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ABSTRACT

This paper presents an attempt to understand relationship of diplomatic peace building and conflict management over resource use along the Kenya- Ethiopia border. In today's realm of international instability, the state is rarely the only actor in the conflict arena; and conflict resolution is no longer a matter of managing state-to-state relations. The modern diplomacy and the UN Agenda for peace are used to structure the analysis of this paper; as they recognize the interplay of state and non-state actors influence on stability of a given region. This paper interrogates the contribution diplomacy of peace building and the management of the Kenya- Ethiopia Cross border resource conflict. This is achieved through the analysis of the trigger factors that occasion the Kenya-Ethiopia cross border resource use conflict; examining the role of the core actors involved in the management of the Kenya-Ethiopia cross border resource-use conflict; and the evaluation the effectiveness of the diplomatic peace building strategies used towards the management of the Kenya- Ethiopia cross border resource use conflict. Various causal factors have been identified including social, economic, historical and political dimensions that render the situation almost “solution-less.” Multiple actors working in a coordinated manner as well as the use of multiple diplomatic approaches have been essential in the conflict resolution. Since the contemporary conflict arena is diffuse and multi-centered, the path towards positive peace must be designed along a number of multiple tracks. Additionally, attempts have been made to preserve and/or generate the local environment as well as the local population. However, diplomatic objectives of peace are yet to be realized.
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1.0 Introduction

Diplomacy of peace building focuses on the role of the state and non state actors in the control and utilization of shared cross-border resources. The peace building strategies employed over these resources are varied depending on the actors involved. In today's realm...
of international instability, the state is rarely the only actor in the conflict arena, and conflict resolution is no longer a matter of managing state-to-state relations. The fact is the rationalist discourse is unable to address dilemmas associated with the decline of human security and the root causes of modern protracted social conflict (Turo, 2010). With the demise of the strong, bipolar power configuration which dominated international affairs between 1946-1989, the international community has been forced to confront the challenges of turbulent multipolarity. This has encompassed the fragmentation of conflicts and the disintegration of states. The new, emerging sovereignty regime among "Third World" states after the period of de-colonization, have been exacerbated by ethnic divisions and the struggle to capture the benefits of finite resources. The exploitive and inequitable management of natural resources has been a pervasive feature of the degenerative trends of the eco-system and environment (Dida, 2008). Within this context the potential for conflict over non-renewable resources is immense.

Thomas Homer-Dixon describes these conflicts in three ways: simple scarcity conflicts which arise over the use of river water, fish and agriculturally productive land; group identity conflicts which can arise from the large-scale movement of populations brought about by environmental change; and relative deprivation conflicts whereby developing societies produce less wealth because of environmental problems and, as a result, their citizens become increasingly discontented by the widening gap between the actual level of economic achievement and the level they feel they deserve (Homer-Dixon, 1991). Conflicts are caused by competition for scarce resources (economic, political and social), and it is assumed that these conflicts will produce winners and losers" (CEWARN, 2005). In the past, policies based upon this approach have ushered in partial settlements, reflecting compromises between parties - mainly states - over territorial issues. However, when the issues involve "the protection of societal values or cultures, and are caused by the underlying deprivation of basic human needs" (CEWARN, 2005), such traditional approaches fail. The long-term deprivation of basic human needs and the erosion of human security creates conditions of protracted social conflict (Temsegen, 2010). According to this argument, "Traditional conflict management approaches cannot effectively manage these conflicts because they miss the essential causes by focusing on substantive or objective issues. In cases where a settlement may be reached it will not provide a long-term, sustainable resolution to the conflict, which will inevitably boil over again at some point in the future."
The alternative methods of conflict resolution have been developed by the peace research community with the aim of creation of conditions of "positive peace." This promotes a series of strategies which go beyond the state-centered dynamics of negative peace; it is a much broader concept which seeks to deal with the structural problems and inequalities which are often the sources of tensions that can escalate into destructive conflict. Unlike the traditional linear perspective, where success is assessed on the basis of a compromising settlement and a state of negative peace, the conflict resolver evaluates success at the point when an agreement is reached which promotes elements likely to promote a positively peaceful society. It bases peacemaking strategies on notions of civil and sustainable societal norms. Since the contemporary conflict arena is diffuse and multi-centered, the path towards positive peace must be designed along a number of multiple tracks. Different types of action must be used to address these different dimensions (Dida, 2008).

Diplomacy is often thought of as the peaceful alternative to violence but in fact diplomacy serves to prepare as often as to avoid war. It is an important part of waging war, often makes the difference in who wins, and nearly always codifies wars’ results (Butterfield, 2005). This paper argues that an enhanced understanding of diplomacy is the best chance society has to replace the norm of conflict with that of stability and peace achieved through diplomatic functions. An enhanced understanding of the theory, practice and application of peace building diplomacy – as this paper attempts - can only lead to a more diplomatic and therefore more peaceful International Relations (IR) system.

This paper interrogates the contribution diplomacy of peace building and the management of the Kenya- Ethiopia Cross border resource conflict. The specific objectives are to analyze the trigger factors that occasion the Kenya-Ethiopia cross border resource use conflict; examine the role of the core actors involved in the management of the Kenya- Ethiopia cross border resource-use conflict; and to evaluate the effectiveness of the diplomatic peace building strategies used towards the management of the Kenya- Ethiopia cross border resource use conflict.

2.0 Conceptual Framework

This paper is located within the theory of modern diplomacy from Innovative school by Paul Sharp in the perspective of enhanced practice and application of diplomacy as the business of peace; as well as the UN Agenda for Peace in explaining the peace building concept. The notion of diplomacy as the avoidance of conflict and the business of peace is
inherent with diplomacy interpreted as best means for modern civilization to prevent international relations from being governed by force. Paul Sharp, from the Innovative School, defines modern, plural diplomacy as ‘the way in which relations between groups that regard themselves as separate ought to be conducted if the principle of living in groups is to be retained as good, and if unnecessary and unwanted conflict is to have a chance of being avoided’. Significantly, Sharp’s definition suggests that modern diplomacy is not dominated exclusively by states and their diplomats, rather by ‘groups’ (Sharp, 2001). The modern diplomatic system is largely a state-qua-state system but one that is being increasingly supplemented and complemented by non-state actors (Murray, et.al 2011). All actors in this system share the common goal of maintaining stability and avoiding conflicts which can damage political relationships hamper trade or regress the emergence of a global civil society, as but a few examples. As more actors are socialised into this largely peaceful diplomatic system, the merits of solving international problems through diplomacy as opposed coercion and force become self-evident.

In the modern sense, diplomacy remains the ‘expression of a shared logic of appropriateness’ informing the actions of and identities of diplomatic actors while, distributing and dispersing shared values, norms and structures to all diplomatic actors. The notions of a shared logic, framework and structure endure at the heart of the modern diplomatic system. As more actors – state and non-state – become part of this system, they adopt the endemic norms, standards and behaviours, which in turn promote dialogue, communication and negotiation as opposed to isolation, miscommunication and non-compliance. All actors then become common stakeholders in the stability of this system, thus further promoting peaceful and diplomatic solutions over potential conflict. Those actors and groups that choose to shun the system or to forge their own diplomatic path to their own policy ends can thus be described as anti-diplomatic and condemned for their reluctance to choose conflict and war over peace and stability.

In support of this theory, the UN Agenda for Peace as highlighted by the Former UN Secretary General, Boutros-Ghali (1992), explains that peace building consists of a wide range of activities associated with capacity building, reconciliation and societal transformation. Such initiatives try to fix the core problems that underlie the conflict and change the patterns of interaction of involved parties, from a condition of extreme vulnerability and dependency to one of self-sufficiency (UN, 2009). This can be achieved through dimensions, for instance, addressing the underlying causes of conflict, which rely on
different strategies and techniques (Burton, 1990; Lederach, 1997). The agenda involves the conception of a holistic, multi-actor, participative program that prioritizes a consideration of local context and capacities. This shift in focus implies that the ultimate goal is to achieve a level of reconstruction and reconciliation in which actors could manage and resolve conflict, without recourse to violence or to external intervention. There is need for enabling local populations to regain control over their physical and material security through a “culture of prevention” and a “culture of peace”, generated from the bottom up as well as from the top down interventions (Werner, 2010).

Sustainable peace can, therefore, be attained if there is a clear balance between the interveners as well as the beneficiaries of such intervention efforts. This study, therefore, synthesized and integrated the various ideas in-built in modern diplomacy theory and the UN Agenda for peace to attempt an explanation of resource-use conflict management through Diplomatic peace building along the Kenya-Ethiopia border. The diagram below shows the synthesis of the theory as well as the concept to show the interaction of variables used in this analysis.

![Figure 2.1: Conceptual Model showing interaction of variables](source: Researcher, 2015)
3.0 Methodology

The research employed quantitative and qualitative research methods. The research was formed through the analysis of secondary data and in this respect, extensive library research was done where journals, books, paper articles, organizations reports as well as published empirical reports were consulted and studied. The analysis of secondary data allows for the examination of existing literature yet can produce more and detailed information, including emergence of new knowledge. This study employed both probability and non-probability sampling methods in which desired population under study was sampled. A total of 381 household heads were sampled from the two countries. Purposive sampling was used to identify the key informants, government officials, CSOs, diplomatic/embassies personnel, and the security officers. Additionally, two focus group discussions were used for the cross-border peace committees comprising at least eight people in each group.

Figure 1: Map of the study area (Source: Researcher, 2015)
4.0 Study Findings

4.1 Historical Analysis of the Natural Resource-use Conflict between the Merille and Turkana

Records of the Merille and Turkana people occupying the Ethio-Kenya border date back to the late 19th century. The two communities, Merille and Turkana are historically nomadic given the geography of the land and the nature of their livelihoods. The Merile and the Nyangatom from Ethiopia occupy majorly the Omo river banks up to the delta where the river ends to the Lake while the Turkana from Kenya inhabit all the entire western side of Lake Turkana stretching from the Kenya –Ethiopia border up where the border of the three Countries intersect (Kenya, Ethiopia and Sudan). The Turkana and the Merille are two distinguished ethnic groups with incompatible cultural norms and quite different in all aspects of ways of life (Yohannes, et al., 2005).

The survival of the Turkana depends upon their ability to acquire land as well as their ability to raise and gain more livestock. While the Turkana people practice a mixed economy, about 80% of their livelihood is dependent on raising livestock. The Turkana raise livestock such as sheep, camel, cattle and goats and their diet consists of the milk and meat that they acquire from these animals. This group is also known to trade with other ethnic groups in order to supplement their diets but these interactions often result in disputes over whether these trades are equitable or not (Haskins, 2010).

The Merille are also known as the Dassanach and number around 50,000. Merille livelihood depends on “pastoralism, flood-plain cultivation, and fishing in and around the Omo River” (Toru, 2010: 11). The people depend on annual flooding of the Omo river in order to grow crops and for vegetation for their livestock to graze on. However, during the past 50 years or so the Merille have suffered massive losses in their number of cattle, goats, and sheep as a result of land scarcity. The impact of these losses have caused larger numbers of Merille people to migrate to areas closer to the Omo river in an attempt to grow more crops as a way to survive. Merille conflict is both internal and external with the majority of incidents involving the Turkana or Nyangatom people. The presence of shared fishing areas and valuable nets creates conflict triggers between Turkana and Dassenech/ Merille. These consequently contribute to the formation of unpopulated buffer areas between the ethnic groups. The two communities have historically clashed over ethnic differences and competition for resources (Toru, 2010).
Apart from the inter-territorial border conflicts, there is also inter-clan Turkana community conflict which erupts as a result of competition over access and control of their local available resource for example the *Kwatella* versus the *Ngissiger* which are the sub clans among the Turkana community. The pastoralists in Ethiopia are also faced with the challenge of inter-ethnic conflicts. For example, conflicts between the Hamer and the Merille, Nyagatom and Karo which are ethnic groups found in South Omo zone of Ethiopia (Avery, 2013).

### 4.1.1 Causes of cross-border natural resource-based conflicts in the region

Resource scarcity, resource control and vengeance were highlighted to be the major causes of conflicts by respondents from the two communities. Stiff competition for dwindling resources especially land, pasture, fishing points and water sources proved a potent spark for the area conflicts. Other causes identified include land encroachment, raiding as a cultural practice, fight over grazing lands which are already overgrazed, climate change, ethnicity, poverty, marginalization of both communities, prolonged dry spells as well as illegal border crossing especially for barter trade.

The study established that the Turkana and the Merille fishermen fight over the fishing rights in the northern part of the Lake near the border where it is characterized by human lives, fishing gears and vessel losses. Either side blames the other for intruding trying to access and fish in others fishing grounds and the same is replicated on the pastoral grazing areas where the Merille collide with the Kenyan security personnel manning the border as the Merille forcefully graze their livestock inside Kenya.

The study established from the key informants in both Kenya and Ethiopia that multitude factors constitute conflict cycles. From the Key informants response, the causes of the conflicts in the region are multiple, interrelated and complex. The communities in search for water and pasture do clash over territorial claims and water usage. The situation is made worse by the harsh climatic conditions of prolonged dry spells which make the water, pasture and grazing land resources scarce amongst the two communities. The struggle for resource accessibility and control also makes the communities to clash. Additionally, the two communities have retaliatory attacks against the perceived attackers and enemies which make the conflict in the area remain persistent.
Droughts in this area result in a further decline on an already scarce supply of water and arable land. This decrease directly affects these two groups through decreasing their crop yields as well as their livestock numbers seeing as many cattle die from a lack of adequate grazing land or water. The only way for these groups to survive with their already bolstering population numbers are to migrate in search of better resources and relocate to areas closer to water sources.

Interview results from the Ethiopian Kuraz woreda local administration established that one of the current causes of conflicts relates to access to grazing pasture and water points. This has been caused by the degradation and reduced carrying capacity of rangelands through encroachment, and little, erratic rain combined with continued overgrazing by large cattle herds. This results in competition over resources, especially during droughts and dry seasons.

A study by Yohannes, et al., (2005) provides that pastoral communities in South Omo have a tradition and culture of fighting enemies communally. Every pastoral community of South Omo has its own specific defense mechanisms to be employed against the enemies which are deeply rooted in the existing socio-cultural factors of each community. Individuals in the groups are encouraged to effectively act against enemies and recognize allies. The tradition of fighting enemies communally, which is regarded as essential for the survival and well-being of the group, becomes the basis for intractable conflict in the study area. The long-standing tradition of classifying the other ethnic groups as permanent or potential enemies also serves an important reason for recurrent conflicts. The categorization of enemies as primary and secondary, whereas primary groups residing in the immediate neighborhood while secondary reside in far away localities.

Natural resource-based conflicts in the region can be attributed to a number of causes which are dynamic in nature. From the response indicated from the FGD discussion at Omorate in Kuraz Worade, competition for scarce resources which are mainly water and pasture is further exacerbated by the drought conditions in the region. The pastoralists’ nomadic nature intensifies the conflict situation as they move around in such of these scarce resources. The inter-territorial movement also enhances proliferation of arms across the two countries thus intensifying the conflicts intensity and magnitude. The study also established from the two FGDs in the study area that, the main water sources in this area are Lake Turkana in northern Kenya and the Omo River that runs throughout southern Ethiopia. The two water sources also create conditions of conflict between the two communities.
The decline of water levels in Lake Turkana was identified as a potential source of conflict between the two communities. According to Powers (2011), Ethiopia’s construction of the Gilgel Gibe III dam on the Omo river has been a cause of conflict, with the Kenyan authorities concerned that the dam would deprive Turkana County of water reserves. As the Merille people follow the receding water into Kenya, tensions between these two groups escalate as new territorial disputes arise. Other responses from key informants cited population growth, industrialization, and land degradation to have increased major international environmental problems on shared resources. Environmental change was highlighted to increase the cost of rebellion in the region.

The study also established that most of the dry season grazing areas and water points are mostly found in disputed land along the border areas. Access to these resources during dry seasons sparks clashes between the Turkana and Merille communities. Similar findings were found by Nembrini, et al., (2005) who asserts that pastoral communities have been fighting for the last 10 years over water and pasture. Additionally, climate and the associated environmental disasters, such as droughts and floods, induce forced migrations and competition over natural resources among the pastoral communities with potential negative consequences for political stability and conflict resolution (Nembrini, 2005).

This study analyzes the central drivers of and potential mitigation strategies for the conflicts between the Turkana and Merille communities in terms of their vulnerability. The vulnerability of pastoral households to drought and recurrent resource based conflicts add to the weakened customary institutions and ineffective pastoral coping strategies that predispose pastoral livelihoods to various stressors. A downscaled understanding of the nature and causes of pastoral conflicts and their interaction with climate variability, among other driving factors, is critical not only in designing appropriate mitigation measures but also in achieving sustainable resource management and secure pastoral livelihoods which corroborates a study by Opiyo, et al., 2012.

This shows the complex nature of natural resources conflict and its management and indicates that a mono-causal analysis will not serve the exercise. The strategic analysis of the scarcity, abundance and management/mismanagement of resources as a cause of conflict and the deficiencies of a mono-causal analysis towards resource-use conflict management remain potential policy issues. The neo-Malthusian school of thought argues that rapid population growth, environmental degradation, resource depletion and unequal resource access combine to exacerbate poverty and income inequality in many of the world’s least-developed
countries. These deprivations are easily translated into grievances, increasing the risks of rebellion and social conflict (Mwanika, 2010). This school however, neglects the additional role that natural resource-use conflicts as the backborne to structural instability and hence long-run underdevelopment. Diplomatic structural peace building that captures conflict management and development as dual roles to sustainable peace.

4.2 Role of the Core Actors Involved In the Management of the Kenya- Ethiopia Cross Border Resource-Use Conflict

4.2.1 The State as actor

The national governments are responsible for policies and frameworks that facilitate structural transformation of conflict especially among the conflict torn pastoralists and agro pastoralist communities along the Ethiopia-Kenya border. They ensure coordination among different line ministries as well as bilateral and multilateral partners through various national platforms. They have the responsibility to ensure implementation of policies and legal instruments, develop prevention, mitigation and preparedness measures and ensure conflict transformation to sustainable peace. (Odhimbo, et al., 2012).

Historical literature analysis for this study highlights that after Kenyan independence, the personal friendship between President Jomo Kenyatta and Emperor Haile Selassie cemented ties and both countries embarked upon joint co-operation in a number of areas, notably in working towards the realization of the principles of “non interference” in the OAU’s Charter (The Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, 2015). The Ethiopia-Kenya boundary was initially defined in 1907, and this was used as a legal base for a detailed boundary description in 1947, and then demarcation, carried out between 1950 and 1955. After Kenya’s independence, a Joint Inter-Ministerial Consultative Committee reviewed the work, and the boundary was formally agreed by a treaty signed in 1970. This treaty determined the present-day boundary, abrogating all previous boundary treaties. This border has been subjected to demarcation (The Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, 2015).

Cooperation has been strongly encouraged by these bilateral contacts. Both countries have embarked upon a number of joint development programmes in road construction, commerce and trade and other areas. Ethiopia has been exploring the possibility of using Mombasa as a port, and is taking a keen interest in the discussions about the creation of a new port at Lamu and the possibilities of rail links with other areas.
From the household respondents’ feedback and the historical analysis of the conflict situation, the results indicated that the state works through the local government as well as joint efforts with non-state actors. The use of the local government institutions as highlighted from the study indicated an existence of both macro-level conflict transformation including high-level visits as well as micro-level conflict transformation. However, both the Kenyan and Ethiopian governments have been blamed to have fueled these tensions by providing firearms to each side and a lack of regulatory aid along with arming each side with firearms. After World War I and in the 1990s, the Ethiopian government supplied the Merille people with automatic weapons, and at times allied with the Merille people against the Turkana people. The Kenyan government on the other hand restricted possession of firearms which escalated the tension between the two groups by making the Turkana people more vulnerable to attacks (Hagmann & Mulugeta, 2008).

The lack of development opportunities amongst the two communities has resulted in the Kenyan and Ethiopian states paying little attention to this area. The neglect by these two states to address conflict in this area has resulted in an increasing number of outbreaks over grazing land in this area. Several peace meetings were held in 2006 between Ethiopian and Kenyan governments along with representatives from each ethnic group. This includes mediation efforts conducted by the United Nations Environmental Programme (UNEP) which were successful, and an agreement signed by the Kenyan and Ethiopian governments. The impacts of these meetings and agreements have been short lived with the conflict between the two communities over water, pasture and land reoccurring as further supported by (Powers, 2011). The study contribution shows that there is a missing link in the negotiation processes and agreements that come from these negotiations as the agreements and ceasefires are short lived in the region.

The above study findings contradict a study by Mwamba (2010) who observes that states’ focus is on the top leadership and macro level while ignoring the majority of the population and micro-level conflict transformation and relationships. The findings also disagree with UN report (2009) indicating that state intervention has only been successful at the formal and superficial levels. The Ethiopian and Kenyan states’ intervention has embraced the shift from macro-level conflict management to include micro-level conflict management.
4.2.1.1 Local Administration

The local administration work to enhance peace through the county and sub-county offices as well as the regional offices. They have played a pivotal role in addressing community conflicts through enhancement of security and facilitation of the operation of government peace initiatives. The local governments have direct responsibilities for citizen safety and considerable knowledge of the potential conflicts their communities are exposed. They equally ought to serve as the interface between the local and national governments. From the Interview with the local government official, the study established their roles to include coordination with various peace building initiatives, for instance, the joint local peace committees chaired by the District Commissioners (District Peace Committee and District Development Committees) in which they meet once in three or four months; enforcement of peace agreements; resettlement and livelihood reconstruction of the affected communities. In addition, they facilitate forms of engagement between the two communities/groups and the government which has enhanced government’s responsiveness to these communities as well as strengthened local peace building blocs. The DPCs have proved to be valuable interface structures between the two governments, community leaders and CSOs when responding to conflict and security situations in the region.

4.2.1.2 Security Personnel

The security personnel under this study included the government police force as well the KPRs. Police posts have been set up in areas perceived to be vulnerable especially along the borders. The study findings that there were few police officers at the border points to effectively control and manage security. Given the vast, extensive borders, the officers were faced with daunting challenges in terms of strengthening border management, countering cross border attacks and movements and preventing conflict reoccurrences. In both the two countries, it was noted that there were few security personnel. The infrastructure was equally not well developed. There was incapacity of government agencies to operate patrols. There were also few manned check points along the borders but erecting these check points was not feasible due to lack of infrastructure development in the region. These factors along with the existence of an expansive border offered the two communities opportunities to illegally enter into either country.
Explanations from the study findings were either due to several factors inherent in the whole security structures; the failure of the security personnel to come up with innovative practices for response in relation to costs and pay-offs outcomes. Nonetheless, these findings corroborate writings of several writers. As observed by Okello *et al.*, (2005) quoted by Opiyo *et al.*, (2012) pastoral conflicts are not adequately explained by resource scarcity theories alone but also by the dynamics of cooperation and co-optation within communities, as well as the theories of economic and political ecology. Due to the inadequate presence of state security apparatus in pastoral areas, owing to their vastness and remoteness, most pastoralists acquire illegal firearms for self-protection, hence compounding the problem and creating a conducive environment for criminals to engage in commercialized livestock raids. The commercialization of cattle rustling has also been linked to loss of livelihoods and poverty among pastoral communities that drive unemployed young men, for whom there are limited economic opportunities, to engage in raids. Additionally, according to Nabea in Opon (2015), a number of land crossings in Africa are highly informal and unpolicied. Departments of countries in the East Africa Community have expressed challenges to the illegal flow of goods, people as well as arms through long and porous borders.

### 4.2.2 Non-state actors

The non state actors include FBOs and organizations (Riam Riam Peace network, IOM, Mercy Corps, Oxfam GB, EpaRDA, SAPCONE) that have a voice in communities and can help in community sensitization and disseminating public information. The individuals and groups involved play an important role of advocacy to help ensure society integration and cohesion, as well as structural transformation of perennial conflicts. The actions promoted by CBOs and NGOs are at the cutting edge of people-centered structural peace building diplomacy practices. They have the advantage of high level of flexibility in accessing funding and implementing pilot strategies and programmes that can inform national and international conflict management policies and practices among the pastoralists and agro pastoralists along the Ethio-Kenya border.

Structural peace-building is not the exclusive domain of either governments or nongovernmental actors both can be effective in this realm. The CSOs consider Integrated Post-Conflict Strategies (IPS) through their emphasis on the local context and capacities. They highlight a need to stress the building of capacities rather than mere structures for peace; the need to carry out conflict analysis and map initiatives and responses; identify
strategies for the sequencing and phasing of efforts; and establish the exit strategies. The findings are supported by a report from Fisher (1997), who notes that CSOs seek to address the root causes of conflict and reconstruct broken relationships between parties and actors through balanced approach further enhanced through partnerships and community participation.

The reconciliatory programs carried out have been facilitated by the CSOs through dialogue forums with the affected communities in established dialogue structures. For instance, the major component of most CSOs activities/projects involve partnering with joint Local Peace Committees (LPCs) and strengthening village committees through exchange programs, economic empowerment and experience sharing.

In Ethiopia, international organizations and national Civil Society Organizations have had a crucial role in establishing local peace committees. Until the adoption of the Conflict Prevention and Resolution Strategy in 2009, the Ethiopian state had a reactionary approach to resolving conflicts – dealing with the consequences rather than preventing outbreaks of violence. In this respect, CSOs have been a step ahead, realizing that sustainable peace demands a different approach, such as the continuity of peace dialogues between violent events. In addition, international organizations have supported various peace efforts such as trainings, forums, peace clubs, peace radios, and peace committees as noted by The Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia (2015).

The woreda peace committees/ District Peace committees have a sufficient mandate to address current conflicts. The committees meet irregularly and only on ad hoc basis to address ethnic conflicts between the Merille and Turkana communities. Regularity of meetings and continuity of membership to these committees is however, hindered by the high turnover in administrative staff at the woreda/district levels.

In the Karamoja cluster, for instance, peace committees have been established in all woredas, though in some instances they appear to exist only nominally. These structures generally conform to the guidelines adopted by SNNPR and the Ethiopian CEWERU guideline. At the woreda level they include the chief administrator along with other local administrators and representatives for women and youth, and a selection of elders or other important persons. Females and youth are represented minimally at the woreda level though they generally have a more significant representation at the kebele level. Composition of woreda LPCs may be over-representative of administrative personnel and would benefit by
increased inclusion of traditional stakeholders and important persons. Kebele peace committees are more inclusive of traditional actors and females (IGAD Report, 2009).

In all cases there are significant logistic and administrative difficulties. The remote location and lack of infrastructure hinder the capacity of LPCs. At the same time, the absence of CSOs or other organizations to act as secretariat for LPCs presents a significant challenge to increased LPC activity. The lack of active joint-woreda and cross-border peace committees hinders timely resolution of nascent conflicts.


According to Paffelholz, (2006b), structural peace-building activities involves creation of middle-level structures. It deals with creating structures systems of behavior, institutions, concerted actions that support the embodiment or implementation of a peace culture. It is about building an economic, military, and community infrastructure that provides concrete and realistic avenues through which a new peace system might express itself. These structures are necessary, because political peace-building can never accomplish conflict transformation by itself. A signed peace treaty does not create peace; it only creates a basis for peace, or a legal infrastructure to support peace. Without the corresponding societal infrastructure to support it, the peace may not hold (Klavins, 2011; Paffelholz, 2006b). Activities of structural peace-building include economic development programs, strengthening democracy and governance, and supporting the creation of indigenous NGOs which support peace. Structural peace-building is not the exclusive domain of either governments or nongovernmental actors both can be effective in this realm.

The issue of peace and security has continued to be a key concern along the Kenya-Ethiopia border. This situation has been exacerbated by the persistent attacks among the communities along the inter-territorial border regions. Like other types of violent conflicts, the occurrences have resulted in loss of lives, property and livelihoods, amongst other gross human rights violations which occur with pastoralist and other related conflicts. The study established that there are existing resource management units which are clustered around common resources regardless of their ethnic identity. The clusters noted by the respondent work across borders. They hold meetings in collaboration with District level government authorities, local government authorities, and other non-governmental organizations active in the District, traditional authorities, and the community members. The territory relevant to
these clusters does correspond to areas used by the respective resource management units, regardless of ethnic and administrative boundaries. This latter characteristic was important as antagonistic groups used movement across administrative (including international) boundaries to attack other groups from an area they were not resident in. This would often lead to retaliatory attacks on the resident community, causing counterattacks, fueling a cycle of violence which the formal administrative structure was not well designed to stop. For the cross ethnic peace initiative to succeed, it became necessary to bring on board the two communities relevant to the use and management of a resource area, regardless of formal administrative boundaries.

Other peace structures identified include the local Peace Committees, administration officials and the Atoweykisi-Ekisil Pastoralist Development Association, a local NGO, which developed an action plan to hold joint consultation/roundtable discussions between the two communities through the Rapid Response Fund peace building project in Merille. Equally, the Ethiopian and Kenyan Conflict Early Warning and Response Units (CEWERUs) took the initiative to spearhead a peace process between the pastoralist communities involved. Within the Conflict Early Warning and Response Mechanism (CEWARN) of the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD), the Ethiopia and Kenya CEWERUs held a two day consultation with local stakeholders in Moyale, Ethiopia. CEWERU heads and their representatives, local administration officials, Country Coordinators and Field monitors, representatives of the pastoral communities and civil society organizations were present. The meeting was called to discuss strategies to further progress towards peace among the pastoralist communities (IGAD, 2009). The non-state actors work in collaboration with the state as well as the community members.

4.3.1 Contribution towards Alleviating Conflict Motivational Factors

The inter-territorial border natural resource-use conflicts occur over the direct use of scarce resources including grazing land, agricultural land, water points and fishing points at the Lake Turkana. These ensue when local demand for resources exceeds the available supply. Such situations are often compounded by demographic pressures, drought, overgrazing and border demarcation, drought and climate change, water scarcity and the steady loss of fertile land. These conflicts have increased and diversified considerably as both the Turkana and the Merille people strive to survive in these hot and semi-arid climates.
From the study findings, it was established that grass-roots peace building initiatives do emerge out of despair and frustration caused by conflicts. For instance, the World Vision, Kenya and Ethiopia and the Kenya Red Cross Society (KRCS) had established a cross-border joint peace building initiatives in the region. These peace initiatives began their operations in 1997 with the aim of educating the rival communities on the advantages of peaceful coexistence, providing formal education, providing water through drilling boreholes and water piping from highlands to lowlands and also providing drought resilient Sahiwal cattle breed. The IOM, on the other hand through the Japan funded project, focused on conflict prevention, protection of victims of conflicts, building and strengthening policies that promote peaceful coexistence and promote partnerships with formal and grass roots structures like peace committees within the region (IOM, 2011).

It was also confirmed that the Ethiopian CEWERU supports local structures up to Kebele (sub-location) level and this is showing encouraging results. From these, the raided livestock have been recovered; noticeable improvement has been made in cross border trade and movement of goods. The meeting stressed that the local committees should get budgetary support from the government and their capacity should be enhanced through training and the provision of trainings and material support.

The study also established joint efforts between Ethiopia and Kenya as discussed in chapter five. Since the inception of these joint efforts by Kenya and Ethiopia, a number of coordinated and sustained interventions have significantly reduced cross-border violence and improved communal relations. The two governments have facilitated communal peace processes resulting in a number of peace agreements allowing pastoralists to share and have access to pasture and water located on both sides of the border. Communities create agreements with each other, supported by peace-building programmes run by local NGOs.

Peace agreements between the fighting sides have been used to help stop fighting, either for a specific, or an indefinite period as noted by this study. During the peace agreement, small-scale violence and violations of ceasefire codes of conduct often continue, even while the ‘overall’ ceasefire continues to hold. The more the violations occur, the likelier that the signed peace agreements will fail. Agreements are usually arrived at by the various actors involved in conflict management in the region including political leaders, CSOs officials, community members as well as the elders. To ensure that peace building and conflict transformation initiatives are effective and respond to the real context and situation between the two communities it is important that individual initiatives be part of a broader,
cohesive strategy, building upon the commitment, skills, knowledge and resources of many different actors. Additionally, there is need for working to develop constructive, pro-active and broad-based mobilization for peace with the focus on middle level structures which is the contribution of this study.

CSOs build social cohesion through inter-ethnic community projects as well as community connectors initiatives which have to be shared by the affected communities without marginalization, discrimination and fighting. The study established that various health facilities, water points, cattle dips, trade centers as well as educational facilities and forums created to enhance interactions as well as cohesion amongst conflicting communities. Peace structures on both sides of the border now liaise regularly in response to occasional disputes. Annual peace tournaments have been initiated to engage youth and women in the peace processes.

The above findings borrow heavily from John Paul Lederach’s first comprehensive and widely discussed transformation-oriented approach (Lederach 1997). He proposed building “long-term infrastructure” for peace building by supporting the reconciliation potential of society. He saw the need to rebuild destroyed relationships, focusing on reconciliation within society and the strengthening of society’s peace building potential. Third party intervention should concentrate on supporting internal actors and coordinating external peace efforts. Sensitivity to the local culture and a long-term time frame are also necessary. This approach has a key focus on peace constituencies by identifying mid-level individuals or groups and empowering them to build peace and support reconciliation. Empowerment of the middle level is assumed to then influence peacebuilding at the macro and grassroots levels, which was identified to be the case between the Merille and Turkana. The findings are also in agreement with UN Agenda for Peace by former UN Secretary, Boutros-Ghali (1992), explaining that peace building consists of a wide range of activities associated with capacity building, reconciliation and societal transformation. Such initiatives try to fix the core problems that underlie the conflict and change the patterns of interaction of involved parties, from a condition of extreme vulnerability and dependence to one of self-sufficiency and cohesion.

While several peace meetings were held in 2006 between Ethiopian and Kenyan governments along with representatives from each nationality, the impacts of these meetings were short lived. Both governments have fueled tensions between these two groups over the years by providing a lack of regulatory aid along with arming each side with firearms
(Powers, 2011). Thus, a signed peace treaty does not create peace; it only creates a basis for peace, or a legal infrastructure to support peace. Without the corresponding societal infrastructure to support it, the peace might not hold.

4.3.2 Trans-boundary coordination frameworks

Long-term, medium and short-term structural peace building diplomacy measures/strategies and efforts can contribute to effective and efficient use of existing scarce resources and maximizing synergy between the Merille and Turkana communities. Better management of water resources and conservation of fragile ecosystems allow diversification of livelihoods and sustain local economies of the two communities.

Findings from the key informants and FGDs indicated the prioritization in seeking sustainable conflict solutions which boil down, to establishing new social contracts. From this perspective, peace-building means arriving at a contract to which all parties can agree; and it implies creating institutions, building trust and establishing a belief among all society members that these institutions are indeed the best way to solve societal problems. The creation of trust was seen as a long-term process because it takes time for reciprocity and vested interests to establish themselves. The peace actors in the region have adopted multidimensional, multi-actor and multi-level approaches that implement a single coordinated, integrative peace-building process, with each actor contributing where it is best able. This approach, as noted, contends that stable peace is built on social, economic, and political foundations that serve the needs of the populace. The root causes of the conflict between the two communities are typically complex, but include resource scarcity, resource control, environmental degradation, climate change and drought as well as underdevelopment and insecurity issues.

Conclusion

The paper represents an attempt to understand relationship of diplomatic peace building and conflict resolution management over resource use along the Kenya- Ethiopia cross border. The modern diplomacy and the UN Agenda for peace are used to structure the analysis; as they recognize the interplay of state and non-state actors influence on stability of a given region. Various causal factors have been identified that render the situation almost “solution-less.” However, multiple actors working in a coordinated manner as well as the use of multiple approaches are essential in conflict resolution. However, diplomatic objectives of
peace are yet to be realized. There is need to encourage attempts to preserve and/or generate the local environment.

**Recommendations**

The rule that diminishing resources play an influential conflict dynamics cannot be underestimated. With deterioration of environmental capacity coupled with increased population growth, there is enhanced competition for scarce resources and may continue to disturb any compromise that existed between the groups. Attempts to preserve and/or generate the local environment should be enhanced.

Need for involvement of local communities in diplomatic activities and development. This fosters ownership especially for the case of Ethiopia where investment priorities are given to outside investors overlooking local community needs. Proactive international engagement, particularly by governments, is and will remain crucial over the medium term (ten to twenty-five years) in helping countries to manage social tensions and stimulate the development of self-regulating civil societies. While non-governmental organizations may be able to respond to situations more quickly than government agencies and may enjoy greater access and flexibility, they lack the capacity to provide the broad structural support necessary in overcoming local conflict dynamics and development shortfalls; their efforts are also more greatly hampered by coordination and security problems.

Encourage local initiatives to promote peace as well as incorporation of other actors. Cross border peace committees which have for centuries fostered peace across ethnic groups should be supported and fostered. The examples illustrated in this paper show how conflict within heterogeneous societies can be managed and, eventually, resolved by establishing more representative fora which include state-society relationship and, thus, encourage compromise and agreement over the finite resources available. This approach encompasses the ethic of global governance and the mechanism of civil society. It captures the ideal of pluralism and overcomes the "zero-sum" game so often associated with resource-based conflict.
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