشر في هذه المجلة لا يقتصر على العلوم الإنسانية وحدها، بل يشمل جميع العلوم، طالما أن موضوع المقال أو البحث ذو صلة مباشرة بالسودان. ونشير إلى أن المجلة تنشر المقالات والبحوث باللغتين العربية والإنجليزية.

نرجو في هذه السانحة أن نشكر الباحثين المشاركين في هذا المجلد على التزامهم بشروط وموجّهات النشر في هذه المجلة، وكذا صبرهم على إصرارنا عليهم لإكمال المعلومات وإجراء التصويبات المطلوبة منهم، روماً للتجويد. ونشكر كذلك الزملاء محكمي المقالات والبحوث على إخلاصهم في مهمتهم وإنجازها بالمهنية المرتجاة، مما يعيننا على المحافظة على المستوى المعهود للمجلة.

والحمد لله أولاً وآخراً.

رئيس هيئة التحرير

محتويات العدد

القسم العربي:

مقالات:

- 1- ملامح الرواية السودانية: الماضي والحاضر وآفاق المستقبل،
بابكر علي ديومة 1
- 2- الصورة التشبيهية في رواية "عُرس الزين"،
المكاشفي إبراهيم عبد الله 29
- 3- الحواضر الإقليمية في العصر المروي - كدُرمَة بإقليم الشلال الثالث
نموذجاً، محمد البدري سليمان 47
- 4- من شواهد الصلات التاريخية المبكرة لدارفور بالعروبة والإسلام:
مقاربة أولية للتحقق من صحة وأصالة وثيقة دارفور من القرن
السادس عشر، خالد محمد فرح 81
- 5- من قضايا الشعر الشعبي في السودان: مفهومه، وموسيقاه،
وموضوعاته، الأصم بشيرالتوم 99

بحوث:

- 6- المسؤولية المجتمعية للمؤسسات في السودان بين النظرية
والتطبيق، سمية محمد الزين أحمد بدوي 121

عرض كتب:

7- عرض كتاب: لغات السودان – مقدمة تعريفية ، تأليف: الأمين
أبومنقة محمد وكمال محمد جاه الله،

177 عرض الصادق محمد سليمان

القسم الإنجليزي:

مقالات:

- 8- Pastoral Development Paradigms – The Case of Sudan
Abdel Ghaffar M. Ahmed 185

Pastoral Development Paradigms – The Case of Sudan

Abdel Ghaffar M. Ahmed

Abstract: Pastoral development witnessed so many changes over the past decades. The development paradigms regularly shifted over the years. This appeared to be clear in the case of Sudan. This paper attempts to demonstrate this issue by using literature reviews and participant observation. It addresses the various categories, as they exist in the daily life of the pastoral groups in Sudan as well as the attempt of the different elites, who are exponents of sedentary civilization. They attempted to settle them by forcing them to join the semi-mechanized schemes. They concluded that the pastoralists are unwilling to change, with especial reference to the southern Blue Nile region.

مستخلص: لقد مرت تنمية القطاع الرعوي بتغييرات عديدة في القرون الماضية. تغيرت النماذج عبر السنين، والسودان في مثل هذه الحال يصبح أكثر وضوحاً. توضح الورقة هذا الأمر من خلال الدراسات السابقة، ومن خلال المشاركة الفعلية في البحث. تقدم الدراسة كل أجزاء الحياة في القطاع الرعوي كما هي عليه في السودان، وتناقش دور الصفوة الذين يدعون لعملية "التحضر" ويريدون إدخال قطاع الرعاة ضمن المشاريع الزراعية. كما أنهم يرون أن الرحل ليس لديهم الرغبة في التغيير. تناقش الورقة هذا الأمر أخذاً من منطقة النيل الأزرق مثلاً.

Key Words: Pastoral paradigm, Sudan groups, elite, Blue Nile.

General Context

Exponents of sedentary civilization in developing countries have come to regard the word nomads as a term of abuse. Through their use of the term "nomads" in an undifferentiated way, it has become a dumping ground for "difficult cases" in development projects, that were nicely constructed by desk-office urban elite developers sitting in the comfort of their well-organized and technically equipped offices with very little or no familiarity with rural life in the country sides. The assumption that such elites hold is that settled cultivators are more receptive to change than nomadic pastoralists. It is, in their view, much easier to introduce settled communities to modernity in comparison to nomadic pastoral groups. Hence, it seems to be only consequent to settle pastoral

nomads to ensure the advance of the process of development. Given such an assumption with regard to pastoral groups in Sudan a number of paradigms addressing development in the pastoral production sector have emerged during the past five or six decades. These mainly concerned engineering changes in the special context within which pastoral groups operate in an effort to force them to settle.

The use of paradigm here refers to a dynamic field of concepts pointing to a union between intelligent inquiry and some particular kind of world view. The contemporary meaning of the term 'paradigm' was given by Kuhn (1962:viii) when he adopted the word to refer to the set of practices and assumptions within an epistemic community that define a scientific discipline in any particular period of time. The use in social sciences led the development of the concept of social paradigm as proposed by M. L. Handa who, like Kuhn, addressed the issue of paradigm shifts focusing on social circumstances that precipitate such a shift and the effects of the shift on social institutions (cf. Handa, 1986). Paradigm shift is used here simply to imply a change from one way of thinking to another suggesting a process of transformation driven by agents who, in the case of pastoralists in Sudan, are outsiders to the pastoral production system (i.e. central planners). These agents enforce a dominant paradigm that comes with its values and system of thought that is standardized and widely held at a given time.

Nomadic pastoralism is a way of life that has evolved round an economic activity that is practiced in areas that can hardly be used otherwise. The activity involves the care of herds of domesticated livestock and requires constant movement in search of pasture and water. In its traditional forms it is either practiced as the main mode of subsistence or combined with agriculture. The nomadic pastoralist moves regularly with his herds during the year according to seasonal variation in climate. His animals, through their milk or meat, provide the family with a substantial part of the diet it needs. The family builds no permanent dwelling and has very few material possessions as it is constantly on the move. However, it should be noted that nomadic pastoralists develop dynamic relations with the sedentary populations around them. The difference between these two categories is often overestimated to the extent that they are

viewed as constituting distinct societies with different cultures and variant forms of social and political organizations, which distort their interdependence and symbiotic relations.

On a global scale, Sudan perhaps ranks first in terms of pastoralist population size (Markakis, 1998:41). About 66 percent of the country is arid land which is mostly pastoral habitat. It is estimated that pastoral activities involve approximately 20 percent of the population and account for 40 percent of the livestock wealth. Until recently the livestock sector played an important role in the economy of the country, accounting for approximately 22 percent of the Gross National Product (GDP), meeting the entire domestic demand for meat, 70 percent of national milk requirements and contributing almost 18 percent of the country's foreign exchange earnings by the late 1980s. It was also a very significant source of employment for about 80 percent of the rural workforce (Ahmed, 1992:138). However, this large percentage has been considerably reduced over the past two decades due to drought, desertification and civil wars.

Table 1: *Total and nomadic population in Sudan, 1955-1993.*

Census year	Total population	Nomadic population	Percent
1955	10,263,000	1,405,000	13.69
1973	14,819,000	1,630,000	10.99
1983	20,564,000	2,191,000	10.56
1993	N/A	N/A	13.80*
1998	N/A	N/A	18.00*

*Source: Ahmed et al., 2002: 12. Note: *estimates*

Source: Darfur Relief and Documentation Center, 2010.

The census figures referring to nomadic people in Sudan can be considered as an underestimation, starting with the first census of 1955/56. This was, and continues to be, a result of the unsatisfactory definition adopted by the authorities, which was based on the type of

dwelling. This being the case, large numbers of nomadic pastoralists were excluded from being counted. Most of the time, the censuses were carried out during the period of agricultural operations. Hence, nomads who used to cultivate small farms and stayed on them for short periods in the course of their movements were considered to be sedentary population. Those who were moving with the animals were not easily reached by census officials. Attempts to remedy this situation resulted in estimated figures rather than precise ones. This explains why the figures for 1993 and 1998 above were just estimates and differ from one source to another with no explanation of the bases on which such estimations were made. Even though the figures from the 2008 census have not been officially released, no exact figures are to be expected. In fact, even if the question on nomads was included as one of the “seven categories of family or social group” in the short questionnaire used in the 2008 census, the criteria for defining ‘who is a nomad’ remain quite ambiguous.

Due to climate change the number of nomadic population in Eastern Sudan has changed, ranging from approximately from 50 percent to 10 percent, resulting from drought and desertification that spread widely. The same situation can be seen in the case of Darfur in the past decade where 50 percent was lost. The numbers in Kordofan have fluctuated up and down between 20 percent and 10 percent in response to the rainfall and the impact of the civil war on the grazing areas as far as one could estimate. The marginalized people in these areas had no option but to join the urban areas in the regions or to move to the central part of the country.

Nomadic Pastoral Categories in Sudan

Nomadic pastoralism as practiced in the Sudan is generally of three types. The first is pastoral nomadism, which means the regular movement of people, whole families, with their animals in search of pasture and water. Pasture is often discontinuous and connected by routes of access. Nomadic pastoralists do not generally have permanent houses; they live in tents. However, each group has traditional and exclusive rights of residence and exploitation over a certain territory referred to as the

group's *dār* (homeland). Their capital is mainly stored in their livestock, which represent a significant part of their social life. The second type is semi-nomadism. This describes a situation where the family is left in the *dār*, while few persons move about with livestock in search of good pasture and water. Family members in the *dār* engage in a variety of occupations, but the most dominant among such activities is agriculture, which supplements their diet.

The third type which is very often included in the definition of pastoralism in the Sudan is transhumance. This is a highly developed form of pastoralism practiced by sedentary cultivators, whose major economic activity is agriculture. The movement is commonly undertaken from a permanent base (Ahmed, 1976:1-13).

In recent years many pastoralists have opted to settle given the circumstances that surrounded their migratory routes due to the expansion of the rain fed schemes and the civil war that affected people moving in the frontier areas between North and South Sudan. These groups have also recognized the benefit they can get from having permanent settlements, where they can easily access services such as health and education. However, they do not intend to abandon their traditional way of keeping animals. Many developed an advanced form of transhumance as can be seen among the Rashaida group in Eastern Sudan and the Rufa'a al Hoi group in Blue Nile State (cf. Ahmed, 2009). The movement of both the Rashaida and the Rufa'a al Hoi are no longer curtailed by the lack of water in places where grazing is available for their animals. They have developed a system of using tankers to take water to the animals where they can have enough grass. They also started to buy what remains of the residues in the agricultural semi-mechanized schemes after they are harvested. During this period these families are settled in places where they can have access to necessary services (ibid:126).

Having the above three types in mind, a nomad is defined as an animal breeder who is continuously moving with his livestock in search of water and pasture and/or keeping the herds away from disease and flies. Pastoral nomadism is not just a haphazard wandering but rather a

well-established pattern of life. It is a systematic, well-organized way of life geared to the well-being of its people and their animals. It is a rational adaptation of human life to the environment by people who are more independent and economically homogeneous when compared to sedentary cultivators, who may share the use of the same land with them (Asad, 1978:57).

The pastoralist ethnic groups in Sudan are enduring multiple marginalization processes, aggravated by development paradigms expressed in the form of strict land laws and misguided development plans promulgated by the state. This situation is further exacerbated by an administrative vacuum resulting from the abolishment of indigenous mechanisms that used to govern the relations between individuals and groups in rural areas. These indigenous rules also served to organize the utilization of available natural resources. A number of attempts to address the issue of nomadic pastoral groups in planned development had no conclusive or positive results. Many development paradigms alluded to above have led to the further marginalization of these people (cf. Shazali and Ahmed, 1999; UNDP, 2006; Casciarri and Ahmed, 2009).

Pastoral Development Paradigms

Since the mid-1940s, land policies first designed by the colonial administration and later adopted by the national governments have tended to marginalize the pastoralists. This was based on the recognition of the colonial administrators that ecological constraints necessitated nomadic pastoral groups' movements. Regulating grazing by delineating areas for larger ethnic federations *dār* (home lands), and stipulating general regulations for the allocation of resources to different sections of ethnic confederations and non-endogenous inhabitants of the *dār* started as early as 1904. This was primarily achieved through the system of Native Administration, a form of indirect rule instituted by the British colonial administrators in the country. At a general level, regulations separated the respective domains of cultivation by enforcing grazing lines (Shazali and Ahmed, 1999:6). A further set of controls over nomadic pastoralist movement devised by the colonial administrators concerned the

manipulation of the water policy. Accordingly, the colonial government used to open and close watering points in order to influence the timing and the direction of the nomadic pastoralist movement, normally away from sites it considered ecologically marginal and in need for rehabilitation. Range management was linked to water policy in any given region and this promoted a high degree of direct control by the government over the nomadic pastoralist movement (ibid:7).

The Soil Conservation Committee Report of 1944 recommended that,

...[t]he rights of nomads particularly need clarification and generally we are of the opinion that in the event of conflict of interest arising between nomads and settled communities it is the interest of the permanent well-being and development of the Sudan that the right of settled communities should prevail and that nomads should be excluded from all areas to be settled (Sudan Government, 1944:15).

The cultivator's interests were considered as paramount, because his crops were then seen to yield a bigger return per unit area (El-Tayeb 1985:35). Semi-mechanized rain-fed farming started in 1944 on the clay plains of eastern Sudan, which is traditionally home to a number of nomadic pastoral groups. Agricultural investment during the colonial period was directed to cotton gravity irrigation of the Gezira scheme and pump schemes along the White, Blue and River Nile with a total neglect of the nomadic pastoral groups. National planners who were exponents of sedentarization followed suit, displaying an almost total disregard for nomadic pastoral groups.

By the early 1960s, investment in rain-fed semi-mechanized schemes were aggressively promoted and scheme owners, with the support of government initiated policies, appropriated most of the land that pastoral groups used to utilize for grazing and partly for small agricultural plots and gum tapping in order to diversify their livelihood sources as in the case of the Rufa'a al Hoi in Blue Nile State and in most other parts of the country. This in turn led to serious conflicts between pastoralists and scheme owners as well as settled communities close to the grazing areas. The conflicts were further exacerbated by the civil war, when

pastoralists who used to move as far south as Khor Yabus bordering the Upper Nile State were denied access to their dry season grazing areas. The situation led a large number of the nomadic pastoralists to settle and develop new systems of adaptation, including the advanced system of transhumance mentioned above.

With reference to such planning strategies, the progress in the development of the pastoral sector can be explained by the type of paradigms that dominated the scene over the last 60 years. Some major paradigms have been prominent on the Sudanese development landscape and influenced the rural production systems in which pastoralists played a significant role. The *concept of settlement*, propagated by the exponent of sedentary civilization, dominated the late 1950s and 1960s. It regarded the pastoral system of livelihood as rudimentary and accused the pastoralists of being resistant to change and wandering about destroying natural resources. They were encouraged to settle and integrate in sedentary societies so that the state could provide them with health, education and other services. Planners thought that such services could only be extended when people were in permanent settlements (cf. Ahmed, 1976). The elites who were in charge of development planning considered settlement as a sign of modernity while the pastoral livelihood systems were viewed as traditional and as a hindrance to the development process they were aspiring for. However, the elite's achievement in this direction was limited and the whole idea of settling the pastoralists came to a standstill.

The *concept of services orientation* followed in the early 1970s with recognition of the pastoral sector's contribution to the national economy. This was in contradiction to the earlier belief of those who were promoting settlement and hence it came as a clear shift in attitude towards the pastoral sector. It argued for the need to support and develop the pastoral sector through the provision of services to both human and animal population to ensure the continuity of the pastoralists' contribution to the gross domestic product and the export sector and no longer insist on their settlement, hence abandoning that paradigm. Mobile animal health services and other minor facilities were provided for the sector. The result was a conspicuous increase in the number of

herds. It was hoped that together with some organization of the rest of the agricultural sector, this may allow the country to play an important role in providing food security to the region. But such planning eventually led to degradation of the pastures and ignited serious conflict between nomadic pastoralists and settled cultivators, semi-mechanized scheme owners as well as the pastoralists themselves. The expansion of the semi-mechanized scheme led to the shrinking of the pasture areas and took over the limited space, where pastoralists could cultivate small plots of land while on the move and return later to harvest them. In places where there are gum gardens that pastoralists and settler villagers used to tap, these were cleared to make room for the schemes. This in fact showed the bias of the planners toward forced settlement of pastoralists (Ahmed, 1987:138).

On similar principles the *concept of market orientation*, propagated by the state policies of the 1970s, considered the country as the breadbasket of the Arab world. The idea behind this line of thought was to attract capital from the Arab World with the abundance of land and available manpower in Sudan to increase food production to the extent of creating self-sufficiency for the region and beyond. The World Bank and other interested parties followed suit realizing the potential that such an arrangement may offer by mainly focusing on the expansion of agricultural production at a time when, during the time (1970s), there was a clear shortage of food in the region and an abundance of the idle capital, land as well as animal wealth waiting to be utilized. However, instead of looking at how an appropriate integration of capital, land, animal wealth and manpower can be envisaged, expansive areas of land were appropriated in favor of irrigated and rain-fed agricultural schemes, strengthening the link between the national and global economy. In areas traditionally used by pastoralists, the World Bank and other foreign investors' involvement in this sector promoted policies encouraging mechanized schemes, leading to a reduction in grazing lands and forcing a large number of pastoralists to settle. At the same time increasing efforts were made to integrate the nomadic pastoral sector into the market economy by encouraging increased off-take that was hoped to reduce the herd sizes, relieve the pressure on the grazing

areas and benefit the national economy. However, nomadic pastoralists did not respond to the proposed policies and kept making use of the provided animal health services to increase the number of their herds leading to further pressure on the land. Planners missed the point that pastoralists are not only interested in the monetary value of these herds but also in the social prestige that they may bestow upon the owner.

The criticism of the above paradigm which implicitly suggests a tendency of moving more and more towards individual interest rather than upholding the communitarian ethos that characterizes the pastoral system of livelihood is paving the way for the gradual emergence of a new one, namely the *concept of human development*. Though not yet fully having taken shape, this paradigm, in which genuine attention is paid to human capital within the pastoral group, seems to resonate with their recently transformed adaptation. Given the occurrence of droughts and other crises, many pastoralists chose to transform their production systems by diversifying their resources and activities even though they had to use different strategies for diversification compared to what they were used to in the old days when they had enough space (Ahmed, 2009:124-128). They maintained some aspects of their traditional systems of livelihood and culture, while at the same time improving the quality of life at present and for future generations. However, it has to be noted that another dynamic is also active. Pastoralists are among the major groups suffering from the prolongation of civil conflicts in different parts of the country. These conflicts are negatively impacting the daily life of the pastoralists, limiting the distance of their movements and destroying the symbiotic relations they used to have with their settled neighbors (Ahmed and Manger, 2007:15). A recent example of trying to overcome such negative effects on development is proposed by the Council for Development and Upgrading of Nomads in Darfur States (CDUN), which attempts to provide services to pastoralists in places where their families can settle, and water and other services can be made available to their animals mainly in Bahr al-Arab basin. The main objective is to avoid major conflicts between pastoralists who lost their grazing land in the northern part due to drought and desertification and moved into areas inhabited by settled villagers who use the land

around the Jebel Marra Massive for cultivation of different variety of crops as well as gardening (cf. CDUN, 2009).

The Case of the Southern Blue Nile

The progressive development of the pastoral paradigms in Sudan can be best illustrated by the case of Blue Nile State. Enforcing the settlement of pastoralists and giving prominence to agriculture still is the main driving force behind development policies in Blue Nile State. In the early 1960s rain-fed mechanized schemes gradually expanded on pasture lands starting from the Dali and Mazmum areas in Sennar State and continuing down south into Blue Nile State. Due to this appropriation of pasture areas, the herds of some nomadic pastoralists decreased to the degree that it was impossible for them to survive in the pastoral system. These pastoralists had no choice but to settle. This was in fact a forced settlement which was engineered by the development planners who realized that by appropriating the land, the pastoralists would have no chance but to settle, paving the way for merchants, retired government employees and absentee land owners to expand their rain-fed agricultural activities. The early group of pastoralists that was forced to settle entered the informal sector in small urban areas of the region, such as Abu Hugar in Sennar area and Sarajiyya north of Damazin. Alternatively, they started cultivating small fields near the villages, where they settled, or worked as hired laborers in the rain-fed mechanized schemes. Many were hoping to accumulate enough capital to reinvest in animals and return to their traditional system of livelihood. Such processes of accumulation were the dream of most pastoralists who had lost their herds. However, in reality these dreams hardly ever materialized due to the changing economic situation in the region and the country as a whole. Such groups had to eke out their living from activities in the informal sector or sell their labor to others who were in need and could afford to pay for it. At the same time the pressure on land increased resulting in more families losing their herds. Under these circumstances the number of people who were forced to settle permanently continued to increase in the 1980s and 1990s, mostly settling along the banks of the Blue Nile and some villages on the plain.

The dominant paradigm therefore continued for a long time to favor agricultural production undermining the livestock sector.

With the failure of all hopes that the Sudan may be able to attract Arab capital and become the bread basket of the region, the significant contribution of the livestock sector to the gross national product was realized as was its potential for further development. It was also noted that the pastoral sector is the main source of the country's animal wealth. This prompted the extension of services to the livestock sector leading to the increase of animal population in Blue Nile State. Concomitantly in-migration, demographic growth and the little health services offered to the inhabitants have increased the human population density in the region. At the same time land continued to be appropriated by the state and private investors, hampering the movement of pastoralists to their seasonal grazing areas by creating many obstacles and thus preparing conflicts with agricultural scheme owners or settled villagers. A number of anomalies started to emerge questioning the rationality of the policies that planners are trying to force on the local population. Competition over land and water became even more serious when new pastoral groups such as the pastoral Fulani, originally coming all the way from the Sahelian countries, entered the region in large numbers (Ahmed, 1973:52-54). This was further aggravated by the population movement and increased settlement from Western Sudan due to drought, desertification and civil strife as illustrated by the case of Darfur.

Planners began to view the increase in livestock numbers as indicating the possibility of channeling excess animals to the market. Hence, the concept of market orientation of the pastoral production system emerged, without paying due attention to what pastoralists value or believe. This new market orientation in fact took root among all pastoralists in Blue Nile State but it did not result in easing the pressure on the land, since the appropriation of land for the rain-fed agricultural schemes continued unabated.

A further new dynamic unfolded in the 1990s, when agricultural scheme owners started to raise animals for sale and feed them residues of their crops. Soon conflicts arose between pastoralists and scheme owners.

Attempts were made to resolve these conflicts through the demarcation of livestock migration corridors to allow the pastoralists to move annually between their dry season and wet season grazing areas. The proposed width of such corridors was supposed to be about two kilometers that extend all the way through the schemes area. These corridors served the dual purpose of providing a template for the development of essential infrastructure and services in rural areas, such as water catchments like small dams, seasonal river beds and natural depressions, ‘hafirs’ (man-made depressions with earth embankments) and deep boreholes. They also mark recognized grazing land and passage ways through which pastoralists could move with their herds, avoiding contact and potential conflict with scheme owners and sedentary communities by circumventing areas of concentrated agricultural activity. However, the implementation of such policies did not last long, since neither the scheme owners nor the settled villagers kept the width suggested for such corridors. Soon the width contracted to a few meters leading to intensive confrontation between pastoralists and others in the area. (ibid:47-49). The Blue Nile land use map shows the direction of corridors (nomadic routes) traditionally used by the pastoralists from their wet season grazing areas in the northern part of the state to their dry season areas in the southern part. It also shows the limited area left for grazing purposes between the schemes that pastoral groups could use during their movements. Unfortunately, during the past few decades, these corridors mostly disappeared due to unplanned expansion of the rain-fed mechanized schemes. Most of these are schemes that are cleared for cultivation by private persons without obtaining licenses from the government authorities in the region. Although governmental authorities know about such cases, no measures are taken against those who are appropriating these plots of land. Corruption among the representatives of the local or central authorities is obvious in such situations. This was further aggravated by the civil war in the southern part of Blue Nile State, which for a long time limited the movement of pastoralists and curtailed their access to their dry season grazing areas around Khor Yabus. Due to these constraints more pastoral groups started to settle, including some rich ones. These are mainly the members of the Rufa’a al Hoi southern *b^adiya* (pastoralists), major

among them are the Wanas^{ab} group (Ahmed, 2009:125-128). They are the ones who started adopting a new strategy for herding their animals, which included changing the direction of the movement of herds from a north-south to an east-west and limiting themselves to moving in the northern part of the state or going as far as the White Nile where they share the grazing areas with pastoralists of that area. By doing so they are trying to avoid conflicts with cultivators as well as keeping away from the war zone. Even though the Comprehensive Peace Agreement signed in 2005 has settled the civil war in the state, hostilities between the local population and the pastoralists remained. This is in addition to the fact that mines were not totally cleared, which represented a threat to humans and animals. These newly settled groups, in attempting to shorten the distance of the herd movement, mainly turned to the use of residues from rain-fed mechanized schemes to feed their livestock. In the past, pastoralists were allowed to feed their animals on this free of charge while they were passing on their way to their dry season grazing areas. However, now that the scheme owners have started to raise their own herd, they began to sell the excess feed to pastoralists. Yet, to make good use of this situation and change the pattern of their movement the pastoralists also started to use trucks to bring water for their herds that were kept with herders on the schemes while the households remained in permanent settlements in villages on the banks of the Blue Nile or in near villages on the plains. After settling they began to appreciate that they are receiving a number of benefits that were not available to them when they were on the move. Such services included access to health and education in addition to being close to the decision making centers, which they started to influence through their participation in the organization of the Pastoralists Union of Blue Nile State. They also observed that poor members of their groups, who settled earlier, were able to reap the benefits of the human development possibilities offered by the settlement and related livelihood systems and were made aware of the need to catch up with such development (Ahmed, 2009:125-128). In other words, the pastoralists, by pursuing health services and education, themselves initiated a new development paradigm similar to what has been alluded to above as a *human development paradigm*.

It is clear that efforts were made to apply a number of paradigms to the pastoralists of Blue Nile State starting with the idea of settling them, favoring agricultural expansion and appropriating pasture land, promoting the market orientation to increase off-take and reduce herd sizes so that conflicts with other land users decrease. Each of these attempts came with its own set of problems and anomalies, giving way to another that attempted to offer a better solution. The latest attempt aims at human development. In fact it is pioneered by the pastoralists themselves and is forcing planners to move in the same direction.

Concluding remarks

For many decades, nomadic pastoralists in Sudan have been a subject to the experimentation by many administrators and development planners. The most conscious attempt to control and administer them using the state machine, started during the early days of the colonial administration. Using indirect rule and dividing rural areas into home lands (dārs) for different ethnic groups, it was possible to control individual and group movements. In addition, monitoring watering points and deciding on grazing routes enabled the government to decide which part of the land can be utilized by the nomadic pastoral groups. The start of gravity irrigation and the rain-fed mechanized farming gradually had a conspicuous impact on lands that both sedentary farmers and pastoralists use for maintaining a living. In all this, the colonial administration clearly favored the agricultural sector and issues linked to its own interests rather than that of its subjects.

The attitude of the post-independence national governments toward the rural sector was not different from the one propagated by the colonial rule. The urban elites were interested in maintaining their power through close control of rural areas. Their idea of developing the nomadic pastoral groups was first to settle them, bringing them under the governmental control and then extending services where they settled. At the same time attention has been paid to agricultural development with a clear neglect of the pastoral sector, which was expected to settle due to the land appropriation mechanisms used by the central authorities. This, together with drought and desertification as well as the extension of mechanized

schemes, gradually led to the shrinking of the pastures and to conflicts between scheme owners, settled cultivators and pastoralists.

This development fostered the emergence of a number of paradigms related to land use in rain-fed and irrigated land and a number of paradigmatic shifts as part of development in the region. Albeit in these paradigmatic shifts the negative attitude toward the pastoral sector prevailed, which had started as early as the colonial administration days and later continued to dominate plans of the post-independence urban elite. Settlement and service paradigms were followed by the market-driven one, which also promoted the extension of the mechanized schemes. Starting recently, a new paradigm related to human development is unfolding (see CDUN, 2009). This paradigm is in fact initiated by the pastoralists themselves and is being supported by some members of the regional elites who are closely related to the rural communities of both pastoralists and settled cultivators. Those elites recognize the state of marginalization of rural areas and genuinely seek to redress the inequality that exists. Pastoralists are especially responsive to this paradigm by transforming their pastoral system and gradually coming to recognize the benefits that they may gain in the future.

References

Ahmed, Abdel Ghaffar M. (1973): "Nomadic competition in the Fung Area", *Sudan Notes and Records*, Vol. 54, pp. 43-56.

----- (1976): *Some Aspects of Pastoral Nomadism in the Sudan*. Khartoum: Sudan National Population Committee and the Economic and Social Research Council.

----- (1987): "National ambivalence and external hegemony: The negligence of pastoral nomads in the Sudan", in M.A. Mohamed Salih (ed.), *Agrarian Change in the Central Rainlands*. Uppsala: Scandinavian Institute of African Studies.

----- (1992): "Rural production systems in the Sudan;

A general perspective” in Martin Doornbos, Lionel Cliffe, Abdel Ghaffar M. Ahmed and John Markakis (eds.), *Beyond Conflict in the Horn of Africa: The Prospects for Peace, Recovery and Development in Ethiopia, Somalia, Eritrea and Sudan*. The Hague in association with James Curry, London: The Institute of Social Studies.

----- (2009): “Transforming pastoralism: A case study of the Rufa’a Al Hoi ethnic group in the Blue Nile State, Sudan”, *Nomadic Peoples*, Vol.13, No.1, pp.113-133.

Ahmed, Abdel Ghaffar M., Alemayehu Azeze, Mustafa Babiker and Diress Tsegaye (2002): *Post-Drought Recovery Strategies Among Pastoral Households in the Horn of Africa: A Review*. Addis Ababa: OSSREA Development Research Report No. 3.

Ahmed, Abdel Ghaffar M. and Leif Manger (eds.) (2007): *Understanding the Crisis in Darfur: Listening to Sudanese Voices*. Bergen: Unifob Global, University of Bergen, BRIC.

Asad, Talal (1978): “Equality in nomadic social systems? (notes towards the dissolution of an anthropological category)”. London, Uk, *Critique of Anthropology*, No.11, Vol.3, pp.57-65.

Casciarri, Barbara and Abdel Ghaffar M. Ahmed (2009): “Introduction”, *Nomadic Peoples*, A Journal of Commission on Nomadic Peoples, Special Issue, Vol.13, No.1, pp.10-22.

Council for the Development and Upgrading of Nomads in Darfur states (CDUN) (2009): *The Development of Nomads and settled Communities in Bahr el-Arab Basin*, a Consultancy report to the Presidency, Sudan.

Darfur Relief and Documentation Center (2010): *5th Population and Housing Census in Sudan - An Incomplete Exercise*, A DRDC Report, Geneva.

Handa, M. L. (1986): “Peace paradigm: Transcending liberal and Marxian paradigms”, paper presented to the International Symposium on Science, Technology and Development, New Delhi, India, March 20-25, 1987, Mimeographed at O.I.S.E, University of Toronto.

Kuhn, Thomas, (1962): *The Scientific Revolution*. Cambridge (USA): Harvard University Press.

Markakis, John (1998): *Resource Conflict in the Horn of Africa*. London: SAGE.

Shazali, Salah and Abdel Ghaffar M. Ahmed (1999): "Pastoral tenure and agricultural expansion: Sudan and the Horn of Africa", in the International Institute for Environment and Development (iied), Issue paper no. 85. Berkshire, UK.

The Council for the Development of Nomads (2009): *The Development of Nomads and Settled Communities in Bahr El-Arab Basin, Southern Darfur State*. Khartoum.

UNDP Khartoum (2006): *Share the Land or Part the Nation: Pastoral Land Tenure System in Sudan, (Study 3)*. Khartoum.

رقم الإيداع: 2010/126