

**JIMMA UNIVERSITY**  
**COLLEGE OF LAW AND GOVERNANCE**  
**DEPARTMENT OF GOVERNANCE AND DEVELOPMENT STUDIES**



**HUMAN RIGHTS ISSUES IN DEVELOPMENT-INDUCED DISPLACEMENT OF THE  
INDIGENOUS PEOPLE: A LOOK INTO VILLAGIZATION PROGRAM IN ANYWAA  
ZONE, GAMBELLA PEOPLES' NATIONAL REGIONAL STATE**

**BY: CHAM OCHAN ODOL**

**Advisor: Prof. V.D Kaushik**

**A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF GOVERNANCE AND  
DEVELOPMENT STUDIES IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT FOR THE  
REQUIREMENTS FOR MASTER OF ARTS IN GOVERNANCE AND  
DEVELOPMENT STUDIES**

**May, 2015**

**Jimma University**

**JIMMA UNIVERSITY**  
**COLLEGE OF LAW AND GOVERNANCE**  
**DEPARTMENT OF GOVERNANCE AND DEVELOPMENT STUDIES**



**HUMAN RIGHTS ISSUES IN DEVELOPMENT-INDUCED DISPLACEMENT OF THE  
INDIGENOUS PEOPLE: A LOOK INTO VILLAGIZATION PROGRAM IN ANYWAA  
ZONE, GAMBELLA PEOPLES' NATIONAL REGIONAL STATE**

**BY: CHAM OCHAN ODOL**

**Advisor: Prof. V.D Kaushik**

**A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF GOVERNANCE AND  
DEVELOPMENT STUDIES IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT FOR THE  
REQUIREMENTS FOR MASTER OF ARTS IN GOVERNANCE AND  
DEVELOPMENT STUDIES**

**May, 2015**

**Jimma University**

**ASSURANCE OF PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR**

The undersigned agrees to accept responsibility for the scientific ethical and technical conduct of the research project and for provision of required progress reports as per terms and conditions of the College of law and governance in effect at the time of grant is forwarded as the result of this application.

Name of the student: \_\_\_\_\_

Date. \_\_\_\_\_ Signature \_\_\_\_\_

**APPROVAL OF THE FIRST ADVISOR AND THESIS EXAMINERS**

Name of the advisor: \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_ Sigiture \_\_\_\_\_

Name of the external examiner \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_ Sigiture \_\_\_\_\_

Name of the internal examiner \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_ Sigiture \_\_\_\_\_

## **DEDICATION**

I dedicate my research work to my two lovely little children: my wonderful daughter and son Neta Cham Ochan and Modera Cham Ochan for being there for me throughout the entire period of my study and research. Both of you have been my best cheerleaders. You will always continue to be the nucleus in my family! I dearly love you both!

## **Acknowledgements**

First and foremost, I would like to sincerely thank my advisor, Professor V.D Kaushik. It is doubtful that this thesis would have been completed soundly without his tireless exertion throughout the hard research work and the lengthy time the research required. I didn't have to wish for a better thesis advisor!

My earnest thanks also go to Rev. Niles Reimers and his wife Winifred Reimers for funding my studies and for their prayers, encouragement and best wishes during my two year's hard times and tiresome works that the study required.

My cousins Alfred Omot Agada and Dingur Ojulu Omot helped me a lot whenever I needed extra financial assistance, especially for house rent and food when I was left with a little money towards the end of my study. I am highly indebted to them! Also, a special tribute is owed to my cousins Adhiero Odhieng Omot and Simon Odhieng Omot for buying me a laptop computer that made my study easier. I am as well indebted to them for other supports they gave me. I am deeply grateful to my family members, my wives: Abejal Okich Ojulu and Ajulu Ogula Akan, for the various special supports and encouragement they offered me throughout the time I spent in the university, and especially during my research period. The two also tirelessly represented me in taking care of my two little children.

Luckily, I have had the help of dedicated classmates, friends back in Gambella, and professionals who have helped me complete my thesis work at last, and to whom I would like to express my appreciation.

I am also grateful to the political authorities: concerned Anywaa zone officials, village leaders, and district leaders, for their collaboration and cooperation during the research on this politically sensitive topic.

Certainly, I am also thankful to all the respondent households who participated in this study. I was really moved by their courage and hospitality. Finally, I would like to thank my translator who helped me in Abari-meti for his incredible work of translating to the few Majang/Majanger ethnic group households who were part of this research's target people.

## **Abstract**

The government's effort to improve the lives of the rural population in Gambella Peoples' Regional State (GPNRS) as whole and Anywaa zone in particular has stirred up the need for clustering the rural populations, leading to the villagization or resettlement program in most parts of the Regional State. While the villagization program seems sustainable on account of the government's perceived improvement of the livelihoods of the displaced populations through creation of access to basic socio-economic infrastructure for those people who were living scattered in different locations and along the riverside which are prone to flood hazards, and those who practiced cut and burn shifting cultivation, and ultimately to enable them be food secured and to bring socio-economic and cultural transformation of the people, the genuine sustainability it has is, in many cases, doubtful since it can impose negative effects on the resettled people. According to the regional villagization action plan, 45,000 rural households have been displaced in the whole GPNRS. Now the question is to what extent the villagization program has affected the human rights and livelihoods of the displaced populations. This thesis can be seen as a contribution to the various ongoing researches in Gambella and other parts of Ethiopia as well as all over the world that tries to answer this question.

In general, those resettled end up with their human rights getting violated and pauperized, at least in part, after resettlement. This particular research applied the Impoverishment Risks and Reconstruction (IRR) model of Michael Cernea to identify the extent to which the involuntarily resettled indigenous people in Anywaa zone have been pauperized. This is scrutinized in the light of human rights throughout the resettlement process. Because of time limitations, the researcher chose to concentrate only on five out of eight impoverishment risks (e.g. landlessness, joblessness, food insecurity, loss of access to common property and loss of access to public services).

In this research, nine villagization or resettlement sites have been investigated in Anywaa zone: Abol-Kiir, Nyikwo, and Kobon villages in Gambella district; Chobo-Kiir, Pokedi and Abari-Meti in Abobo district; and Gog-dipach, Thatha and Pochalla in Gog district. Both questionnaires and in-depth interviews have been carried out to scrutinize this topic.

As a result, this research reveals that all investigated human rights issues and risks that the resettlers faced were present in all of the nine resettlement villages. Therefore, these results reveal that the villagization program in Anywaa zone has led to a number of human rights violations and has not been truly sustainable due to its negative effects on the livelihoods of the resettled populations. So, in order to overcome human rights violation and also pauperization of the displaced people in the future, it is crucial to enforce existing resettlement policies and enhance participatory mechanisms since the resettled households lack any influence concerning their own resettlement.

## **List of Abbreviations and Acronyms**

Anywaa: The local name for Anyuak or Anuak

CESCR: Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights

CAT: UN Committee Against Torture

CDD: Community-Driven Development

CSA: Central Statistical Agency of Ethiopia

Das: Development agents

Dha-Anywaa: Anyuak language

EPRDF: Ethiopian People's Revolutionary Democratic Front

FPIC: Free, Prior and Informed Consent

GPDUP: Gambella People Democratic Unity Party

GPDF: Gambella People Democratic Front.

GPDC: Gambella People Democratic Congress

GPLM: Gambella People's Liberation Movement

GPNRS: Gambella Peoples' National Regional State

ICCPR: International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights

ICESCR: International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights

IDPs: Internally Displaced Persons

ILO: International Labor Organization

IRR: Impoverishment Risks and Reconstruction model

NGOs: Non Governmental Organizations

SNNPRS: Southern Nations, Nationalities, and Peoples' Regional State

SPLA: Sudanese People's Liberation Army

SPSS: Statistical Package for Social Scientists

UN: United Nations

UN-EUE: United Nations Emergencies Unit for Ethiopia

UNOCHA: United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs

USAID: United States Agency for International Development



Assurance of principal investigator and examiners-----	I
Dedication-----	II
Acknowledgements-----	III
Abstract-----	IV
List of abbreviations and Acronyms-----	V-VI

Table of contents

Chapter one

1. Introduction-----	1
1.1 Background of the Study-----	2
1.2 Statement of the problem-----	5
1.3 Significance of the study-----	7
1.4 Objectives of the study-----	7
1.4.1 General objectives-----	7
1.4.2 Specific objectives-----	7

Chapter two

Literature Review

2. Development-induced displacement-----	9
2.1 Development-induced displacement and resettlement: An ethical issue-----	10
2.1.1The public-interest-----	10
2.1.2 Self-determination-----	10
2.1.3 Egalitarianism-----	10
2.2 Risks and development-induced displacement-----	11
2.3 Theoretical models of Resettlement-----	11
2.3.1 Landlessness-----	12
2.3.2 Joblessness-----	12
2.3.3 Homelessness-----	13
2.3.4 Marginalization-----	13
2.3.5 Food insecurity-----	13

2.3.6 Increased mortality and morbidity-----	13
2.3.7 Loss of access to common property-----	14
2.3.8 Social disintegration-----	14
2.4 Causes of impoverishment-----	15
2.5 Development-induced displacement and sustainability-----	17
2.5.1. Minimize or avoid-----	17
2.5.2. Restore or improve livelihoods-----	17
2.5.3. Move people in groups-----	17
2.5.4. Share benefits and allocate resources-----	17
2.5.5. Promote participation-----	17
2.5.6. Protect indigenous people-----	18
2.5.7. Rebuild communities-----	18
2.5.8. Consider hosts' needs-----	18
2.6. Free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) -----	19
2.7. The Ethiopian legal system-----	20
2.8. International Human Rights Law, Forced Evictions, and Indigenous Peoples' Rights-----	23
2.8.1. International Human Rights Law-----	23
2.8.2. International human rights law and forced Evictions-----	23
2.8.3. The Rights of the Indigenous people-----	25
Chapter Three: Research methodology	
3.1. Study area and period-----	29
3.1.1. Conflicts and their major causes in Gambella Region-----	30
3.2. Study design-----	33
3.3. Sample Size and sampling technique-----	34
3.4. Data collection procedure-----	34

3.4.1. Primary Sources-----	34
3.4.2. Secondary Sources-----	35
3.4.3. Research instruments-----	35
3.5. Limitations of the study-----	35
3.6 Operational definitions-----	36
3.7. Data Analysis Procedure-----	37
3.8. Data quality management-----	37
3.9. Ethical consideration-----	38
Chapter Four: Results and Discussion	
4.1. General backgrounds of the respondent households-----	39
4.2. Resettlement period, information and how resettlers view it-----	41
4.3. The resettlement process: participation, compensation and opinions-----	44
4.4. Description of the villagization program by the resettlers-----	47
4.5. The issue of Landlessness-----	49
4.5.1. Land registration-----	54
4.6. Joblessness in the resettlement villages-----	55
4.7. The issue of food insecurity-----	58
4.8. Loss of access to common property-----	63
4.9. Loss of access to public services-----	67
4.10. Suppression of Dissent-----	76
Chapter Five: Conclusion and Recommendations	
5.1. Conclusion-----	80
5.2. Recommendations-----	82
References-----	85
Appendices-----	91-104

## **Chapter One**

### **1. Introduction**

This thesis concentrates upon human rights issues in development-induced displacement- seen in light of various risks that resettlement and its processes carry. It particularly looks into the villagization program in Gambella Regional State's Anywaa zone. The targets are the resettled households in the nine resettlement villages who got displaced from their original places to new villages. The research findings has exhibited that villagization program is a critical issue which require a keen attention if it has to be free, successful and sustainable. This is because many resettled households live in adverse situation after villagization. Poverty and vulnerability to various problems can have negative effects on the livelihoods of the resettled population. It is, therefore, crucial to offer these disadvantaged households the promised development services that can appease the negative resettlement problems they are exposed to.

Though it can help in various ways, the research intends to fill the existing gap in the research literature on villagization and resettlement program in Ethiopia in two ways: it will furnish insight and understanding into the processes and quality of the villagization program, as it intends to develop a more profound and both quantitative and qualitative understanding of the program's perceived quality. Secondly it will analyze human rights issues in the light of resettlement risks such as, loss of access to public services, loss of access to common property, landlessness, joblessness, food insecurity and to some extent, social disintegration and health issues. Human rights issues and social justice elements in the villagization process are also succinctly investigated in a way that can help the readers grasp something of importance regarding the villagization program in the region.

This thesis is structured as follows. Chapter one starts with background of study which provides a theoretical framework with a general introduction about the costs of villagization or resettlement program, a brief description of development-induced displacement, its resultant hazard or risks and the fundamental or basic causes of these risks or hazards. Then follows the statement of the problem in which the study topic is problematized and more information about Ethiopia at large and Gambella in particular, including few of its historical facts regarding past and current villagization program, demography, history and economy are outlined. Significance

of the study in which the potential benefits of the study are outlined, and objectives of the study which deals with the general and specific objectives of the study, follow the statement of the problem. Chapter two describes the theoretical frameworks of various approaches to development-induced displacements or related literatures reviewed about the research topic. It is followed by chapter three which is about the research methodology. The research methodology deals with the study area and period, study design, sample size and sampling technique, data collection procedure, research instruments, data analysis procedure, data quality management, ethical considerations, operational definitions, and limitations of the study. The fourth chapter is about results and discussions. It is here that various findings of the whole thesis rest. The fifth chapter deals with the research conclusions and recommendations that were made as per the research finding. As usual, appendices as well as references are at the end.

### **1.1. Background of the Study**

For various reasons such as the need for land and social wellbeing, development projects result in the displacement of people from their land (Stanley, 2004). These people are forced to move for the goal of economic development and various other perceived benefits. This event is commonly known as development-induced displacement (Dao, 2010). Compulsorily displacing people out of their land is not merely about relocating people physically; it has the possibility of causing problems on the lives of the people being relocated. Such problems include demolishing of economic, cultural and social life which leads into pauperization of both the present and the future generations (Maldonado, 2012). Throughout the globe, forced displacement for development purpose takes place at an enormous scale. It results in removing approximately 10 million people every year (Bisht, 2009). Urban infrastructure, transportation (such as canals and roads), forest and park reserves, population redistribution schemes, agricultural expansion, energy (such as power plants, oil extraction and exploration, mining and pipelines) and water supply (such as dams, irrigation and reservoirs) are the major causes of development-induced displacement (Robinson, 2003).

Development-induced displacement increases the vulnerability of people for certain risks. Landlessness, joblessness, homelessness, marginalization, food insecurity, increased mortality and morbidity, loss of access to common property and social disintegration are examples of such risks (Cernea, 2000).

Ethiopia has a long history of brutally displacing rural populations through resettlement and so-called villagization programs during the former Derg regime and also under the current government of the Ethiopian People's Revolutionary Democratic Front (EPRDF). In many cases, the former and the present Ethiopian governments carry out their resettlement or the so-called villagization program with an intention of providing its distant and isolated populations with better services and socio-economic infrastructure, or enhance food and water allotment. However, in most cases, the programs failed the populations that they were supposed to help (Human Rights Watch/Africa, Evil Days 1991).

Displacement in the past has occurred primarily in two ways: one is resettlement from the highlands to the lowlands; the other is carried out through villagization, explained as the clustering of agro-pastoral and/or shifting cultivator populations into more permanent, sedentary settlements. Past villagization programs were copious with problems: forced displacements of populations accompanied by serious human rights violations in which dissenting opinions were hushed by fear of retribution. A leading scholar on villagization wrote in 1991 about the Derg era programs:

*The verdict on villagization was not favorable. Thousands of people fled to avoid villagization; others died or lived in deplorable conditions after being forcibly resettled.... There were indications that in the short term, villagization may have further impoverished an already poor peasantry. The services that were supposed to be delivered in new villages, such as water, electricity, health care clinics, schools, transportation, and agricultural extension services, were not being provided because the Government lacked the necessary resources.... Denied immediate access to their fields, the peasants were also prevented from guarding their crops from birds and other wild animals (Mulatu, 1991).*

The history of villagization in Ethiopia is a lengthy one with dramatic impacts on rural populations and was a significant ingredient of the former regime's socialist agricultural collectivization policies. Grouping scattered farming communities into small villages of several hundred households each has been the objective of villagization.

Villagization of the rural Anywaa, also called Anyuak/Anuak, began in 1986 with the new villages being described as more similar to forced labor camps (Genocide Watch, 2004). Villagized and resettled Anywaa people, along with many other ethnic groups who were

relocated from the highland areas of the country, were compelled to labor involuntarily on the new government owned farms, clearing forests, or building infrastructures. Those who resisted were beaten, detained and intimidated by the government security forces. As a result, many of the dissidents fled into Southern Sudan- the then Sudan. The Anuak were prevented from moving freely outside their villages. They were denied access to the Baro River (locally called Openo) for fishing activities—a crucial part of Anuak livelihoods and identity. The authorities often beat those who were caught fishing (Steingraber, 1987).

The opposition to the Derg's resettlement and villagization policies resulted in the formation of the Gambella People's Liberation Movement (GPLM). The GPLM was founded in 1987 in opposition to the policies of both the Derg government and the Sudanese People's Liberation Army (SPLA) who were active in Gambella at that time. The GPLM engaged in armed struggle against both the Derg regime and the South Sudanese People's Liberation Army (SPLA). The Derg and the GPLM committed human rights abuses as the Ethiopian government targeted the GPLM and rural populations accused of supporting the GPLM, while the GPLM attacked individuals perceived to be linked to the government (Steingraber, 1987). In collaboration with the current Ethiopian government-the EPRDF, the GPLM ruled Gambella regional state from 1991 to 1998 (Human Rights Watch, 2005). Sporadic, isolated, and disorganized attempts at forced displacement have occurred since that time, with one effort in November, 2008 involving the forced displacement of Gambellans from Lare and Puldeng villages to a new area. During this, the villagers who opposed the displacement resisted. This led to a reaction from the police forces that reportedly killed livestock and burnt homes. In addition to killing livestock and burning houses, the same police forces also killed nine people and wounded 23 others (Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre, 2011).

Since the livelihoods and food security in Gambella are unsteady, policy changes are going to affect the survival of hundreds of thousands of people. According to the government, renewed villagization policy in Gambella is intended to improve socio-economic infrastructure (Gambella Peoples' National Regional State Villagization Program Action Plan (2003 EFY: p.1)). This intention, however, is not trustworthy according to the local population who fear that the government is using this villagization program as an apparatus to confiscate their lands for commercial agriculture and natural resource extraction.

This research looked into the vulnerability of the displaced and resettled communities in Anywaa zone to the resettlement risks in light of their resultant human rights issues that came with the resettlement and its process. The central question is:

*What is the impact of villagization program on the human rights of the resettled communities in Anywaa zone and to what extent are involuntarily resettled communities vulnerable to human rights violations?*

*How can the process of resettlement in Anywaa zone be understood and described? That is:*

- To what extent have free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) provisions been complied with?
- How has the relocated community been compensated?
- To what degree do the actual FPIC and compensation as delineated by the relocation program and the country's constitution differ?
- To what extent the displaced villagers of Anywaa zone are vulnerable to human rights violations?

In order to answer the questions above, various components of relocation process such as the degree of participation in decision making about the villagization and compensation as well as related human rights violation issues, were profoundly investigated. The relocation or resettlement process was also compared with the resettlement program in order to analyze where improvements (if necessary) need to be made.

## **1.2. Statement of the research problem**

With the history of brutality and serious human rights violations attached to villagization program under the former Ethiopian regime, and under the current regime as was the case in 2008 in Lare area and Puldeng village in Gambella region, there is a strong reason that the process and impact of current villagization program on the human rights and livelihood of the resettlers in this same region, particularly in Anywaa zone, needs to be seriously looked into. One of the key criteria for measuring the success and wellbeing of the current villagization program should be the improved or at least the restored status of the resettled people and their families, and when the resettlement was carried out on just and volunteer basis. Being forcibly ousted from one's land and habitat carries with it the risks of becoming poorer and vulnerable to



many other social and health problems such as landlessness, joblessness, homelessness, marginalization, food insecurity, increased morbidity and mortality, loss of access to common properties (including forests and rivers), social disintegration, loss of access to public services (including health facilities, transportation, and electricity), loss of schooling for school-age children, and loss of civil rights or abuse of human rights such as loss of personal property without fair compensation, or violence from security forces or risk of communal violence in resettlement sites. This happens because a significant portion of people displaced do not receive compensation for their lost assets, and effective assistance that can allow them to re-establish themselves productively. It is on the basis of these problems that the study sought to analyze the impact of this relocation and resettlement program on the livelihoods and rights of the affected people in the nine selected resettlement villages in Anywaa zone.

Another important point is the ethical controversy associated with development projects and consequent involuntary resettlement. Development as an aim or aspiration of public policy should be oriented towards the increased well-being of the population. One justification for the implementation of development projects and forcible removal of people from their native lands is the argument that the project will lead to more efficient use of land and thus generate more income than before for the affected society.

Human rights considerations of people who are displaced should be looked into from two main aspects. The first is identification of key rights of the displaced, especially in the overall situation of planning and implementation of development projects. The provisions of the Declaration on the Right to Development adopted in 1986 by the United Nations General Assembly should be treated as a point of reference in considering the following issues. Firstly, self-determination of indigenous people and the right to maintain their own model of life and economy are basic principles that determine the intact functioning of indigenous people in their present domain or territory. The right to land and access to common resources, the right to cultural identity, the right to environmental protection and to more suitable forms of development, should be included among the other important rights in the context of people displaced or affected by development projects.

Secondly, attention should be paid to the protection of displaced and resettled people within public international law documents. The rights known as the third generation of human rights (such as rights to participate or partake in cultural heritage, rights to natural resources, rights to intergenerational equity and sustainability, rights to self-determination, right to economic and social development, and rights to healthy environment, among others) have to play a positive role by pointing out the need to take into account the situation of vulnerable communities. However, there is only a very limited possibility of implementing these principles in full, together with control of negative practices, in countries characterized by low standards of respect for human rights. Finally, problems of development-induced displaced population also play a limited role in the binding and non-binding documents adopted so far in relation to protection and support for internally displaced persons (IDPs). The international organizations and agencies which carry out these policies still pay little attention to this problem.

### **1.3 Significance of the study**

This research may help the Ethiopian government towards drawing up a new relocation and resettlement policy or modify the one it has for the wellbeing of the displaced.

It is hoped that the lessons learnt from this study may also be utilized by any other government organization and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) that carry out such relocation and resettlement programs and projects, to execute them in such a manner that will reduce the negative effects on the rights of those affected.

The research may supply supplemental understanding and contribute to the existing knowledge on the subject matter of development-induced displacement as well as human rights issues attached to it and will also provide areas for further research on the topic.

### **1.4 Objectives of the study**

#### **1.4.1. General Objectives**

The general objective of this research is to examine the impact of villagization program on the human rights of the resettled communities in Anywaa zone and the extent to which these resettled communities were vulnerable to human rights violations.

#### **1.4.2. Specific Objectives**

1. To explore the extent to which free, prior and informed consent have been complied with in the government relocation or villagization program.

2. To find out a clue about how the relocated community got compensated and how just the villagization process was in terms of treating the resettlers' dissent and community participation in decision making process regarding their own resettlement.
3. To assess the degree to which the actual FPIC and compensation as delineated by the relocation program or the country's constitution differ.
4. To determine the effects of the relocation program on the livelihood of the resettlers with specific focus on human rights issues which is seen in relation with risks such as landlessness, joblessness, food insecurity, loss of access to common property and loss of access to public services.

## Chapter Two

### Literature Review

#### 2. *Development-induced displacement*

During the 1950s and 1960s, modernization theory dominated the development discourse. According to this theory, development was perceived as the transformation of a traditional society into a complex and modern ones such as the ones in the Western world. Development projects which were capital-intensive were the key to success or the way to achieve goals. Issues like displacement were seen as necessary evils in order to develop or, even as a good deed, since it will make people more delicate to change. However, the development ideal has changed. For this reason, the focus is nowadays on things like social justice, the human rights, environmental safety or protection and reduction of destitution. This is because of the belief that development brings both benefits as well as costs such as development-induced displacements (Robinson, 2003).

Development-induced displacement is a worldwide issue that has already displaced millions of people. For example, in the early part of 1990s, the construction of 300 high dams, that is, higher than 15 meters has brought about the displacement of 4 million people. This also gives an indication of the high numbers of displaced people today, because processes such as urbanization, industrialization and electrification are continuous. It is as well apparent that as long as development projects are beneficial for many people, often the difficulties brought about by these development projects have to be paid by the most marginalized and poorest of society (Dao, 2010).

During 1951-1990 in India, for example, about 2 per cent of the total population has been displaced. While 40 per cent of the displaced were tribal, they only constituted 8 per cent of the total population (Robinson, 2003). Besides displacement by dams, the term development-induced displacement also consists out of other development activities, including urban infrastructure, transportation (canals, roads etc.), forest and park reserves, population redistribution schemes, agricultural expansion, energy (power plants, oil extraction and exploration, mining, pipelines) and water supply (including dams, irrigation and reservoirs) (Courtland Robinson, W, 2003).

## **2.1. Development-induced displacement and resettlement: An ethical issue**

Development-induced displacement raises ethical questions. When is development-induced displacement, for example, vindicated and what is indebted to the displaced? Penz (1997:37-43 and 2002:4-5) categorized the ethical viewpoints concerning development-induced displacement into three perspectives: the public interest, self-determination and egalitarianism perspectives.

**2.1.1. The public-interest.** This perspective assumes that development-induced displacement is justified when the project has net benefits for the population as a whole. Thus, based on a cost-benefit analysis, people with this perspective justify a project when the benefits of the project exceed the costs (for example, displacement and impoverishment). A minority, for example can be worse off. However, if the entire population, that is the public interest, earns or profits more than it loses, than the development project will be approved. Queries can however be raised concerning the term 'public interests' mentioned above. Is this term solely confined to the elite within a society or are also the interests of the poor included?

**2.1.2. Self-determination.** This perspective can be divided into two forms. These are the libertarian and the communitarian forms. The former mainly stresses on individual self-determination; it views displacement as immoral due to the violation of people's freedom and the right to property. Thus, people should not be forcibly displaced since it takes away their freedom and makes them loss their properties. The latter emphasizes on the importance of self-determination of whole communities, which is violated when communities are forcibly displaced. The 'self-determination' perspective also has some drawbacks since it disregards the public interests. The self-determination perspective can also cause a project to be too costly and lead to an unequal distribution of benefits when the displaced demand compensation that is way more than what is necessary in order to sustain (or even improve) their lives.

**2.1.3. Egalitarianism.** This perspective justifies a project when it reduces inequality and poverty. In order to do this, a project should mainly benefit the poor while the burdens should be carried by the better off. Concerns, however, arise with regard to horizontal inequality. It could, for example, be the case that some disadvantaged groups benefit from a project while other disadvantaged groups suffer due to displacement.

As it is evident from the view point of egalitarianism, displacement caused by development or commonly development-induced displacement is a troublesome ethical issue in which individuals' rights and self-determination stand in tension with distributive concerns and the public interest (Stanley, 2004). Penz (1997:37-43 and 2002:4-5), however, mentions that development-induced displacement can be justified when certain conditions are met. These conditions include negotiated resettlement instead of forceful or compelling displacement, utilizing benefits to reduce inequality and poverty, reduction or minimization of the amount of re-settlers and repayment for all the losses of the people displaced. These requirements are however seldom met.

## **2.2. Risks and development-induced displacement**

Development-induced displacement has consequences on the displaced population. These consequences are, however, very much dependent on how resettlement is negotiated, planned and executed. Positive resettlement case studies are however rare (Stanley, 2004). Most people that are displaced are left without strategies to cope with their new circumstances. The fact that only 1/3 of the 60 million people that have been displaced in India between 1947 and 2004 were resettled on a planned fashion, is one confirmation for the statement mentioned above. Displacement has the capability to make people poor and to eventually destroy their lives (Maldonado, 2012).

## **2.3. Theoretical Models of Resettlement**

Building upon various approaches such as the Chambers Participatory Development Model called *Sustainable Rural livelihoods: practical concepts for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century* (Chambers, 1991) that predominantly dealt with the processes of voluntary resettlement, Scudder and Colson, 1996 suggested a four-stage model of how people and socio-cultural systems respond to resettlement. The stages include; recruitment, transition, potential development and handing over or incorporation. In the recruitment stage, without informing those to be displaced, policy-makers and/or developers formulated development and resettlement plans. During the transition stage, the affected people learnt about their future displacement, which according to Jason (2003) intensified the level of stress experienced. Potential development only begun after physical relocation had occurred and the displaced began the process of rebuilding their economy and

their social networks. The last stage which is called handing over or incorporation indicated the handing over of the local production systems and community leadership to a second generation of residents that identified with and felt at home in the community. Once this stage was achieved, resettlement was thought to be a success (Jason, 2003).

The Scudder–Colson model focused on the different behavioral tendencies common to each of the stages through which resettlers passed and was devised to illustrate the stages of settlement based on free will. However, when this model, latter in the 1980s and 1990s, was applied to some cases of involuntary resettlement, evidences from involuntary resettlement schemes that failed to pass through all the four stages suggested that a new model was required to explain the consequences of involuntary relocation especially destitution or impoverishment which resulted from forced resettlement schemes.

Michael Cernea, a sociologist, who has researched development-induced displacement and resettlement for the World Bank, has created another model called Impoverishment Risks and Reconstruction (IRR) model which attempts to identify the different impoverishment risks that are intrinsic to displacement (Stanley, 2004). In *Risks, Safeguards, and Reconstruction: A Model for Population Displacement*, Cernea identified the following eight impoverishment risks: the risk of landlessness, the risk of joblessness, the risk of homelessness, the risk of marginalization, the risk of food insecurity, the risk of increased mortality and morbidity, the risk of loss of access to common property, and the risk of social disintegration (Cernea 2000).

**2.3.1. Landlessness:** Land is an important foundation for people's livelihoods, productive systems and commercial activities. Losing land due to displacement may severely impact these aspects. Both man-made and natural capital will be lost.

**2.3.2 Joblessness:** When displacement occurs, there is a high risk of joblessness for people employed in agriculture, enterprises and services. In urban areas, people may lose their jobs in services and industry. In rural areas, landless employees lose their jobs on land of others (that are sharecropped or leased) and assets that could be used during common property regimes. Finally, self-employed producers lose their business (including customers). Joblessness is often still visible for a long duration after relocation. In the beginning of resettlement however, the issue of joblessness might not yet be visible due to temporary employment opportunities in project-related jobs. However, these opportunities are often short-lived. For example, during the

construction phase of dam projects resettled people may get the opportunity to get employed. However, employment opportunities diminish when the project nears its end.

**2.3.3 Homelessness:** Displacement can lead to reduced housing standards or even homelessness. Loss of a household home or the cultural space of a group can lead to status deprivation. Housing standards can worsen when compensation is based on the market value instead of the replacement value. A temporary reduction of housing standards can occur when displaced people do not have the capability to quickly pay for the costs of adequate housing, thus forcing them to live in temporary shelters that often have the same conditions as refugee camps. Case studies have shown that this 'temporality' may be extended to very long time periods. A study of the Kukadi-Krishna irrigation subprojects in India, for example, has shown that 59% of the displaced people had to live up to 10-15 years in semi permanent or temporary houses after their resettlement.

**2.3.4 Marginalization:** Marginalization takes place when people lose their economic power and get caught in a spiral of downward mobility. Skills, obtained before resettlement might not be useful for the new location, thus severely impacting the applicability of acquired human capital. Economic deprivation and marginalization can already begin before displacement has taken place due to the decrease in investments in services and infrastructure in areas which were chosen for development projects. Not only economic marginalization can occur but also psychological and social marginalization. This is for example the case when the social status of people is deprived. People can lose their confidence in themselves and the society as a whole. A feeling of injustice may arise and vulnerability may be deepened. Their self-image may be negatively affected due to their victimization and the coerciveness of displacement. The host community may also perceive them as a socially degraded people. They can be seen as strangers and denied entitlements and opportunities.

**2.3.5 Food insecurity:** Inadequate resettlement stimulates the risk of temporary or chronic undernourishment. This can be caused by reduced incomes and food crop availability after relocation. Food production capacity needs to be rebuilt in the new area which might take many years. In the meanwhile, risks of undernourishment and hunger increase. Joblessness and landlessness need to be dealt with in order to reduce this risk.

**2.3.6 Increased mortality and morbidity:** Health levels can be severely deprived due to displacement. This can for example be caused by, psychological trauma, social stress, relocation-



related illnesses (including schistosomiasis, malaria etc.), improvised sewage systems and unsafe water supply that increases vulnerability to illnesses such as dysentery, chronic diarrhea etc. The weakest segments of the relocated population (like infants, children and elderly) are most vulnerable for health deprivation. There is also a strong link with the risk 'homelessness' (or reduced housing standards) which can negatively impact health. Reservoirs can also lead to accidents (like drowning incidents) and act as a source of diseases. The health of people that were not displaced can also be seriously affected.

**2.3.7 Loss of access to common property:** Common property assets of communities (including water bodies, quarries, burial grounds, pastures, forests etc.) will be lost due to development-induced displacement, which negatively affects the livelihood and income levels of the assetless and landless poor. These people heavily depend on common property resources for generating income. A lack of protection of people's access to common property sources stimulates them to use common property resources of the host population (thus stimulating conflict) or protected areas.

**2.3.8 Social disintegration:** Involuntary resettlement destroys the social fabric of communities: it ruins patterns of interpersonal ties and social organization and fragments and disperses kinship groups and communities. It disrupts production systems (including consumer-producer relationships), local labor markets, local voluntary associations, self-organized mutual services and reciprocal help. Thus, involuntary displacement reduces social capital, worsening powerlessness, vulnerability, dependency and poverty. It is proven to be very difficult to rebuild social networks. Social disintegration is especially the case when families are dispersed separately instead as groups. It can also diminish people's cultural identity due to the abandonment of spatial contexts and/or symbolic markers such as graves, shrines, etc (Cernea, 2000; Robinson, 2003).

It has to be mentioned that these eight risks are not all-inclusive. Also other risks such as human rights violations, loss of access to public services (including access to health, education, water, electricity) and failure to implement a program, have also been identified as possible risks. The risk 'loss of access to public services', which is one of the risks that will be investigated in this research, can greatly accelerate impoverishment. Of particular importance, delayed or lost educational opportunities can, for example, lead to severe long-term impoverishment. The risk

'human rights violations', accentuates that displacement without appropriate recompense is, by itself, a violation and desecration of human rights. In addition to the violation of economic and social rights, displacement can also lead to the violation of political and civil rights such as the negation of the rights of a citizen (such as the right to vote) also known as disenfranchisement, degrading treatment or punishment, arbitrary arrest, the deprivation of political voice, among others (Courtland Robinson, W. (2003); Wilmsen, etal 2010)

A common issue is the unequal vulnerability of different segments within the displaced community for the above mentioned risks (Cernea, 2000). Women, for example, are frequently more adversely affected by development-induced displacement than men. This is for example the case when resettlement compensation is only given to the heads of the households (which are often men). Compensation criteria can also be based on the age of the person to receive compensation. Women are often more adversely affected by development-induced displacement due to their high dependency on common property resources for generating income. Limited inclusion of women in resettlement planning further increases their vulnerability to risks. Children are another example of a vulnerable group since displacement often disrupts children from going to school. A lack of schooling can also be a long-term problem when a reduction of the resettled households' income and living standards pushes children into the labor market. Stanley 2004, in his book '*Development-induced displacement and resettlement*' argues that factors like the procedures of resettlement, the conditions of project and the area of resettlement, influence the unequal distribution of risks.

**2.4 Causes of impoverishment:** Development projects including, for example, dam construction can cause the above mentioned risks. This is the case in many developing countries in which there is still a lack of binding policies and laws to limit the risks and size of development-induced displacement and legal measures to protect the displaced people for largely paying the project costs. Existing resettlement policies can be insufficient in restoring the lives of the displaced (Maldonado, 2012). Compensation for example is often provided in order to compensate for the income loss, economic disruption and dispossession of displaced people (Cernea, 2003). Many case studies however have shown that the provided compensation is often not enough to restore the livelihoods of people (Cernea 2008). There are various underlying causes for this, including (Cernea, 2003): Undercounting of assets that should be compensated,

low valuation of assets, limited or no incorporation of non-market costs and income, difficulties with compensating for non-physical losses, compensation delays, corruption, inappropriate use of compensation by the recipient which makes him/her quickly cashless and assetless, and finally, appreciation of assets after determining the compensation that will be provided.

The over-reliance on compensation alone is also a frequently observed mistake in resettlement policies, since this ignores the cultural and social effects of displacement. Cash compensation alone is not enough to completely restore the livelihoods of the displaced (Maldonado, 2012).

Even when there are appropriate resettlement policies present in a country, there can still be impoverishment of displaced people due to the limited implementation of these policies. It can, for example, be the case that local authorities are not aware of the existing resettlement policies (Maldonado, 2012). The policy goals are often not clearly described which can lead to different interpretations, making implementation problematic. It can also happen that weakness within decision making and communication chains (due to coordination issues, limited capacity, work pressures, etc.) problematizes effective implementation. Finally, corruption can also limit the implementation of proper resettlement policies (De Wet, 2002).

Another issue concerns the limited participation of displaced people within the process of development-induced displacement. Many authors (including Cernea, 1997; WCD, 2000; De Wet, 2002; Price, 2009 and so forth) emphasize the importance of participation of the displaced community within the planning and implementation of development projects although this is often absent or limited (World Commission on Dams/WCD, 2000). People that are going to be displaced by development projects should have the right to participate since it will greatly affect their way of life and existence. Participation also has benefits including, greater resettlers satisfaction, fewer delays and conflicts, lower project costs, reduced need for institutional coordination (which is often a significant weakness in displacement programs) and increased long-term sustainability. An important part of participation concerns the provision of information about the project (including information about the need to resettle, people's options, entitlements, eligibility, appeal mechanisms, etc) (Cernea, 1997). Many case studies however have shown that this is often inadequate and incomplete (Robinson, 2003).

## **2.5. Development-induced displacement and sustainability**

It is evident from the forgoing discussion that displacing people could negatively affect the people and sometimes environment. Thus, despite the perceived benefits, the question is whether development projects that results in displacement of people from their original land are truly sustainable. To answer this question, it is important to be aware of the key concepts of sustainable development. Parlak (2007) outlined these concepts as follow:

(1) Just, inter-generational distributions (2) Human-centered development (3) Poverty reduction (4) People as 'able actors' and trust building (5) Social justice (6) Environmental protection (7) Combining ecology with economy during decision-making (8) Democracy (including governance and participation).

One important player is the World Bank (WB) which was the first development agency (engaged in constructing and funding projects which displace people) that established a policy on involuntary resettlement. Adopting this policy will also greatly improve the development project's sustainability (concerning displacement and resettlement). Although this policy has been upgraded numerous times, the key elements remain the same (Stanley, 2004), which include (Cernea, 1997):

**2.5.1. Minimize or avoid.** Involuntary displacement should be minimized or avoided as much as possible due to its impoverishing and disrupting impact.

**2.5.2. Restore or improve livelihoods.** The earning capacity and living standards of the displaced people should be improved or at least restored. An adequate resettlement plan should be incorporated within the project.

**2.5.3. Move people in groups.** Adaptation to the resettled area will become easier when people move in groups and when the distance between the original location and the new location is smaller.

**2.5.4. Share benefits and allocate resources.** The losses of displaced people should be fully compensated. The displaced people should also have a share of the project benefits and need to be supported during the transfer and transition period.

**2.5.5. Promote participation.** Not only the resettlers but also the host population should participate within resettlement planning. It is important to rely on the cultural and social institutions of these people when creating the reestablishment and transfer process.

**2.5.6. Protect indigenous people.** Groups of which resources are taken from for the project or who have informal customary land rights (including pastoralist, ethnic and tribal minorities etc.) should receive appropriate compensation. Thus, compensation should also be given to those who don't have legal land rights.

**2.5.7. Rebuild communities.** The new resettled community should be able to integrate with the socio-economic context of the area. Adequate services, infrastructure and settlement systems are crucial.

**2.5.8. Consider hosts' needs.** Not only the resettlers but also the host population needs to be assisted, since the increased population density due to resettlement can cause negative environmental and social effects.

Also many scholars have written recommendations for improving development projects' sustainability concerning displacement and resettlement. Price (2009), for example, argues that transnational advocacy (accelerated through social groups and NGOs) can be a crucial factor in stimulating better accountability mechanisms and policies concerning development-induced displacement. De Wet (2002) also calls for increasing public pressure and support for pressure groups and NGOs in order to improve resettlement planning.

Price (2009), just like many other scholars (e.g., Cernea, 1997; De Wet, 2002; Drydyk, 2007; McDonald-Wilmsen et al., 2010) also emphasizes the importance of participation. According to Price, participation is important in order to incorporate socio-cultural concerns within resettlement planning. Drydyk (2007) also mentions that participation is necessary in order to attain equitable outcomes. McDonald-Wilmsen et al. (2010) also speak of the importance of community-driven development (CDD) which creates capacity within communities by valuing and integrating their knowledge within the resettlement programme; it empowers communities.

Cernea (2000) also made many recommendations in order to improve resettlement planning. From the risks mentioned earlier, Cernea (2000) argued for risk reversal through appropriate financing and targeted strategies. These strategies include: land-based resettlement, reemployment, house reconstruction, social inclusion, improved health care, adequate nutrition, restoration of services and community assets, community rebuilding and the creation of networks. These compensation measures go beyond merely financial compensation. Cernea (1997) also mentioned major factors which make resettlement planning a success, including:

1. Political commitment, which should be expressed in law and policy, fair resource allocations, effective grievance procedures and implementation of norms.
2. Technical expertise in resettlement planning, reliable demographic assessments and an adequate social analysis.
3. Public participation with finding and implementing resettlement solutions.
4. Commensurate financing and correct cost assessments.

## **2.6. Free, prior and informed consent (FPIC)**

In this research, the term free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) has been used in order to analyze the degree of participation. FPIC started as a medical term, relating to the importance of informed consent of patients before any drug or medical treatment was given. Nowadays, the term is seen as a political right, and applicable for many different situations of indigenous communities. The word "free" relates to the absence of outside pressure and coercion. Thus people should be 'free' to say no to a project. The word 'prior' emphasizes the importance of sufficient time to engage in discussions and gather information (including translations) which should be completed before the project starts. Thus, constraints and time pressures should be absent during this process. The word 'informed' emphasizes that people should be fully aware of the project including all the different views and positions. Finally, the word 'consent' relates to a compelling and clear agreement, which takes the decision-making structures of the indigenous people into account. Full participation of decision-making institutions, representatives or authorized leaders is necessary in order to reach an agreement (as chosen by the indigenous people) (Global Forest Coalition, 2008). In sum, the term FPIC grants the indigenous people (who are often the ones that need to move due to development program) the right to participate in the decision-making process and to give consent (or disapproval) regarding activities that influence their traditional territories, lands and resources. This consent, which is based upon complete understanding of the issues which might arise due to these activities, should be given freely and before the activities have been authorized or implemented (MacKay, 2004).

In Ethiopia, the study of development-induced displacement in combination with human rights issues hasn't always been pronounced unless in the form of reports by human rights agencies such the Human Rights Watch, Oakland Institute, and probably few other international humanitarian agencies. Moreover, the researcher feels that the subject of development-induced

displacement, mostly uncombined with human rights issues, is dealt with more recently and the studies are small in number with most being academic or university students' study papers focusing in one way or another on urbanization.

Nebiyu (2000), for example, took on a study on 'The Impact of Development-induced Displacement' taking the case of Sheraton Addis Project, woreda 14, kebele 24 and 25. The project was executed in 1994 by displacing 718 households to Kotebe district, Wereda 28, Kebele 04 at the outer border of the city around CMC area. His finding showed that 99% of the displaced were satisfied with the relocation

Birhanu (2006) also carried out a study whose title is *'Impact of Urban Redevelopment on the livelihood of displaced people in Addis Ababa'* on the implementation of Casanchis local development plan. Here, major finding of the study shows that partial resettlement has disrupted the social network and neighborhood ties of the displaced. 2.5% of the relocated households were satisfied with the relocation project.

Abebe (2001) conducted another study entitled *'Urban Renewal in Addis Ababa: A Case Study of Sheraton Addis and Casanchis Projects'*. It revealed that development projects that were implemented by private developers are relatively better and effective than the ones implemented by the government. He infers that the implementation of urban renewal projects both by government and private developers are without proper institution, policy-planning, legal framework and participation of all concerned bodies; and finally suggests further studies on the socio-economic effect of the implementation of urban renewal programs.

## **2.7. The Ethiopian legal system**

All land in Ethiopia, according to the Ethiopian constitution, is state-owned. However, in practice one can observe that Ethiopia's land tenure system is a complex mix of traditional and modern systems of land tenure. As a result the nature of state-owned land has long been a divisive issue.

When the Derg overthrew Emperor Haile Selasie and came to power in 1974, it largely annulled existing customary land tenure systems and instituted communal or state ownership of land. Since Ethiopian Peoples' Revolutionary Democratic Front (EPRDF) took power in 1991, the

Ethiopian government has recertified state ownership of land on the ostensible grounds “that opening land markets would provide inroads for involuntary dispossession of land from poor and vulnerable peasants” (Tesfaye Teklu, 2005.p.6). From that time to the present, the EPRDF has taken several steps toward a more private land tenure system including permitting land to be rented and, more recently, the government’s long-term leasing out of large area of land to foreign investors.

The Ethiopian government has partially executed a formal land tenure system with significant donor support in four of Ethiopia’s nine regions (the Amhara, the SNNPR, the Oromiya, and the Tigray). Various land tenure systems have been undertaken in each of these regions as per the intricacies of the regional legislation. However, no formal system of land tenure is yet in place in the four regions where the resettlement or villagization program took place. Gambella has not yet passed regional legislation that would make possible the development of a formal land tenure system. International NGOs have been very active in helping with land registration processes under these land tenure systems to increase tenure security, with some attainments (USAID, 2014, p.1). In general terms, these processes have included granting leases or certificates of land holdings to farmers, residents, and other land users.

In Gambella, land is largely administered according to traditional systems. Boundaries are understood according to local customs and conflicts related to land are resolved in traditional forums. In its 2011 report, the Oakland Institute described it as follows:

*Everyone in the village knows the territory, and where the traditional demarcation is. The territory is respected as people fear the ancestral spirits.... [L]and according to the village is divided into agriculture, (shifting cultivation all over your own territory but not in another without consultation and permission), used for fishing (rivers and ponds), alluvial soil used for permanent agriculture, areas used for hunting (called ‘dwaar’ in Dha-Anywaa/Anyuak language), and some areas are used for protection (dense forest) during times of conflict. These areas are respected. Some areas have trees to be worshipped in that place.*

However, it appears that these traditional systems of land tenure in Gambella are not recognized, because in most cases those land parcels continue to be called “unused” or “underutilized.” This is in spite of there being a strong basis in the constitution for the recognition of customary rights. Article 40(5) of the Ethiopian constitution states: “Ethiopian pastoralists have the right to free



land for grazing and cultivation as well as the right not to be displaced from their own lands. The implementation shall be specified by law.” Article 40 (7) of the FDRE also states:

*Every Ethiopian shall have the full right to the immovable property he builds and to the permanent improvements he brings about on the land by his labor or capital. This right shall include to alienate, to bequeath, and, where the right of use expires, to remove his property, transfer his title or claim compensation for it. Particulars shall be determined by law (Constitution of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, No. 1/1995, art. 40(5) and (7).)*

Historically, Ethiopia has neglected pastoralist land rights and the system of communal land utilization that underpin these pastoral traditions (Hagmann, 2005). Therefore, the lack of a formal land tenure system greatly diminishes security of tenure for Gambella’s population and gives a more limited legal recourse for displacements and expropriations. Nevertheless, the constitution of Ethiopia and, to lesser degree, federal legislation provides protection from expropriation and the right to compensation. The Ethiopian constitution states:

*Ethiopian peasants have the right to obtain land without payment and the protection against eviction from their possession. The implementation of this provision shall be specified by law, (Constitution of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, No. 1/1995, art. 40(4).)*

It also decrees that without prejudice to the right to private property, the Government may expropriate private property for public purposes subject to payment in advance of compensation commensurate to the value of the property (Ibid., art. 40(8)).

Here, all persons who have been displaced or whose livelihoods have been adversely affected as a result of State programs have the right to commensurate monetary or alternative means of compensation, including relocation with adequate State assistance as mentioned in article 44(2) of the country’s constitution.

This constitutional framework is codified in the country’s federal legislation. “A Proclamation to Provide for the Expropriation of Land Holdings for Public Purposes and Payment of Compensation” outlines expropriation and compensation procedures (Proclamation No. 455/2005, Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia). According to this, compensation is to be equal in worth to the replacement cost of property on the land, any improvements (value of capital and labor) made to the land and 10 times the average annual income from the previous

five years. Critically, however, this legislation is only applicable to lands where the individuals have legal title. The researcher has observed that in Gambella region's Anywaa zone villages where villagization is taking place, none of the of the respondent households have legal title unless the registrations which are done by development agents (DAs) whenever they measure farmlands; and for those without legal title but having customary or other entitlements to land, there are no other expropriation or compensation procedures under Ethiopian law to implement the constitutional provisions.

## **2.8. International Human Rights Law, Forced Evictions, and Indigenous Peoples' Rights**

### **2.8.1. International Human Rights Law**

Ethiopia is a party to the key international human rights conventions including the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) which was adopted in December 16, 1966, and entered into force in March 23, 1976. Ethiopia ratified the ICCPR in the year 1993, the International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights (ICESCR) in the year 1993, and The African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights, also called the African [Banjul] Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights, adopted June 27, 1981, in the year 1998. The African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights entered into force on Oct. 21, 1986. All of these international treaties set out fundamental rights to which all persons are due, including rights to the security of the person; to be free from arbitrary arrest; to have access to a livelihood, food, and housing; to education; and to the highest obtainable standard of health.

Under international law, states have an obligation to examine grave human rights violations and to punish the perpetrators. The duty to try and punish those responsible for grave human rights violations has its legal basis in various treaties, including the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), article 2(2). Moreover, they have an obligation to make certain that victims of abuses have an effective remedy and that the persons claiming such a remedy shall have their rights determined by competent judicial, administrative, or legislative authorities as stipulated in the ICCPR, article 2(3). We can find 'Guidance on reparation to victims' in the 'UN Basic Principles and Guidelines on the Right to a Remedy and Reparation for Victims of Gross Violations of International Human Rights Law and Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law, G.A. Res. 60/147, U.N. Doc. A/RES/60/147 (December 16, 2005).' The Principles reaffirm that a state should provide adequate, effective, and prompt reparation to victims for acts or omissions constituting violations of international human rights norms.

### **2.8.2. International human rights law and forced Evictions**

The International human rights law protects the right to property. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which is broadly recognized as customary international law, states that “everyone has the right to own property alone as well as in association with others.” Moreover, it states that no one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his property (Universal Declaration of Human Rights, G.A. res. 217A (III), U.N. Doc A/810 at 71 (1948), art. 17). See, for example, Banjul Charter, article 14, which states: “The right to property shall be guaranteed. It may only be encroached upon in the interest of public need or in the general interest of the community and in accordance with the provisions of appropriate laws.” Nevertheless, governments are generally entitled to expropriate land for public purposes, if done, as noted below, according to law with public participation, due process, and adequate compensation.

Whether or not they are considered to be in ownership of the property in question, individuals are protected from human rights violations that may arise out of forced evictions. Here, ‘*Forced evictions*’ have been defined as “the permanent or temporary removal against their will of individuals, families and/or communities from the homes and/or land which they occupy, without the provision of, and access to, appropriate forms of legal or other protection” (Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (CESCR), General Comment No. 7 on the right to adequate house; forced evictions (1993), para. 3.). In its general comment on forced evictions, the UN Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights discussed the interrelationship between forced evictions and violations of other human rights, such as the right to the security of the person and the right to an adequate standard of living (Ibid., para. 4). The UN Committee Against Torture (CAT), which supervises or monitors state compliance with the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, has held on several occasions that forced evictions can amount to acts of cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment. In 2004, for example, the CAT expressed concern concerning the ill-treatment of Roma in Greece who were forcibly evicted or relocated by the authorities (Conclusions and Recommendations of the Committee against Torture regarding the fourth periodic report of Greece, UN Doc. CAT/C/CR/33/2 (10/12/2004), sec. 5(j), Annex 31.). It is noted that forced displacement can take place in connection with forced population transfers and in the name of development (CESCR, General Comment No. 7, paras. 1-7). The committee concluded that before an eviction occur, the authorities must explore all feasible alternatives in

consultation with affected groups, and that those evicted must receive adequate compensation for affected property. Forced evictions may only be carried out if they are in accordance with general human rights law (Ibid. paras. 11, 13, and 14).

Other UN bodies have made statements about forced evictions that highlight their impact on other human rights. For example, the UN Commission on Human Rights Resolution 1993/77 affirms that forced eviction constitutes a gross violation of human rights, particularly the right to adequate housing (UN Commission on Human Rights, Resolution 1993/77, para. 1). The UN Human Rights Fact Sheet No. 25 on Forced Evictions and Human Rights concentrates on treating forced evictions as a serious violation of human rights rather than as a side-effect of some broader issue (UN Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, Fact Sheet No.25, Forced Evictions and Human Rights, Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action (Part 1, para. 30)). Forced Evictions and Human Rights, Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action, was adopted by the World Conference on Human Rights in Vienna in June 23, 1993.

### **2.8.3. The Rights of the Indigenous people**

In particular case, the populations affected by the resettlement in Gambella include the Anyuak/Anuak (locally called Anywaa), the Nuer, the Majanger/Majang, and other groups that identify themselves as indigenous to the area.

While it has not adopted an official definition of “indigenous peoples,” the UN and its specialized agencies regard self-identification as a fundamental criterion for indigenous status. That is, there is no formal definition of indigenous people under international law. However, the Study of the problem of discrimination against indigenous populations, (known as the Martínez-Cobo Study, 1986), provided a widely accepted definition of indigenous peoples as:

*Having a historical continuity with pre-invasion and pre-colonial societies that developed on their territories, consider themselves distinct from other sectors of the societies now prevailing in those territories, or parts of them. They form at present non-dominant sectors of society and are determined to preserve, develop and transmit to future generations their ancestral territories, and their ethnic identity, as the basis of their continued existence as peoples, in accordance with their own cultural patterns, social institutions and legal systems.*

Indigenous peoples’ rights derive from the core international human rights instruments to which federal democratic republic of Ethiopia is party. For example, the UN Committee on Economic,

Social and Cultural Rights in General Comment No. 7 on Forced Evictions recognizes that indigenous peoples are often affected disproportionately by forced evictions. Furthermore, there are specific references to indigenous peoples in the Convention on the Rights of the Child and in the UN Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination's General Recommendation 23 on Indigenous Peoples. Many of the communications brought under article 27 of the ICCPR on the protection of minorities have been submitted by members of indigenous peoples (Nowak, 2005. P. 651).

The treaty provisions most applicable to indigenous populations are reflected in the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, which was adopted by the UN General Assembly in 2007 after many years of negotiation (Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, G.A. Res. 61/295, U.N. Doc. A/RES/47/1 (2007)). The declaration explains or interprets key rights, including those regarding lands and resources (See also International Labor Organization, Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention, 1989 (No. 169), art. 1(2)).

Then-UN Special Rapporteur on the condition of human rights and fundamental freedoms of indigenous peoples, Rodolfo Stavenhagen, stated in his February 2007 report that; "The Declaration of the Fundamental Rights of the Indigenous people must be a fundamental part of the discussion about future international standards relating to indigenous peoples, not only at the international level, but also in regional or specialized areas. Its adoption also gives a strong impetus to the clarification of emerging customary law concerning indigenous rights at international level, and should similarly energize the process of legislation reform and domestic court proceedings." This is also mentioned in United Nations, Report of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights and fundamental freedoms of indigenous people, Rodolfo Stavenhagen, UN Doc. A/HRC/4/32 (2007), sec. 79, annex 15, and also generally in United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues under the, 'Frequently Asked Questions: Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.' Note that Ethiopia did not take a position on this Declaration and was absent from the vote when the Declaration was passed at the UN General Assembly.

Indigenous land rights under international law are guided by contemporary understandings of cultural integrity and self-determination (Anaya, 1996: 104-107). The UN Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination in its general recommendation on indigenous peoples calls upon states to:

Recognize and protect the rights of indigenous peoples to own, develop, control and use their communal lands, territories and resources and, where they have been deprived of their lands and territories traditionally owned or otherwise inhabited or used without their free and informed consent, to take steps to return those lands and territories. Only when this is for factual reasons not possible, the right to restitution should be substituted by the right to just, fair and prompt compensation. Such compensation should as far as possible take the form of lands and territories (Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, General Recommendation 23 on Indigenous Peoples (Fifty-First Session, 1997) U.N. Doc. A/52/18, Annex V).

Ethiopia has been a party to the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination since 1976. The relationship between indigenous peoples and land and its legal implications was earlier developed in the International Labor Organization (ILO) Convention No. 169 concerning Indigenous and Tribal Peoples in Independent Countries. ILO Convention No. 169 sets out that governments shall respect the special importance for the cultures and spiritual values of indigenous peoples of their relationship with the land they occupy or otherwise use. ILO Convention (No. 169) concerning Indigenous and Tribal Peoples in Independent Countries was adopted in June 27, 1989, 76th Session of the General Conference of the ILO, and entered into force in Sept. 5, 1991. Refer to article 13 (1).

The Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples provides that states should put in mechanisms for prevention of any action that has the aim or effect of dispossessing indigenous peoples of their lands, territories or resources, or any form of forced population transfer that similarly violates or undermines their rights (Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, art. 8(2)(b-c)). Indigenous peoples shall not be forcibly removed from their lands or territories: “no relocation shall take place without the free, prior and informed consent of the indigenous peoples concerned and after agreement on just and fair compensation and, where possible, with the option of return ( Ibid. art. 10). Indigenous people shall have the right to the lands, territories, and resources that they have traditionally owned, occupied, or otherwise used or acquired (Ibid. art. 26).

Ownership of land by indigenous and other peoples has been recognized regardless of title deed. In *The Mayagna (Sumo) Awas Tingni v Nicaragua*, the Inter-American Court of Human Rights ruled that “as a result of customary practices, possession of the land should suffice for indigenous communities lacking real title to property of the land to obtain official recognition of

that property” (The Mayagna (Sumo) Awas Tingni Community v. Nicaragua, Judgment of August 31, 2001, Inter-Am. Ct. H.R., (Ser. C) No. 79 (2001), secs. 151-152).

In accordance with the Declaration, states shall establish and implement, in conjunction with indigenous peoples concerned, a fair, independent, impartial, open and transparent process, giving due recognition to indigenous peoples’ laws, traditions, customs, and land tenure systems, to recognize and adjudicate the rights of indigenous peoples pertaining to their lands, territories, and resources, including those which are traditionally owned or otherwise occupied or used. Indigenous peoples shall have the right to participate in this process (Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, art. 27). Where indigenous peoples are entitled to redress, this should be by restitution or, when this is not possible, just, fair and equitable compensation, for the lands, territories, and resources that they have traditionally owned or otherwise occupied or used (Ibid. art. 28).

Several regional and international bodies have been created to promote respect for the rights of indigenous peoples, including the Working Group on Indigenous Populations/Communities of the African Commission on Human and Peoples’ Rights, the UN Working Group on Indigenous Populations, the UN Special Rapporteur on the rights of indigenous peoples, and the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues. International indigenous rights case law is expanding on the meaning of the rights discussed in the Declaration (Inter-American Commission on Human Rights, “Indigenous and Tribal Peoples’ Rights over their Ancestral Lands and Natural Resources,” 2009). A February 2010 decision by the African Commission on Human and Peoples’ Rights, in the first ruling of an international tribunal finding a violation of the right of development, found that the eviction of Kenya’s Endorois people, with minimal compensation, violated their rights as an indigenous people to property, health, culture, religion, and natural resources, and ordered Kenya to restore the Endorois to their historic land and provide compensation. This landmark ruling could prove to significantly advance the rights of indigenous peoples over their traditional lands in Africa (African Commission on Human and Peoples’ Rights, Case 276 /2003, Centre for Minority Rights Development (Kenya) and Minority Rights Group International on behalf of Endorois Welfare Council v Kenya (February 4, 2010).

## Chapter Three

### Research Methodology

This chapter outlines the methodology that was used to conduct the research. It constitutes the study area and period, study design and population, sample size and sampling technique or sampling procedure, data collection procedure (instruments, personnel, data quality control), operational definitions, data analysis procedure, data quality management, and ethical consideration.

#### 3.1. Study area and period

Gambella Peoples' National Regional State (GPNRS) is one of the administrative regions of Ethiopia. It is located in the south-western part of the country and borders two other regions- Oromiya to the north and east and the Southern Nations, Nationalities, and Peoples' Regional State (SNNPRS) to the south-and the Republic of South Sudan to the West. The regional state is divided into three zones. These Are: Anywaa, Majanger/Majang and Nuer zones. Most of Gambella is flat and its climate is hot and humid. Annual rainfall averages about 600mm while the minimum/maximum temperatures are approximately 21.1.degree Celsius and 35.9 degree Celsius respectively.

Agro-ecologically, the region is predominantly lowland with few midlands (Amharic-weynadega). Recession riverside agriculture is common, particularly maize and sorghum, and widely practiced by Anywaa people along Baro (locally called Openo), Gilo and Akobo rivers. As the region is generally not cereal self-sufficient, alternative income sources such as fishing are important sources of food. Wild food consumption is part of the daily dietary intake given the still partly untouched bush land and natural forest resources.

Amazingly replete with natural beauty, Gambella is one of the Ethiopian regional states which are most biologically diverse and visually stunning. As a state which apportions a border with South Sudan, Gambella is a destination point for numerous of sub-Saharan migratory species, especially the White-eared kob. These species call much of the Gambella landscape their home especially during the Ethiopian dry season (Denney M., 2012, p.1)



The biological productivity of the land has drawn a large number of national and international investors towards the region. These national and international investors buy large portions of land in Gambella with an aim of developing it for cash crop exports. In a sort of exchange for their use of the fertile land, these investors claim and hence are perceived to have the potential to add to the overall economic development of the Gambella regional state by rendering jobs for the local communities, building and maintaining infrastructure, and expedite the development of services such as schools and business centers (ibid). This claim is however debatable since none has ever executed this claim except the one time rice distribution that was made by the Saudi Star company to the local communities in Abobo district a few years back.

Investment in Gambella regional state brings forward an important study of environmental and land governance because NGOs and governmental institutions in the region work toward engaging the investors in community engagement and environmental preservation. Besides, Gambella can be delineated as a pristine ecological environment, largely bereft of industrial development and pollution. Due to this cause, Gambella furnishes an excellent opportunity for engaging agricultural investors in socially responsible development that sets opportunities for both regional economic growth and environmental protection.

### ***3.1.1. Conflicts and their major causes in Gambella Region***

The United Nations Emergencies Unit for Ethiopia (UN-EUE) carried out a field assessment to Gambella Peoples' National Regional State between the 23<sup>rd</sup> and 29<sup>th</sup> of December 2002. The principal focus of the assessment task was to inspect and understand the dynamics of ethnic relationships, the livelihoods of various ethnic groups and the contributing factors for the constant ethnic conflict that characterizes the region (*Abraham Sewonet, 2002 p.1*).

Found to be the major cause of inter- group conflict between the Anywaa and the Nuer are the different livelihoods followed by these two groups. Unlike the Nuers who are mainly pastoralists, the Anywaa are primarily crop cultivators. This conflict has a long history in that it can be traced as far back as the early 20<sup>th</sup> century. The question of what tribe or ethnic group constitutes the majority in Gambella region is also the second most important factor that has shared in bringing about a constant strife between the two aforementioned ethnic groups. It is familiar that being a majority ethnic group implies that the majority ethnic group gets more seats in the government's parliamentary system and other political privileges such as, for example,

higher budget allocations. This is the reason why the Anywaa never acknowledged the legitimacy of the 1994 population census which mentioned them as representing 27% of the total population of Gambella and put the Nuers at 40%. The Anywaa's argument has something to do with the then Ethio- Sudanese border which was difficult to control and which is to the present day believed to have kept the Sudanese Nuer infiltrating into Gambella region. The crossing of the Sudanese Nuers into Jikaw woreda/district to be counted during the 1994 population census is cited as an example in this regard (*Abraham Sewonet, 2002 p.3*)

Another important contributor to the conflict in the region is an easy access to arms. In their book entitled *'Transformation of conflict and local capacity for peace in Gambella Region,'* Gebre Selassie and Sisay H, (2001) mentioned that as a border area, people in Gambella region have easy access to arms and that arms are easily accessible owing to SPLA's presence on the other side of the border adjacent to Gambella Regional State and due to movement of people from Southern Sudan to Ethiopia. Regarding the disarmament, it happened to be an easier task among the more sedentary Anywaa ethnic group when the Ethiopian government assayed to disarm illegal arm owners. This wasn't, however, the case among the Nuer ethnic group who still appear to have access to weapons. Even though the Ethiopian government attempted to disarm illegal arm owners, the Nuers still appear to have access to weapons. The main reason here is that the Nuers are pastoralists who are constantly moving back and forth between Ethiopia and South Sudan where little or no control is made on illegal weapon ownership (Gebre Selassie and Sisay H, (2001, p.3).

In *'National Perspective on the conflict in Gambella,'* Dereje Feyssa (2009, p.642) argued that the levels of conflict in Gambella Region are not the same. In this regard, he is trying to shade light on the conflict between the Anywaa and the Nuer which is an old sort of conflict that dates back to the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century when the Nuer (Jikany) migrated to the east from South Sudan; and the one between the Anywaa and the Majang ethnic group which was a recent one. Access to and control over vital natural resources, cultivation and pasture lands along the tributaries of Sobat river were the main driving forces of Nuer territorial expansion (*ibid. p.642*). Another type of conflict is that of the state against ethnic groups. This one is largely related to political conflict and military confrontation between the Ethiopian Peoples' Revolutionary Democratic Front (EPRDF) and the armed groups of the Anywaa ethnic group. This happened despite the fact that the Anywaa and the EPRDF were initially allies as it was evident that the

EPRDF, in what appeared a memorandum of understanding, promised the GPLM political power over Gambella Region in post-Derg Ethiopia. The Nuer ethnic group then perceived siding with the Derg; the Anywaa appeared a 'natural ally' for the current government, the EPRDF. As an independent political organization, however, the GPLM opposed EPRDF's hegemonic political conduct. The EPRDF on its part, demilitarized the GPLM in 1992, transmuted it into a party in 1995 and the leadership was replaced by 'user-friendly' members. In 1998 the EPRDF further compelled a merger between the GPLM and the Nuer-based party, the GPDUP (Gambella People Democratic Unity Party) and firmly settled a more docile regional umbrella organization, the then GPDF (Gambella People Democratic Front). This was begrudged, especially by the educated Anywaa who established an independent political organization known as the GPDC, Gambella People Democratic Congress which seriously challenged the EPRDF-affiliated GPDF during the 2000 regional election (ibid. p.645).

Cross-border conflicts or incursions are another different level of conflict in the Gambella region. It is about extensive cross-border cattle raiding and the associated loss of human lives from the attacks carried out by the Lou Nuer and the Murle from the Southern Sudan (Dereje Feyssa, 2009. P. 646).

Of an importance here also are the contradictions in Ethiopia's Federalism. According to Bahargava and Suberu, the Ethiopian federalism, similar to its Nigerian and Indian counterparts, demonstrates strong centralizing features (Bahargava, 2006; Suberu, R. 2006). This is evident in its fiscal policy which makes the States practically dependant on the federal government for their financial wherewithal (Keller, 2002) as well as the political structure in which governance issues in the states are controlled by the ruling party through member parties or affiliates (Aalen, 2002). Because its constitution generously provides for the Regional States political autonomy as well as control over their resources, the Ethiopian federal variant needs to account for this paradox more than its Nigerian or Indian counterparts. As a matter of fact, the Ethiopian constitution has gone extra miles in catering to the States autonomy including and up to secession (Dereje Feyssa, 2009. p.649) The problem that was between the GPLM and the EPRDF; between the GPDF/EPRDF and the GPDC makes sense if it is filtered through this apparent political contradiction. Lying beneath the problem is the hegemonic ambition of the EPRDF and the challenges it has faced in areas particularly where there are independent or semi-autonomous political organizations.

The study examined the impact of a government relocation and resettlement program also called villagization program on the human rights of indigenous people in Anywaa zone's resettlement villages of Nyikwo, Abol-Kiir and Kobon in Gambella periphery district; Pochalla, Thatha and Gog-Dipaach in Gog district; and Chobo-Kiir, Pokedi and Abari-Meti in Abobo district. Given the fact that Dimma and Jor districts are the furthest and hence hard to reach within the given time and finance, villagization program in those areas was not taken as part of this research.

Anywaa zone is one of the three zones of the Ethiopian region of Gambella. It is composed of five districts. These are Gambella periphery, Abobo, Gog, Dimma and Jor districts. This zone is bordered on the southwest by South Sudan, on southeast by the Southern Nations, Nationalities, and Peoples Region (SNNPR), on the east by Majanger/Majang Zone, on the northeast by the Oromiya Region, and on the northwest by South Sudan and Nuer Zone. Towns in this zone include Gambella, Abobo, Pinyudo, Abol, Ongogi and Dimma.

Based on the 2007 Census conducted by the Central Statistical Agency of Ethiopia, this Zone has a total population of 99,556, of whom 50,722 are men and 48,834 women. 52,561 or 52.8% of population are urban inhabitants. A total of 24,490 households were counted in this Zone, which results in an average of 4.07 persons to a household. The largest ethnic groups of the zone were the Anuak (53.61%), the Nuer (11.76 %), the Oromo (9.14%), the Amhara (9.1%), the Kambata (4.35%), the Majangir (2.3%), the Tigre (2.19%), the Wolayta (1.52%), the Gurage (1.4%), and the Hadiya (1.19%). All other ethnic groups made up 3.44% of the population. Anuak/Anyuak language (Dha-Anywaa) is spoken as a first language by 54.18%, 12.52% speak Nuer, 11.33% Amharic, 8.59% Oromiffa, 4.47% speak Kambata, 1.96% speak Tigrinya, 1.45% speak Wolayata, 1.1% speak Hadiya, and 1.09% speak Gurage; the remaining 3.31% spoke all other primary languages reported. The largest group of the inhabitants is Protestants, with 64.81% of the population reporting they embraced this belief, while 29.16% professed Ethiopian Orthodox Christianity, 5.61% were Catholic, 5.3% were Muslim, and 2.2% practiced traditional religions.

### **3.2. Study design**

According to Enon (1998), a research design is a plan of how the researcher is going to carry out the investigation. It discusses why, where, how, and when the research can be started and

accomplished. This research is a mixed type which applied both qualitative and quantitative approaches. The researcher applied both qualitative and quantitative approaches because using these approaches side by side is far more comprehensive than attacking a problem from only one point of view. For example, the qualitative data collected offered to refine and fill the breaches needed to be filled in the interpretation of quantitative data. Information was obtained from both primary and secondary sources and the survey involved 107 respondents detailed in the following subsection. The findings were critiqued, conclusions drawn and recommendations made.

### **3.3. Sample Size and sampling technique**

The population that was surveyed includes resettlers in the resettlement villages, village leaders, and government officials. The sample consisted of 107 respondents: 90 resettlers' households, 9 village leaders from the nine resettlement villages, 6 district officials from the three districts, and 2 Anywaa zone officials.

Purposive sampling technique was used to select districts, villages and informants. However, random sampling was also used for the household surveys. For random sampling, the researcher moved around the villages and randomly selected whichever house that was found open with members available and only interviewed the member/s with his or her consent.

### **3.4. Data collection procedure**

#### **3.4.1. Primary Sources**

The researcher spent about two months doing research in nine of the aforementioned resettlement villages in Anywaa zone. Semi-structured questionnaires for household surveys and open-ended questions and semi structured interviews for key informants and officials were employed. Opinions and perceptions of the respondents regarding the resettlement were measured using the five points Likert scale. The purpose of using semi-structured interviews was that they were flexible and could allow new questions to be brought up during the interview.

### **3.4.2. Secondary Sources**

Secondary data was obtained from journals, articles, published or unpublished documents, and Resettlement Action Plan. Some of these are available online while others, such as Resettlement Action Plan, were also accessed from the different offices and libraries in the state's headquarter, Anywaa zone's headquarter, and districts' headquarters.

### **3.4.3. Research instruments**

The researcher employed semi-structured interviews, interview guides and semi-structured questionnaires to the respondents from the selected sample. Both focused on three main sections. Section one contains background information, the second, how resettlers see the government relocation and resettlement program and people's involvement in the relocation process; and third section focuses on the impact of relocation on their livelihoods and human rights which was seen in relation with issues such as landlessness, joblessness, food insecurity, loss of access to common property resources, education, community decision making regarding their own resettlement, and suppression of dissent. The last part deals with interview questions for officials.

### **3.5. Limitations of the study**

This research encountered assorted limitations which have been mentioned below.

1. Language: Although majority of the respondent households spoke Dha-Anywaa or Anyuak language as their mother tongue, a translator was required in Abari-meti village which is inhabited by Majanger/Majang people. Here, it was crucial to use a translator from the Majanger/Majang ethnic group who spoke and understood Dha-Anywaa so as to communicate and collect data through surveys and interviews. The translator was manifestly informed about the questions of the household surveys as well as the content of the interviews. It could, however, still be possible that the translator slightly converted the questions during the surveys and interviews or that the translator translated the answers erroneously. Despite the fact that the chance that this took place was minor (due to the translator's Dha-Anywaa skills and understanding of the questions asked), it could still have happened.

2. Time: The time spent doing data collection or fieldwork in the distantly scattered villages was about two months period. This limited the amount of data that has been collected. It was for this very reason that a decision was made to focus mainly on some of the eight risks that have been identified by Michael Cernea (2000), although social disintegration was slightly touched on the

way due to the fact that some people fled the country or their villages leaving behind families and relatives. It was in light of these risks as well as human rights violations and loss of access to public services that the human rights issues were looked into throughout the villagization program. So selection of these five risks out of eight was based on time availability.

3. Data bias: This research only collected data after the completion of the villagization program. Only a recall method was used in order to learn more about the situation of the resettled households before resettlement. This technique, however, heavily counted on the memories of the respondent households to depict the past occurrences and circumstances. It could have led to data of low quality because of the time interval between the resettlers' experiences and the moment of data collection. Moreover, the process of villagization could have been experienced as negative, which might have stimulated the respondent households to describe the past in an unrealistic manner. The negative experience that the resettlers faced could also have led to an exaggeration of the negative aspects of the situation after the villagization program. Additionally, other actors like loyalist government officials in the zone and the districts also might have given imprecise answers to provide a more positive image of the villagization process. Those officials who aren't that much loyal to the government also might have given imprecise answers to provide a more negative image of the villagization process. In order to reduce the influence of these issues, answers of various types of actors (such as the government officials, the households and former civil servants) have been compared with each other throughout the research to make a more balanced conclusion.

### **3.6 Operational definitions**

**Relocation** is an act of moving someone or something to a new place to work or operate.

**Resettlement** is a process through which populations are moved from their dwelling-place and or economic activities relocate to another site and reestablish their productive activities, services and community life. In World Bank terminology, resettlement covers all direct economic and social losses resulting from land taking and restriction of access together with the consequent compensatory and remedial measures, including economic rehabilitation of displaced persons to improve or restore their incomes and living standards (World Bank, 2004, p5). It can be voluntary or involuntary; the primary goal is to prevent impoverishment to improve the livelihood of the resettlers.

**Voluntary Resettlement** refers to any resettlement not attributable to eminent domain of other forms of land acquisition backed by powers of the state. This type of resettlement is based on the principle of informed consent and power of choice, meaning that the people involved are fully knowledgeable about the project, its implications and freely agree to participate in the project.

**Involuntary Resettlement** refers to two distinct but related processes. One is displacement, which is a process by which development projects cause people to lose land or other assets, or access to resources. This may result in physical dislocation, loss of income, or other adverse impacts. The other is resettlement or rehabilitation, which is a process by which those adversely affected are assisted in their efforts to improve, or at least to restore their incomes and living standard. Involuntary resettlement usually takes the form of forced migration and eviction and is itself never the primary objective of a project that causes displacement but rather a byproduct of urban programs, construction of dams, highways, industrial estates and ports among others.

**Livelihoods:** A livelihood comprises the capabilities, assets (including both material and social resources) and activities required for a means of living. Livelihoods are systems upon which people survive in a given community, and these include assets like land, food stores, tools, livestock, networks, skills, roads, schools, credit, trade and remittances, etcetera.

**Development-induced displaced populations** refer to those persons who are forced to move as a result of losing their homes to development projects. The World Commission on Dams (WCD, 2000) report refers not only to physical displacement, but also to livelihood displacement, which deprives people of their means of production and displaces them from their socio-cultural milieu.

### **3.7. Data Analysis Procedure**

The responses or findings were tabulated according to the major themes that emerged from the research questions, and frequencies and percentages were found from descriptive statistics using statistical package for social scientists (SPSS) version 20. From this statistics work and interviews, narrative explanations were generated.

### **3.8. Data quality management**

The two most important and fundamental characteristics of any measurement procedure are reliability and validity. These two principles were considered in this research.



In order to check the validity and reliability of the research instruments, the pre-test (pilot test) was done in resettled villages with 10 resettlers. The pre-test provided an advanced opportunity for the investigator to check the questionnaires and to minimize errors due to improper design elements, such as questions, wordings or sequences.

After the dispatched questionnaires got returned, necessary modification were made on items and complete removal or replacement of any unclear questions happened as a result. Additionally, the reliability of the instrument was measured by using Cronbach alpha test. A reliability test was performed to check the consistency and accuracy of the measurement scales. As Cronbach's alpha shows the results are acceptable (between 0.71 and 0.92), indicating questions in each construct are measuring a similar concept. As suggested by Cronbach (as cited by Tech-Hong and Waheed, 2011), the reliability coefficients between 0.70–0.90 are generally found to be internally consistent. Cronbach alpha test was done using SPSS version 20.

To aid the information gathered from interview through the questionnaires and secondary sources, the qualitative data collected served to refine and fill gaps needed to be filled in the interpretation of quantitative data. Interviews were audio-recorded, transcribed and supplemented by field notes for ethical considerations.

### **3.9. Ethical consideration**

The researcher obtained a support letter from his University which he used to gain approval from the respondents and to convince them that the research was purely academic and that the information that would be obtained would exclusively be for academic purposes and would be confidential.

The primary way that the researcher used to protect research participants regarding breaking of confidentiality was anonymizing which was done through pseudonyms. These pseudonyms were chosen by either the researcher or suggested by the participants and were not used in the final research paper, but destroyed to avoid getting accessed by someone who might identify the respondents they were used to represent. Moreover, interviews with the respondents were conducted in safe places as preferred by the research respondents. In this regard, most respondents preferred being interviewed in their own houses.

## Chapter Four

### Results and Discussion

#### 4.1. General backgrounds of the respondent households

The research was carried out in the following nine resettlement villages.

Table1

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
AbolKiir	10	11.1	11.1	11.1
Nyikwo	10	11.1	11.1	22.2
Kobon	10	11.1	11.1	33.3
Chobo-Kiir	10	11.1	11.1	44.4
Pokedi	10	11.1	11.1	55.6
Abari-Meti	10	11.1	11.1	66.7
Pochalla	10	11.1	11.1	77.8
Gog-Dipach	10	11.1	11.1	88.9
Thatha	10	11.1	11.1	100.0
Total	90	100.0	100.0	

Table 2 indicates that the level of education of the questioned households has been satisfactory as only 10 (11.1%) of the re-settled respondent households didn't attend any form of formal education. The remaining households attended school at various educational levels ranging from grade 2 (4, 4.4%), grade 3 (5, 5.6%), grade 4 (8, 8.9%), grade 5 (14, 15.6%), grade 6 (8, 8.9%), to grade 12 (3, 3.3). From this, it can be concluded that a number of people who got affected by the villagization program have, at least, some basic knowledge about human rights.

Table2

Educational level				
	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
0	10	11.1	11.1	11.1
2	4	4.4	4.4	15.6
3	5	5.6	5.6	21.1
4	8	8.9	8.9	30.0
5	14	15.6	15.6	45.6

6	8	8.9	8.9	54.4
7	6	6.7	6.7	61.1
8	14	15.6	15.6	76.7
9	12	13.3	13.3	90.0
10	3	3.3	3.3	93.3
11	3	3.3	3.3	96.7
12	3	3.3	3.3	100.0
Total	90	100.0	100.0	

We can observe from table 3 below that more than half, that is, 54 (60%) of the respondent households were male-headed and less than half, that is, 36 (40%) of the households were female-headed. Table 4 demonstrates the age structure of the 90 respondent household members. The youngest among the questioned household members aged 29 and the oldest aged 60 years. The average age of the questioned households is 43.32. However, all the 90 (100%) questioned households mentioned that their occupations were farming (table 5 below)

Table 3

**Sex of the respondents**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Male	54	60.0	60.0	60.0
Female	36	40.0	40.0	100.0
Total	90	100.0	100.0	

Table4

**Descriptive Statistics of the age of respondents**

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Age of the respondents	90	29	60	43.32	7.359
Valid N (listwise)	90				

Table5

**Occupation of the respondents**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Farmer	90	100.0	100.0	100.0

The resettlement process of the respondents took place between 2011 and 2013 and all the respondents did not get displaced in one go. As indicated in table 6, in 2011, 42 (46.7), 2012 28 (31.1) and in 2013 20 (22.2) respondent households were displaced respectively.

**4.2. Resettlement period, information and how resettlers view it**

Table 6

**period of settlement period**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2011	42	46.7	46.7	46.7
2012	28	31.1	31.1	77.8
2013	20	22.2	22.2	100.0
Total	90	100.0	100.0	

Concerning the information prior to the actual displacement, however, all the displaced respondents had the information regarding their displacement which they gathered from different sources, with 13 (14.4%) getting their information from village leaders and others 77 (85.6%) getting theirs from the district leaders (tables 7 and 8). None of them got their information regarding resettlement from printed media or other means.

Table 7

**Were you informed about the resettlement process prior to this event?**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	90	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table 8

**Information sources of the resettlement process**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Village leader	13	14.4	14.4	14.4
district leaders	77	85.6	85.6	100.0
Total	90	100.0	100.0	

Although, the resettled households had the prior information about their being shifted to another location under the villagization scheme, most of them had not given their consent. A majority of respondents, 64 (71.1%) did not give their consent; only 26 (28.9%) respondents gave their consent (Table 9)

However, the 64 (71.1%) of the respondent households who mentioned that they didn't give their consent regarding their resettlement had to leave their original places without their consent and move to the villagization sites. This act of forcefully moving people from their land is contrary to article 40 (5) of the Ethiopian constitution which speaks of the rights not to be displaced from one's own land.

Table 9

**Did you give your consent regarding resettlement process?**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
No	64	71.1	71.1	71.1
Yes	26	28.9	28.9	100.0
Total	90	100.0	100.0	

Moreover, all of the resettled households (including the 26 (28.9%) who gave their consent regarding their resettlement) complained that they were not given enough time to prepare themselves for the migration to the resettlement sites. They also complained of the difficulties (moving back and forth while carrying some of their belongings on their heads since the government did not provide vehicles to help them carry their belongings) they faced during their movement from their old villages to the resettlement sites. Some of the households also complained that they were not informed about the importance of this project, the resettlement sites, time to move and their compensation.

The researcher is, therefore, of the opinion that the kind of information the resettled people received was very limited and that consultation with the affected populations wasn't made as per the conclusion put forward by the UN Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (CESCR) which infers that before an eviction can occur, the authorities must explore all feasible alternatives in consultation with affected groups. Furthermore, households couldn't also propose their preferred potential resettlement sites for themselves, rather the districts and regional government who had the final and the only say in determining the resettlement sites. Some

resettlers, village and district leaders complained that the whole resettlement process was not being monitored according to the resettlement programme. In addition to this, the households' situation after resettlement was also not monitored in order to find out whether people's lives become better or worsened. Among the three leaders of the three districts in which this particular research was carried out, two mentioned that there are no solutions that were or are being executed by officials in the districts or the zone itself, so as to redress the problems or difficulties of the re-settled populations.

More than half of the questioned households 62 (68.9%) mentioned that they were promised to receive both land for land (represented by 2) and other things (represented by 4) as is in the questionnaire. Others or other things 12 (13.3%) in this case means things such as fertilizer, mosquito nets, grinding mills, food aid, electricity, cleared land, tools, seeds and other agricultural inputs, clothes and clean water. Moreover, some of the resettled households, that is, 16 (17.8%) were also promised with various trainings by the government (table 10).

Table 10

**What was promised by these information sources**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Training	16	17.8	17.8	17.8
Others	12	13.3	13.3	31.1
2&4	62	68.9	68.9	100.0
Total	90	100.0	100.0	

However, not only the respondent households, but the village leaders and some of the district officials also confirmed that all the promises have not been fulfilled. This again is a human rights violation when seen in light of Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights' (CESCR) General Comment No. 7, paragraphs 1-7 which stipulates that those evicted must receive adequate compensation for affected property. These concerned individuals mentioned that even the very limited hand pumps which were provided were not in good shapes. Villagers complained of continuous break down of the very few hand pumps which they consider as the ones of low qualities. They also complained about the long time they take in getting them fixed; the complete absence of electricity, various trainings, and very few teachers, just to mention a few. Some of the women headed households mentioned that due to scarcity of water service

provision in the new resettlement sites, women and girls who live where there are no nearby rivers or streams now walk to far distances to fetch water. This makes them fall into harassment by men they meet on their ways. In addition to majority resettlers, that is, 81(90%), these female-headed households mentioned that they prefer their life in the old villages because the new villages lack a number of things that used to be present in the old villages-fertile land and common properties from which they benefited was a common argument of complaint as is shown in Table 11 below.

Table 11

**Which village do you prefer to live between the old and the new?**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Old	81	90.0	90.0	90.0
New	9	10.0	10.0	100.0
Total	90	100.0	100.0	

These failed promises, coupled with the displacement which began just before the harvest time, disappointed most of the resettled households. So when the resettled households become aware that little or none of the promised things could be provided, some resettlers simply deserted the new villages. Although the resettlers are not permitted by the government to return to their old farmlands and villages, some of them secretly went back to their areas only to find all properties they left behind destroyed by wild animals such as monkeys and hyenas

**4.3. The resettlement process: participation, compensation and opinions**

The questioned households who resettled to the nine villages did so during the years 2011, 2012 and 2013 (mentioned earlier in table 6). More than half, that is, 64 (71.1%) of the population or the questioned households had the feeling that they did not give their consent concerning the resettlement process. Only 26 (28.9%) mentioned that they gave their consent regarding the villagization program (table 9). However, as confirmed by some concerned district officials, this 64 (71.1%) of the household population were convinced by villages and districts’ leaders to comply with the government’s development plan. They mentioned that the people were told that they had to move since their areas are located far away from the main roads and other social services such as schools, health centers and so forth. Some households mentioned that they were also told that they had to move because their areas get flooded sometimes. One major problem

that was confirmed by many respondent households is that the people were not free to choose to go to another location of their choices. Majority of the households also complained that they were not allowed to freely remain in, or come to the new villages and freely return to their original areas, if they chose to do so. Refusing villagers from remaining in their original villages was done by warning them that they won't receive any form of the promised aid which was promised for those who agreed to move to the new sites. Some of these households mentioned that they feared being targeted by unknown armed groups or the local soldiers themselves, because they were told by the same soldiers who were always present in every meeting regarding villagization that no one would rescue them if they faced any danger in their old villages. This made them suspect the soldiers themselves. This is a plain human rights violation when seen in light of the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, art. 10 which specifies that no relocation shall take place without the free, prior and informed consent of the indigenous peoples concerned and after agreement on just and fair compensation and, where possible, with the option of return. According to the respondent households, the only form of compensation provided to the resettlers in their new sites was land for the lands they left behind instead of cash for land or cash for any other property that the resettled population lost due to the resettlement (table 12). This act denies the rights which are mentioned in the Proclamation No. 455/2005, of Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, which requires that compensation is to be equal in worth to the replacement cost of property on the land, any improvements (value of capital and labor) made to the land and 10 times the average annual income from the previous five years.)

Table 12

**Have you received any form of compensation?**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
No, but land	90	100.0	100.0	100.0

This land was given to the resettlers in their new resettlement sites, thus partly invigorating them to move to the new sites. Other personal properties (mango and other valuable fruit trees, crops, utensils, houses, etc) that the resettled households lost due to displacement were not considered for compensation.



Regarding participation in decision making process, all 90 (100%) of the research households didn't have the feeling that they took part in decision-making concerning their own resettlement (table 13).Some of the questioned households mentioned that, without any consultation or chances for dialogue, the local government officials came and talked to the village elders and those that are influential in the community. It was after this that those local government officials together with some members of the regional police, some soldiers and elders called them for a meeting where they were told that they were to be resettled to a different place. This again is in contrast with obligations put down in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Banjul Charter, article 14, which clearly describes that governments are generally entitled to expropriate land for public purposes if done according to law with public participation, due process, and adequate compensation.

Figure 13

**Did you participate in decision making regarding resettlement process?**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
No	90	100.0	100.0	100.0

Some of the village leaders confided that anyone who raised his or her voice against the villagization program was considered instigator and some got deposed from their leadership positions in the villages. Many of the respondent households mentioned that people got warned that they should not speak against the villagization program.

Therefore, silence during any of those meetings or fleeing from the village to the bush or another country were the only options available to the households. Table 14 tells us something about the issue of fleeing to other villages, the bush or to another country to avoid being targeted by authorities for not supporting the villagization program. Here, almost all (85 (94.4%)) the questioned households mentioned that they knew or heard of people who fled to the bush or other countries due to their opinions that were seen as set against villagization programme. South Sudan and Kenya were the major countries to which such people fled. Only 5 (5.6%) of the questioned households mentioned that they didn't know or hear about people who fled to other

villages or countries to avoid being targeted by authorities for not supporting the ideas about the villagization program.

Table 14

**Did you know or hear of people who fled to other villages, the bush or to another country just to avoid being targeted by authorities for not supporting the villagization program?**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
No	5	5.6	5.6	5.6
Yes	85	94.4	94.4	100.0
Total	90	100.0	100.0	

Also all 90 (100%) of the questioned households had the feeling that their resettlement needs were entirely not considered (table 15). This discontent regarding participation was verified by some of the village leaders and some concerned district officials who mentioned that the resettled populations didn't have any influence about their own resettlement (including compensation, location to be resettled, time of movement and so forth.). They also confirmed that there was only a one-way information transfer, that is, from the project designers and the local government to the households or the population affected in which households had no influence concerning their own resettlement process.

Table 15

**Your resettlement demands were taken in to account**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	90	100.0	100.0	100.0

#### **4.4. Description of the villagization program by the resettlers**

The villagization process was not considered by many households as voluntary but forced on people.

Table 16

**How do you describe the resettlement process?**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Voluntary	19	21.1	21.1	21.1
Forceful	71	78.9	78.9	100.0
Total	90	100.0	100.0	

As we can observe from table 16, only 19 (21.1%) of the questioned households mentioned that the villagization process was voluntary. Majority 71 (78.9%) of the questioned households, however, mentioned that it was the other way round. This 71 (78.9%) of the questioned households consider it as forceful or not carried out on voluntary basis. They mentioned that local police officers, soldiers or militias and some zone and districts officials used to go along with the villagers to the new resettlement village sites and oversaw the building of traditional huts. A village leader mentioned that these local police officers, soldiers or militias, and district officials could keep on being replaced by others on daily basis until the construction was finished by the villagers- a sort of forced labor. He also mentioned that people of all backgrounds were threatened by the government officials, because any police officer, district or zone official, or militia who refused to go to the new resettlement sites, cut grass for the construction of the traditional houses; or anyone who refused to comply and carry out the duty assigned to him or her were warned that they would be deposed, dismissed or won't receive their salaries. This claim can be justified by the fact that those who expressed concern or questioned the government's motives, or refused to carry out their duties were frequently threatened, dismissed or deposed from their leadership positions, and in some cases arrested by local police or soldiers. So everybody was expected to be present in the new resettlement sites whenever it was their turn no matter how far or near the distance was.

To support this mistreatment and abuses during construction of the houses in the new sites, one of the questioned zone officials mentioned that the government's villagization plan endorsed a "participatory approach" as one of its implementation principles. In this case, according to him; the target beneficiaries should contribute construction materials and labor. However, what this meant in practice was that the resettled villagers who were moved from their homes to the new

locations leaving behind a number of their belonging and houses were required to build their own houses without any compensation for all they left behind except for the land.

Figure 1: Anywaa zone officials taken to cut grass for the construction of villagization houses.



*Resting for sometime after cutting some bundles of grass*

This absence of compensation and forced labor, seen in light with fact that the army and the policemen who supervised this process would threaten whoever decelerated in work, is by itself a human right violation. (Refer to appendix 3 for more villagization related pictures. As a former official in Anywaa zone’s justice department, the researcher was himself one of the victims of this forced labor).

Table 17

**Opinion of resettled households about the resettlement process**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Very Negative	90	100.0	100.0	100.0

The table above clearly indicates that, all 90 (100%) of the questioned households didn’t have a good opinion about the resettlement process (table 17). The level and degree of dissatisfaction will be more extensively delineated in the next sections which will analyze the extent to which the five selected risks (e.g. landlessness, joblessness, food insecurity, loss of common property and loss of access to public services) were present in the resettlement villages.

**4.5. The issue of Landlessness**

The villagization process did provide land to all the displaced households, but a serious reduction in the size of the households’ lands in the new resettlement sites is a significant issue since many

households lost a significant size of lands after resettlement. From the tables 18 and 19 below, one can easily see a significant decrease in the land sizes in the new resettlement sites. For example, the number of households who possessed 3 hectares of land in the old village sites decreased from 38 (42.2%) to 13 (14.4%) in the new resettlement sites. Surprisingly, the number of households who had 4 and 5 hectares of land accounting to 9 (10%) and 2 (2.2%) respectively in the old villages dropped to 0% in the new resettlement sites. Compare tables 18 and 19 below for further details. As confirmed by a number of village leaders and some district agriculture offices' officials of the three districts, this drop in the land sizes does not mean that the newly resettled populations were not given enough lands in the new sites. They mentioned that the resettlers were given lands that ranged from a maximum of 4 hectares for those who have livestock and 3 hectares for those who only cultivate crops. However, the problem is that significantly large portions of the lands that were distributed in the new resettlement sites are not fertile but rather barren lands. This dissuaded a number of the households from cultivating the whole land they have in the new resettlement sites.

Table 18

**How much former land did you have (in hectares)?**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
1.5	1	1.1	1.1	1.1
2.0	23	25.6	25.6	26.7
2.4	1	1.1	1.1	27.8
2.5	5	5.6	5.6	33.3
3.0	38	42.2	42.2	75.6
3.5	10	11.1	11.1	86.7
4.0	9	10.0	10.0	96.7
4.5	1	1.1	1.1	97.8
5.0	2	2.2	2.2	100.0
Total	90	100.0	100.0	

Table 19

<b>How much current land do you have (in hectares)?</b>				
	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
1.0	2	2.2	2.2	2.2
1.5	12	13.3	13.3	15.6
2.0	54	60.0	60.0	75.6
2.5	8	8.9	8.9	84.4
3.0	13	14.4	14.4	98.9
3.5	1	1.1	1.1	100.0
Total	90	100.0	100.0	

Tables 20 and 21 exhibit the attitudes of all the questioned households about their own land. From here, one can see that there is a considerable difference between people's opinion about the soil quality of their former lands in their old villages and their current lands in the new resettlement sites. The households were very much in favor of or positive about the land condition or land quality of their former villages which majority, that is, 78 (86.7%) of them mentioned as 'very good' and only few, that is, 12 (13.3%) mentioned as 'good' (table 20). The labels 'bad' and 'very bad' are not mentioned by the questioned households in relation to the condition of their lands in their former villages. They are, however, very pessimistic or negative about their lands in the new resettlement sites which they consider as dry, infertile and overused (table 21). For this reason, only 13 (14.4%) of the questioned resettled households mentioned that the condition was 'very good', 28 (31.1%) as 'good' the remaining 19 (21.1%) and 30 (33.3%) mentioned that the condition of their lands were 'bad' and 'very bad' respectively. They mentioned that supplemental inputs such as fertilizers are required in the resettlement villages in order to effectively grow crops, but the government has not provided such inputs so far. For this bad soil quality, most of the households are producing little amount of crops. This makes them vulnerable to hunger, starvation and poverty which may result in various health problems.

**Table 20****How was the condition of your former land?**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Very good	78	86.7	86.7	86.7
Good	12	13.3	13.3	100.0
Total	90	100.0	100.0	

**Table 21****How is the condition of your current land?**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Very good	13	14.4	14.4	14.4
Good	28	31.1	31.1	45.6
Bad	19	21.1	21.1	66.7
Very bad	30	33.3	33.3	100.0
Total	90	100.0	100.0	

The issue of landlessness is as well protruding when looking at the kinds of crops planted or produced in the former places and the current villagization sites (tables 22 and 23). As per the questionnaire, the category 1, 2 & 3 displayed in both tables 6.22 and 6.23 below about crops planted or produced in both former and current agricultural lands stands for ‘maize’, ‘sorghum’ and ‘others’ (such as fruits and vegetables) which all 90 (100%) of the questioned research households mentioned to have planted or produced in their former villages. This, however, is not the case in the new resettlement villages. Unlike in the old villages in which all of the questioned households planted or produced all these kinds of crops, only few 3 (3.3%) of these households plant or produce all these crops in their current places. Majority 79 (87.8%) of the households questioned depend solely on maize and the remaining 8 (8.9 %) plant only sorghum. This 9 (8.9%) claimed that unlike maize which is the main food crop of the region, sorghum gives better yields in low quality lands. This reality compelled them to prefer growing it in their farmlands which they believe are of low qualities or infertile. It can also be observed from here that the category ‘others’ (represented by 3) which is mentioned in both tables 22 and 23 and which consists of ‘fruits’ and ‘vegetables’, has also significantly lessened after resettlement. This is an indication that the resettled villagers are deprived of a number of kinds of food that they used to produce in the old villages.

**Table 22****What kind of crops did you use to plant on your former agricultural land? (more answers are possible)**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
1,2&3	90	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table 23

**What kind of crops do you plant on your current agricultural land? (more answers are possible)**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Maize	79	87.8	87.8	87.8
Sorghum	8	8.9	8.9	96.7
1,2&3	3	3.3	3.3	100.0
Total	90	100.0	100.0	

Comparison between the use of crops that the households planted or produced in the old villages and in the new villages can also tell us something about the situation of the resettlers in the new resettlement sites. Before resettlement, all 90 (100%) the questioned households used their crops for both consumption and income generation activities by selling their crops in the markets (table 24).

Table 24

**Did you use to sell your crops or use it for consumption?**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Use crop for both	90	100.0	100.0	100.0

This, however, didn't become the case after villagization. Only 18 (20%) of the questioned households mentioned that they used their crops for both consumption and income generation activities by selling them in the markets after resettlement. The remaining majority, that is, 72 (80%) mentioned that they use their crops only for their own consumption after resettlement (table 25).



Table 25

**Do you sell your crops or use it for consumption?**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Use crop for consumption	72	80.0	80.0	80.0
Use crop for both	18	20.0	20.0	100.0
Total	90	100.0	100.0	

This can be explained by the low qualities of lands which can't produce enough yields in the resettlement areas. It can also be confirmed by looking at, or at least, by exploring how the questioned households viewed the conditions of their lands in both the old villages and the new resettlement areas (tables 20 and 21 mentioned earlier). As displayed here (tables 20 and 21) earlier, before the villagization, most (86.7%) of the questioned households mentioned that the conditions of their lands were very good. The remaining 13.3% mentioned that the conditions of their land were good. None of the questioned households mentioned the categories 'bad' and 'very bad' in relation to the conditions of their former lands (table 20). The questioned households, however, viewed the condition of their lands differently after villagization. Here, only 14.4% of the questioned households mentioned that the condition of their land was very good. The remaining 31.1%, 21.1% and 33.3% mentioned that the conditions of their lands were 'good', 'bad' and 'very bad' respectively (table 20 also mentioned earlier).

**4.5.1. Land registration**

Though doubtful, land registration is seemingly one of the good outcomes of the villagization program which most of the questioned households appreciated. All 90 (100%) of the questioned households mentioned that their lands were registered after the villagization. This compared to what it was before the villagization in which 34 (37.8 %) of the questioned households mentioned that their lands were not registered, is praiseworthy according to the resettled population (tables 26 and 27).

Many households, however, doubt this land registration because none of the resettled households was given land certification by the government. Some of them mentioned that they are afraid

another villagization may occur in the future and their present land and the things (valuable trees, houses, and other properties) that they will have on them won't be compensated by the government.

Table 26

**Was your former land registered?**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
No	34	37.8	37.8	37.8
Yes	56	62.2	62.2	100.0
Total	90	100.0	100.0	

Table 27

**Is your current land registered?**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	90	100.0	100.0	100.0

#### **4.6. Joblessness in the resettlement villages**

The risk of 'joblessness' is widespread in the resettlement villages. Tables 28 and 29 below reveal the main income sources of the questioned households before and after resettlement. As can be observed from table 29, income sources have declined significantly after resettlement. A vast majority, that is, 78 (86.7%) research households or population now depend solely on agriculture as their current main household source of income. This is a completely different case when compared to their previous income sources. Before resettlement, all 90 (100%) the questioned households used to have agriculture (major farming), garden activities, forestry (including planting of mango and other useful trees) and fishing, indicated in table 28 below as 1, 2, 3 and 4 as portrayed in the questionnaire, as main households' income sources. After resettlement, however, this number decreased significantly to only 13.3% households. Majority of the households 78 (86.7%) become solely dependent on agriculture as their main source of income (table 29). This is an indication that a huge number of main households' income sources have been lost after the villagization. It was confirmed by many households that the forest from which

they used to generate income is now very far from where they are resettled. This makes it hard for them to travel from the new villagization sites to the forests to collect forest products such as fruits, roots, firewood, medicines and many other things for the market. Moreover, there are some of the resettlers who mentioned that they are restricted from benefiting from the forests by the local authorities. Therefore, out of fear that one might be arrested, they chose not to access the forest for their needs or income generation activities. Still a number of households complained of the bad land quality in the resettlement areas that they claim can't help them produce as much food as possible so that they could use part of it for market to generate income.

This transgresses General Comment No. 12 of the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (the body in charge of monitoring the implementation of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights) which mentions that the right to food is the right to have regular, permanent and unrestricted access, either directly or by means of financial purchases, to quantitatively and qualitatively adequate and sufficient food corresponding to the cultural traditions of the people to which the consumer belongs, and which ensure a physical and mental, individual and collective, fulfilling and dignified life free of fear.

Table 28

**Former main household sources of income**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
1,2,3&4	90	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table 29

**Current main household sources of income**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Agriculture	78	86.7	86.7	86.7
1,2,3&4	12	13.3	13.3	100.0
Total	90	100.0	100.0	

With the extreme loss and decrease in the above mentioned income sources comes a severe loss of income. The questioned households used to earn on average about Birr 1131.00, a maximum of Birr 2000 and a minimum of Birr 700 per month before resettlement (table 30). This however

diminished significantly to an average income of Birr 913, a maximum of Birr 2000 and minimum of Birr 100 per month (table 31).

Table 30

**Descriptive Statistics of former monthly income (Birr)**

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Average monthly household income (Birr)	90	700	2000	1131.00	302.224
Valid N (list wise)	90				

Table 31

**Descriptive Statistics of current monthly income (Birr)**

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Average monthly household income (Birr)	90	100	2000	913.44	291.698
Valid N (list wise)	90				

In comparison, we can observe that there is a high decrease in the people's income in the resettlement sites. This considerable decline can be largely illustrated by the reduction of farmland sizes and other activities (including the ones found in the forests) which was an important source of income before resettlement. This income source has decreased after resettlement and has not been adequately substituted by other income types. Also many re-settled households complained about the lack of job opportunities in the resettlement sites which they thought would have been modern and better income generation means in comparison to the ones they had in their old villages. Another matter is that people used to earn income from their lands. This is, however, no longer possible in the resettlement sites due to the bad quality of lands as well as their diminished sizes. Therefore, households now have to try to distance themselves from traditional income generation and farming practices and find new ways of making a living which could be very hard, especially with the lack of support (such as distribution of fertilizers, tools, etc, which are badly needed by the resettled populations) from the local or central governments to undertake these new activities.

The issue of joblessness can also be seen in tables 32 and 33 below. Prior to resettlement, all 90 (100%) of the questioned households had various options and means to generate income. They used their ‘lands’, ‘common properties’ (forests and rivers) and ‘shifting cultivation’, displayed in the table below as ‘1’, ‘3’ and ‘4’ (as indicated in the questionnaire), to get enough food and generate income as a result. This however changed intensely to all 90 (100%) of the questioned households depending solely on their own lands for income generation. Here, most of the households complain of their own lands as infertile. This discouragement in farming can be explained by the fact that although the resettled households were provided lands that are up to 4 hectares large, many of them choose to cultivate smaller parts of their lands because they believe that cultivating their whole lands whose large parts are of bad qualities, is energy wastage and therefore not necessary. According to some households, benefiting from the common properties to generate income decreased after resettlement due to the fact that forests and rivers are now far from the resettlement sites, and according to some, the former (forests) are restricted by the local authorities. A number of households also complained about the government’s restriction on shifting cultivation which used to be a major part of their lives before villagization. All these combined led to many households doing nothing that can help them live the life that they were used to.

Table 32

**On whose land do you generate income?**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
1,3&4	90	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table 33

**On whose land do you generate income?**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
own land	90	100.0	100.0	100.0

#### 4.7. The issue of food insecurity

Another predominant risk in the new resettlement sites is food insecurity, which intensified significantly after resettlement. Before the resettlement, the questioned resettled households

produced food, with an annual average food production of 3,996.78 kg per household, a minimum of 2,060 kg per household and a maximum of 5,800 kg per household (table 34). This however changed radically after resettlement to an annual average of 2,671.56 kg per household, a minimum of 1,200 kg per household and a maximum of 3,950 kg per household (table 35). This can be explained by the fact that a number of households stopped producing food as enough as they can due to the bad land quality in the resettlement sites. Together with a low income, these households became very susceptible to food insecurity and poverty. This is an evidence that the obligations that States parties have to fulfill in order to implement the right to adequate food at the national level, as set out in article 2 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR), as well as The Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights in General Comment No. 12, have not been abided by. These obligations are as follows:

- *The obligation to respect existing access to adequate food requires States parties not to take any measures that result in preventing such access;*
- *The obligation to protect requires measures by the State to ensure that enterprises or individuals do not deprive individuals of their access to adequate food;*
- *The obligation to fulfill (facilitate) means the State must pro-actively engage in activities intended to strengthen people's access to and utilization of resources and means to ensure their livelihood, including food security;*
- *Whenever an individual or group is unable, for reasons beyond their control, to enjoy the right to adequate food by the means at their disposal, States have the obligation to fulfill (provide) that right directly. This obligation also applies for persons who are victims of natural or other disasters.*

Table 34

**Descriptive Statistics of former food crops produced (kg per year)**

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
How much food crops do you produce (kg per year)?	90	2060	5800	3996.78	791.644
Valid N (listwise)	90				

Table 35

**Descriptive Statistics of current food crops produced (kg per year)**

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
How much food crops do you produce (kg per year)?	90	1200	3950	2671.56	563.628
Valid N (listwise)	90				

The food insecurity issue can further be verified by analyzing the amount of food crops used for own consumption (tables 36 and 37). Prior to the villagization, each households on an average used 700.33 kg, a minimum of 400 kg and a maximum of 1,200 kg of their annual food production for their own consumption. This number, however, lessened to an annual average of 495.44 kg per household, a maximum of 650 kg per household and minimum of 300 kg per household which is a significant reduction compared to before villagization. Therefore, these numbers show that far less produced food crops are used for own consumption, which make households very vulnerable to food insecurity and other health problems.

Table 36

**Descriptive Statistics of former food crops production for own consumption (kg per year)**

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
How much food crops do you produce for own consumption (kg per year)?	90	400	1200	700.33	129.757
Valid N (listwise)	90				

Table37

**Descriptive Statistics of current food crops production for own consumption (kg per year)**

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
How much food crops do you produce for own use (kg per year)?	90	300	650	495.44	88.776
Valid N (listwise)	90				

The discontent with their current food consumption was also verified by the households themselves since more than half, that is, 49 (54.4%) of the households mentioned that their own food production doesn't satisfy their nutritional needs at all after the villagization; 30 (33.3%) of the households mentioned that they are partly satisfied, and the remaining 11 (12.2%) mentioned that their own food production satisfies their nutritional needs. Before villagization, however, all 90 (100%) the questioned households mentioned that they were entirely satisfied with the fulfillment of their nutritional needs by their own food production (tables 38 and 39). Most of them mentioned that the fertile lands on which various crops grew in their old villages offered them the foods that fulfilled their nutritional needs.

Table 38

**Did the former food crop production use to satisfy your own nutritional needs?**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	90	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table 39

**Does the current food crop production satisfy your own nutritional needs?**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	11	12.2	12.2	12.2
Partly	30	33.3	33.3	45.6
Not at all	49	54.4	54.4	100.0
Total	90	100.0	100.0	

More food needs to be purchased in order to cope up with the diminished food consumption from own production for the many households who no longer produce as enough food as possible in the resettlement villages. This diminished food consumption from own production can be confirmed from table 37 mentioned earlier. However, purchasing more food is very difficult since people's income reduced significantly from an average of Birr 1132.00, a maximum of Birr 2000 and a minimum of Birr 700 to average of Birr 913.44, a maximum of Birr 2000 and a minimum of Birr 100 per month per household after resettlement (tables 30 and 31 also mentioned earlier).



Another issue which is also confirmed by all 90 (100%) the questioned households and which has a connection with food consumption is the fact that the resettlement process has led to the loss of income sources (table 41 below). This, seen in light with the rise of people's food expenditures after resettlement, shows that life is hard in the resettlement sites. Before the villagization, households mentioned that they used to spend on average Birr 609, a maximum of Birr 1000 and a minimum of Birr 200 per month on food. After the villagization, however, this expenditure increased drastically to an average of Birr 791.22, a maximum of Birr 1500 and a minimum of Birr 250 per month (tables 40 and 41 below). Thus, households in the resettlement sites are now compelled to depend on other relatives who are mostly civil servants in the local government for their food consumption costs. Some confirmed that they heavily depend on remittance money from relatives abroad for their food. Still there are some who are badly suffering due to the reason that they don't have relatives who are civil servants in the government who receive monthly salaries or who are abroad on whom they can depend for the high food costs.

Table 40

**Descriptive Statistics of the household's monthly income formerly spent on food (Birr)**

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
How much of the household's monthly income did you use to spend on food (Birr)	90	200	1000	609.00	167.104
Valid N (listwise)	90				

Table 41

**Descriptive Statistics of household's monthly income currently being spent on food (Birr)**

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
How much of the household's monthly income is spent on food (Birr)	90	250	1500	791.22	244.999
Valid N (listwise)	90				

Table 42

**Has the resettlement process led to a loss of income sources?**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	90	100.0	100.0	100.0

**4.8. Loss of access to common property**

Before the villagization, all 90 (100%) of the questioned households had access to common properties, including the forests and/or rivers (table 43). Access to common properties however decreased after villagization to more than half 51 (56.7%) not having access and the remaining 39 (43.3%) mentioned that that they have access to common properties, but with fear that they might be jailed for using the forests (table 44). This violates the rights mentioned in General Comment 23. In General Comment 23 on Indigenous Peoples (fifty-first session, 1997) UN.Doc.A/52/18,Annex V, The UN Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination in its general recommendation on indigenous peoples calls upon states to recognize and protect the rights of indigenous peoples to own, develop, control and use their communal lands, territories and resources. It goes further by mentioning that where the indigenous peoples have been deprived of their lands and territories traditionally owned or otherwise inhabited or used without their free and informed consent, to take steps to return those lands and territories. Only when this is for factual reasons not possible, the right to restitution should be substituted by the right to just, fair and prompt compensation. Such compensation should as far as possible take the form of lands and territories.

Table 43

**Did you use to have access to common property?**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	90	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table 44

**Do you currently have access to common property?**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
No	51	56.7	56.7	56.7
Yes	39	43.3	43.3	100.0
Total	90	100.0	100.0	

One thing should be clear here; that is, most of the questioned households who mentioned that they lost access to common properties said so not because they lost access to all common properties, but because they lost access to either rivers or the forests due to their distances and, to some extent, out of fear that the local authorities won't allow them to use the forests. However, when distinguishing between different types of common properties, a serious decline of access to forests can be observed (table 46). Of the 90 (100%) questioned households that had access to both common properties (forests and rivers) before villagization (table 45), only 4 (4.4%) of all the questioned households mentioned that they have access to both the forests and the rivers after villagization (table 46).

Table 45

**What type (s) of common property did you formerly use or had access to?**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Both forests and rivers	90	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table 46

What type (s) of common property do you currently use or have access to?

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Forests	30	33.3	33.3	33.3
Rivers	56	62.2	62.2	95.6
Both forests and rivers	4	4.4	4.4	100.0
Total	90	100.0	100.0	

Here, it can be observed that the number of households accessing both common properties decreased significantly after resettlement. Access to the rivers however remained high with more than half 56 (62.2%) mentioning that they have access to them (table 46 above). This can be interpreted by the availability of rivers and probably absence of restrictions about them in Gambella regional state as a whole and Anywaa zone in particular. Access to the forests for building logs, firewood, fruits for various purposes, roots for various purpose, etc, however, went low to 30 (33.3%) of the households mentioning that they access them (table 46 above), although out of some sort of fear of local authorities who may not hesitate to threaten them against the use of the forests.

Generally, the common properties are used for various purposes. These various purposes can be categorized into income-generating activities and non-income generating activities labeled as ‘all’ (table 47) as per the questionnaire to imply that all 90 (100%) of the question households used common properties for ‘food’, ‘other income generating activities’, ‘construction’, ‘hunting’, ‘medicines’, ‘irrigation, fishing, bathing, washing, etc’, and ‘firewood’.

Table 47

**What kind of activities were the former common properties used for (more answers are possible)?**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
All	90	100.0	100.0	100.0

After the villagization, however, majority 32 (35.6%) of the respondent households shifted to using river only for activities such as fishing, irrigation, bathing, washing, etc. Some of these mentioned that they rarely generate income by selling fish unless whenever they get extra number which the household doesn’t want for home use. 19 (21.1%) of the questioned households mentioned that they use other means of income generating activities like cutting and collecting woods to sell in the market. 24.4% of the households mentioned that they used common properties for food. Medicine 4 (4.4%), construction 3 (3.3%), firewood 7 (7.8%) and hunting 3 (3.3%) were mentioned by some households as activities that they used the common properties for. Therefore, we can observe that after villagization, there is a considerable decline in the number of households’ use of some particular activities that the common properties are used for (compare tables 47 &48).

Table 48

**What kind of activities are the current common properties used for (more answers are possible)?**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Medicine	4	4.4	4.4	4.4
Food	22	24.4	24.4	28.9
Other income generating activities	19	21.1	21.1	50.0
Construction	3	3.3	3.3	53.3
Fishing, irrigation, bathing and washing, etc	32	35.6	35.6	88.9
Firewood	7	7.8	7.8	96.7
Hunting	3	3.3	3.3	100.0
Total	90	100.0	100.0	

The income earned from the activities with common properties significantly decreased after villagization or resettlement to an average of Birr 901.56, a maximum of Birr 1600, and a minimum of Birr 100 per month per household (table 50). This was not the case before villagization or resettlement. Before the villagization, households used to earn from these activities on average Birr 1280.33, a maximum of Birr 2500, and a minimum of Birr 700 per month (table 49). The decline of the use of common properties for earning income can be mainly explained by the lessened access to the forests because of the fact that a good number of the income-generating activities were forest-related followed by fishing in the rivers.

Table 49

**Descriptive Statistics of the former income earned from activities with the common properties**

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
How much do you earn from these activities per month (Birr)?	90	700	2500	1280.33	378.238
Valid N (listwise)	90				

Table 50

**Descriptive Statistics of the current income earned from activities with the common properties**

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
How much do you earn from these activities per month (Birr)?	90	100	1600	901.56	259.935
Valid N (listwise)	90				

We can observe a sharp decline of the households' opinions about their satisfaction with common properties after villagization. Here, more than half 56 (62.2%) of the questioned households mentioned that they are 'not' satisfied with them, whereas 43 (37.8 %) of them mentioned that they are 'partly' satisfied with the current common properties. From here, we can see that the label 'yes' (as displayed in the questionnaires) to imply that they are fully satisfied with the current common property was never mentioned in the questioned households' reaction to the question (table 51). This implies that none of the resettled households is fully satisfied with the current common properties as it used to be the case before the villagization. Most of these

households complained that common properties such as forests are now too far away and that they lacked vehicles and other means that can make accessing these properties easier. Some households (e.g. mostly elderly) also complained that they could not access common properties which are now a long distance away due to their ages and its associated health problems. Another common complaint concerned the lack of resources on common properties after resettlement. Some households expressed their displeasure, for example, about the lack of fishes in their current area of the river saying that the parts or areas of the rivers that they used to access before the villagization had more fish than the current parts. Also some households complained that common properties became too dangerous after resettlement due to the presence of snakes and other dangerous animals in some of the current areas which was not the case in their previous places. A displaced old man in Thatha village mentioned that this happened because the owners of the land were not consulted or informed that new people were coming to their land. Still some households complained about the restrictions on the use of common property such as forest from which they used to find a number of things that sustained their livelihood in their old villages.

Table 51

**Are you satisfied with current common property resources?**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
No	56	62.2	62.2	62.2
Partly	34	37.8	37.8	100.0
Total	90	100.0	100.0	

#### **4.9. Loss of access to public services**

Analysis of people's access to public services, that is, water, sanitation facilities, electricity, and education will be made in this section.

Regarding water, most 80 (88.9%) of the questioned households mentioned that they had no access to clean drinking water before the villagization. It was only few questioned households 10 (11.1%) that mentioned that they had access to clean drinking water before the villagization (table 52). This can be seen as a good outcome of the villagization program.

Table 52

**Did your household use to have access to clean drinking water?**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
No	80	88.9	88.9	88.9
Yes	10	11.1	11.1	100.0
Total	90	100.0	100.0	

The problem of limited access to clean drinking water however has not continued to be the case after villagization. Only 23 (25.6%) of the questioned households mentioned that they didn't have access to clean drinking water, but the remaining majority respondent households 67 (74.4%) mentioned that they got access to clean drinking water after villagization or resettlement (table 53). There is, however, serious complaints and dissatisfaction about the water services in the resettlement areas even by those who mentioned that they have access to them. The dissatisfaction with the access to clean drinking water here (even though more than half 67 (74.4%) of the questioned households mentioned that they have access to it), is brought by the fact that the resettlement areas have few hand pumps that the resettled households consider not enough. It is also brought by the fact that the few hand pumps in the resettlement areas never get fixed quickly whenever they get broken. In addition to many households, almost all the villages' leaders and some concerned district government officials also confirmed these problems as true. Moreover, a number of the resettled households complained that the hand pumps they received in the new areas are not only few but are also not of good quality compared to the ones that they knew have lasted long without breaking down in other places. Due to the limited number of hand pumps, they have to wait in a long line for a long time each day to fetch water. This long time spent waiting to fetch water from the few hand pumps in the resettlement villages could compel many resettlers to get themselves water from the nearby river, streams and sometimes from locally hand dug water holes. For this reason, some households complained of diarrhea and skin diseases. Many of them also mentioned that they are vulnerable to catching guinea worm which is one of the diseases in Gambella regional state. More research needs to be conducted by professionals in the fields of health to verify these claims. Compared to people's access to clean drinking water before resettlement, however, we can observe that there is an increase (from

11.1% to 74.4%) in the number of households having access to clean drinking water in the resettlement areas. Compare tables 52 and 53.

Table 53

**Does your household have access to clean drinking water?**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
No	23	25.6	25.6	25.6
Yes	67	74.4	74.4	100.0
Total	90	100.0	100.0	

Due to the reasons mentioned above (e.g. the limited number of hand pumps and hence limited availability of enough water, and the fact that they break and never get fixed quickly), there is serious problem with the use of people's sanitation facilities although very few of the households 4 (4.4%) mentioned to have access to sanitation facilities (hand dug pit latrines) after resettlement. Although this 4 (4.4%) is better than nothing compared to the life in which the households were in before the villagization took place, that is, when none of them had access to sanitation facilities (tables 54 and 55), the repeatedly broken water pumps and their small number hinder the use of these few facilities.

Table 54

**Did your household use to have access to sanitation facilities before resettlement?**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
No	90	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table 55

**Does your household currently have access to sanitation facilities in the resettlement villages?**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
No	86	95.6	95.6	95.6
Yes	4	4.4	4.4	100.0
Total	90	100.0	100.0	

This is the main reason why almost all 88 (97.8%) of the questioned households in the resettlement villages are negative about their current sanitation facilities (table 56). The



remaining 2 (2.2%) mentioned that they are neutral about their current satisfaction with sanitation facilities. Households were more positive before resettlement, stating that their life in the less populated areas was safer and better than the present life which requires them to depend so seriously on technology and modernization-related things and what happens whenever those things are not available or not provided sufficiently.

Table 56

**To what extent are you satisfied with the current available sanitation facilities?**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Neutral	2	2.2	2.2	2.2
Very negative	88	97.8	97.8	100.0
Total	90	100.0	100.0	

Households therefore require minimal awareness or support about the hygienic means of promoting health through prevention of human contact with the hazards of wastes as well as the proper disposal of waste materials. So availability or sufficient supply of facilities and services for the safe disposal of things like human urine and feces is very necessary. It is a plain fact that insufficient awareness on sanitation is a major cause of disease world-wide and improving sanitation is known to have a significant beneficial effect on health both in households and across communities. Therefore, simple technologies (e.g., awareness on the health benefit of pit latrines and hence digging and using them) or even simply awareness on personal hygiene practices (e.g., hand washing with soap, behavior change) is really necessary in the resettlement sites, at least, because the resettled population are now living in a populated areas. All these solutions are rarely or not at all available in the resettlement areas.

As for the electricity service, all 90 (100%) the questioned households mentioned that they didn't have access to this service both before and after villagization (tables 57 and 58). For this, almost all of the respondent households complained that they were cheated by the government using vacant promise since they were told by some government officials that they would have access to electricity in the villages to which they were migrating.

Table 57

**Did your household formerly use to have access to electricity?**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
No	90	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table 58

**Does your household currently have access to electricity?**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
No	90	100.0	100.0	100.0

Concerning the access to education, a distinction has been made between primary and secondary education. As mentioned earlier, the education level of most households was not too bad. Only 11.1 % haven't attended any formal education. The remaining household members attended schools and at various levels though not up to the level of colleges. For example, 3.3% of the questioned household members were 12 grade complete; 13.3% and 15.6% of them are 9 and 8 grades complete respectively, etc.(table 2).

As for the resettlers' children's education, all 90 (100%) of the questioned households mentioned that their children used to have access to primary education before the villagization. They also mentioned that their children still have access to primary school after the villagization (tables 59 and 60). However, as confirmed by the village leaders, district leaders, zonal leaders and some of the questioned households, the children used to travel long distances to reach primary schools before the villagization. This makes their children's current access to primary school better since they no longer travel the aforementioned long distances.

Table 59

**Did your children formerly use to go to primary school in the old village?**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	90	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table 60

**Do your children currently go to primary school in the current village?**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	90	100.0	100.0	100.0

Concerning the satisfaction or opinion with former primary educational services, 20 (22.2%) of the questioned households mentioned that they were very positive about it. The remaining 17 (18.9%), 45 (50.0%), and 8 (8.9%) mentioned that they were positive, neutral and negative respectively about the former primary educational services (table 61). Regarding the opinions about and satisfaction with the current (after villagization) primary educational services, 58.9% of the questioned households mentioned that they are very positive or very much satisfied. The remaining 22 (24.4%) and 15 (16.7%) mentioned that they were neutral and negative respectively (table 62). Various reasons have been mentioned by many of these households that led to their dissatisfaction with primary school services after the villagization, including the lack of drinking water and limited class rooms for the students in the schools. Also some households complained about the insufficient facilities in the primary schools saying that the primary schools lacked a number of things (including good latrines, enough benches, enough teachers, good roofs, etc.).

Table 61

**To what extent were you satisfied with the former primary educational services?**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
very positive	20	22.2	22.2	22.2
positive	17	18.9	18.9	41.1
neutral	45	50.0	50.0	91.1
negative	8	8.9	8.9	100.0
Total	90	100.0	100.0	

Table 62

**To what extent are you satisfied with the current primary educational services?**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
very positive	53	58.9	58.9	58.9
neutral	22	24.4	24.4	83.3
negative	15	16.7	16.7	100.0
Total	90	100.0	100.0	

Access to secondary education, on the other hand, decreased from 40 (44.4%) to 15 (16.7%) after villagization or resettlement. Majority of the questioned households 75 (83.3%) complained that they couldn't send their children to secondary schools. Only a very few households 15 (16.7%) mentioned that their children went to secondary school after villagization (tables 63 and 64).

Table 63

**Did your children formerly go to secondary school?**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
No	50	55.6	55.6	55.6
Yes	40	44.4	44.4	100.0
Total	90	100.0	100.0	

Figure.64

**Do your children currently go to secondary school?**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
No	75	83.3	83.3	83.3
Yes	15	16.7	16.7	100.0
Total	90	100.0	100.0	

There are two main reasons for this (firstly the lack of money due to the decreased farm sizes and income earned through other means, and secondly the absence of secondary schools nearby). The lack of money can be explained by the new situation after villagization in which the households earn far less money than before villagization due to decreased farm sizes and decline of income earned through other means such as common properties which are now hard to access by many households. The absence of secondary schools in the new resettlement sites (except in Abol-Kiir village of Gambella district) used to be the case in the old places also (before villagization) where the students were compelled to travel on daily basis to other villages or district headquarters which were in some cases very long distances away. A major problem which was mentioned by many households was that the students who used to travel to the far away distances on daily basis when they were in the old villages sometimes couldn't travel to those far away secondary schools when heavy rainfalls make the roads impassable or the same destroys their

exercise books. So when in the old villages, some of the children were forced to permanently move to other villages or district headquarters to go further with their studies in secondary schools. Moving permanently to where there were secondary schools was, however, possible only for households who had enough money to provide for their children to live outside their home villages. The villages’ leaders and some of the interviewed districts and zone officials, as well as, the drop out students who couldn’t go for further studies after they finished the primary levels confirmed this problem as true.

It is for these reasons that majority 80 (88.9%) of the questioned households feel very negative and only the remaining few respondent households 10 (11.1%) feel very positive about the secondary education after the villagization compared to the 10 (11.1%), 22 (24.4%) and 58 (64.4%) of the questioned households who mentioned that they were ‘very positive’, ‘neutral’ and ‘very negative’ respectively, when asked about the extent of their satisfaction with secondary education before villagization (tables 65 and 66). From here, we can observe that the questioned households like the secondary education services that they had in the old villages more than the ones in the new villages.

A comparison between the government’s contend that villagization is being undertaken to ensure more efficient delivery of services to rural populations and the fact that secondary schools are completely not available in majority of the resettlement villages, makes the government’s claim a belied one. From this, one can conclude that failure to provide promised infrastructure that used to be major failing of Ethiopia’s past resettlement and villagization efforts, as mentioned by T. Assefa, 2005, remains so today

Table 65

**To what extent were you formerly satisfied with the secondary educational services?**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
very positive	10	11.1	11.1	11.1
neutral	22	24.4	24.4	35.6
very negative	58	64.4	64.4	100.0
Total	90	100.0	100.0	

Table 66

**To what extent are you currently satisfied with the secondary educational services?**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
very positive	10	11.1	11.1	11.1
very negative	80	88.9	88.9	100.0
Total	90	100.0	100.0	

International human rights law grants for the right to education and call for governments to provide universal and compulsory primary education. Many of the questioned households mentioned that they had been a bit hopeful about resettling to the new villages in part because they were persuaded that their children would be closer to both primary and secondary schools. But, in addition to the complete absence of secondary schools in the resettlement villages, (except in Abol-Kiir village of Gambella district), they found out that even the primary schools that their children attend in the new sites lacked a number of things (including limited teachers, safe drinking water, toilets, limited benches, etc).

For secondary education, some children continue to walk long distances to access secondary schools in other villages or, in most cases, in districts' headquarters. To make things worse, a number of their children who finished their primary school levels are staying at home without going for further studies.

Another past (during the villagization process) problem is that most of the questioned households mentioned that there were problems with their children in various schools. Students were forced by local government officials, militias and some village leaders to provide labor for the construction of the traditional houses at the new resettlement sites. They mentioned that warnings such as 'one won't sit on the grade 8 and grade 10 examinations' were used to compel students at various academic levels to provide labor (cutting grass, poles, etc) for constructions which were going on in the new resettlement sites.

One more problem that the questioned households mentioned that hindered their children from going to schools was absence of food in the resettlement sites as a result of diminished farm sizes and bad farmland qualities. Many households also mentioned that they don't have money to make their children move permanently to other villages to continue with their secondary education as they used to do in their old villages where they produced enough food that could be

used both for household consumption as well as for the market. Many households also complained about the very little financial income they get (in the resettlement sites) from the common properties (forests and rivers) for their own consumption and the market activities.

**4.10. Suppression of Dissent**

Concerning suppression of dissent, all 90 (100%) of the questioned households mentioned that they witnessed or heard about it (table 67). This was also confirmed by some village leaders, present and former officials who had leadership positions in the government who mentioned that villagers and government officials couldn't voice their dissents about the villagization without fear of being attacked by policemen, army and other people who consider themselves as government's loyalists. They confirmed that suppression of dissent was mostly carried out through various sorts of mistreatment and baseless charges against people of all backgrounds (villagers, officials, youth, police, etc) by twisting anything that they say in opposition to villagization program into something bad in the eye of the government. Through this tactic in which all community's mechanism for expressing views or constructive dialogue was blocked, the loyalist government officials have managed to effectively silence any public opposition to the villagization program. A number of households also mentioned that to make this tactic very effective, the army or police were present at public meetings even when those meetings were not about villagization program. Two district officials mentioned that this was intentionally done so that the army or the police's presence could intimidate the people given the fact that all people are aware of problems or mistreatment that some of the villagers, opposing officials, youth and students faced in the hands of policemen and the army in relation to villagization issues. These same district administrators mentioned that some of these mistreatments (beating, imprisonment, harassment, arbitrary arrests etc,) were carried out by the security forces both openly and secretly. They further went ahead to claim that perhaps the former, that is open or public mistreatment, was to exhibit what would happen to those that may oppose the government's villagization policy in the future.

Table 67

**Did you witness or hear of any suppression of dissent in your village or other villages regarding villagization program?**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	90	100.0	100.0	100.0

Suppressing of dissent was one of the serious human rights violations during the villagization program. The questioned households mentioned various problems that members of the resettled population, zone and district officials, students, village and traditional leaders, who showed their dissent about the villagization program faced as a result of their negative opinions about the resettlement program. 16 (17.8%) of the questioned households mentioned that they heard or knew that people who showed their dissent about the villagization program were dismissed from their jobs; 35 (38.9%) mentioned that they heard or knew about people who got demoted for disagreeing with the government’s villagization program plan; 7 (7.8%) of the questioned households mentioned that they heard or knew about people who got beaten up because of their negative opinions concerning the villagization program; still 5 (5.6%) of the questioned households mentioned that they heard or knew some people got imprisoned or arrested because they showed their dissent about the villagization program; and lastly 27 (30.0%) of the questioned households mentioned that they heard or knew people who got harassed or isolated in the community because they didn’t show any sign of cooperation regarding the villagization program (table 68).

Some village leaders and government officials confirmed this problem by adding that any person who showed any sign of disagreement with the government’s villagization program or asked a tough question about it was considered to be an anti-government or a rebel who is provoking his village members to reject the government’s development policy. They mentioned that all this beatings, imprisonment, demotion, dismissal and harassments were carried out to make sure that none of these community members speak up against the villagization program next time here and in other villages, but instead be cooperative in the mobilization of villagers in favor of the program.

Table 68

**What did you know or hear that happened to the people who showed dissent about villagization?**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Dismissal from job	16	17.8	17.8	17.8
Demotion	35	38.9	38.9	56.7
Beating	7	7.8	7.8	64.4
Imprisonment or arrest	5	5.6	5.6	70.0
Isolation or harassment	27	30.0	30.0	100.0
Total	90	100.0	100.0	



Although the main official assertion is that the villagization program was executed chiefly to make certain that better government services reached to rural populations in Gambella, there are proves that all or some former farmlands that used to belong to the villagers are made available for investors who are doing commercial agriculture. As can be observed from the questioned households' reactions in table 69 below, only 7 (7.8%) of the questioned households know that they are still the owners of their former lands. 25 (27.8%) of them mentioned that their former farmlands are no more theirs, but the investors'. 58 (64.4%) of the questioned households mentioned that they don't know who currently owns their former farmlands. Most of these mentioned that they don't even go around their former farmlands to see what is happening on them or who owns them.

Some of the few 25 (27.8%) who mentioned that their former farmlands now belong to investors said that some government officials to whom they are related told them that their lands were included into the major lands that got leased to investors. Some of them mentioned that they saw their former farmlands being cultivated by investors. A government official in Gambella periphery district confirmed this as true by saying that even the former farmlands that the villagers claim that it is still theirs were already secretly taken. He claimed that a time will come in which all the lands that the resettled villagers left behind (including the ones that belong to the villagers who claim to own them) will be cultivated by the investors in their eyes. He argued that going to one's former farmland and eating two or three mango fruits that didn't attract the monkeys' attention doesn't mean that one still owns that land; it is when one still cultivates it and get all of its yields every year.

In Abobo woreda, however, the issue of former farmlands that belonged to the resettled villagers seems plain. Some of the questioned households mentioned that they were told by government officials that their former farmlands won't be left as bushes without planting something on them. They mentioned that they were told that people with better technologies might come to cultivate them and that they (villagers) would also benefit from what those people would produce. A district official in Abobo district mentioned that one thing that is or will probably be a prove to the official claim mentioned above is the fact that farmers in Abobo district received small bags of rice that were distributed by Saudi Star company more than a year ago.

Table 69

**Who owns your former land now?**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
I own it	7	7.8	7.8	7.8
One of the foreign or local investors	25	27.8	27.8	35.6
I don't know	58	64.4	64.4	100.0
Total	90	100.0	100.0	

## Chapter Five

### Conclusion and Recommendations

#### 5.1. Conclusion

After analyzing the resettlers' situation before and after the villagization program in the study area, the researcher found both positive and negative aspects of villagization program which led to various conclusions. Regarding risks such as Landlessness, joblessness, food insecurity, loss of access to common property, loss of access to public services (electricity, secondary school, etc) and social disintegration, the resettlers in research villages (except Abol-Kiir which has access to high school) the researcher found that they are vulnerable to all the risks mentioned above. While comparing the accessibility to secondary school education in the nine research villages, it has increased only in Abol-Kiir village of Gambella district after the villagization program. The lack of access to secondary school was, however, more severe in the other eight resettlement villages.

This research study has delineated the villagization program, resettlement process and the actual situation of the re-settled population as of now and during the resettlement process in the nine resettlement villages in Anywaa, including the prevailing risks and the human rights issues faced by the resettlers throughout the villagization program. All these combined, the findings answer the central question:

*What is the impact of villagization program on the human rights of the resettled communities in Anywaa zone and to what extent are involuntarily resettled communities vulnerable to human rights violations?*

Resettled households in the nine resettlement villages heavily experienced interconnected risks of landlessness, joblessness, food insecurity, lack of access to common property and lack of access to public services. Despite the fact that there were differences among different groups of the population who were affected by the villagization program (such as women-headed households, elder(s) etc.) and among the resettlement villages, almost all households became more impoverished after resettlement. Lack of compensation, poor land quality and absence of aid in various forms to sustain the lives of the resettled households in the new villages, are one of

the compound and major causes of this high vulnerability. Specifically the bad quality of land after villagization was a very serious issue since it made it impossible to undertake traditional agricultural practices on which the resettlers heavily rely, leading to problems of joblessness and food insecurity. Therefore, resettled population had to find other possibilities (e.g., dependency on civil servant relatives and the ones in the western world) for sustaining their livelihoods. This livelihood sustenance means was identified in all the nine villages due to its repeated mention by the resettled populations. It, however, according to most households could not sustain to the desired level the lives of the resettled populations who benefit from it. Moreover, not all the resettled populations are beneficiaries of this life sustenance means, since most of the households don't have such relatives. For these reasons, the resettled populations have fallen short about getting into a better life as stipulated and promised in the resettlement plan or retaining even their resilience. This absence of resilience among the resettled households can be elucidated by the lack of reliable means and capacity of the households to tackle their problems which would have enabled them to adapt to the new environment.

The absence of adaptive means and capacity of the re-settled households can be explained by using the attributes of the local adaptive capacity framework that normally helps in responding to variability of and change in situations. In addition to this, the characteristic 'asset base' decreased significantly after the villagization program. More importantly, people's natural capital (common properties), financial capital and physical (psychological) capital diminished badly due to the prevailing risks. The resettled people's existing human capital was often insufficient to get over with the new circumstances since their skills and knowledge was mostly dependent upon traditional agricultural practices that became of little use after the villagization which threw the resettlers in the areas which are hard to cultivate using simple tools and dependence on rain water. Households had prior information/knowledge concerning the situation after villagization program (regarding land quality for example) but lacked things (e.g., fertilizers, tools, etc) that could have possibly made them adapt the new environment. The resettled households were not compensated for their assets that they lost to villagization- an act that would have sustained their lives. Moreover, there were no attempts that were made to assist the resettled population with adapting to the new environment in the resettlement villages and the potential consequences of households' villagization or resettlement were not sufficiently dealt with.

Furthermore, for the resettlers to live a good life after the villagization, it is so important that they get demands and voices heard and have control or influence on the terms and conditions of their own resettlement. However, this was completely missing in all the nine resettlement villages. This thesis confirms the findings of Artati (2011) and McLinden (2011): free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) was absent for the majority respondent resettlers in the nine villages. The households had no influential choices but to agree with whatever they were told in some sort of persuasion and then move for the wider public interest and they did so out of some sort of fear that they might be targeted if they objected. This is in conformity with the public-interest perspective, which justifies projects and programs when they have net advantages for the population as a whole (for example, economic development). So this is still the substantial situation in Anywaa zone.

To conclude, this thesis' research findings exhibit that the villagization program in Anywaa zone is far from sustainable since it has brought with it numerous hardship on the resettlers. Important aspects of sustainability such as inter-generational equity, participation, poverty reduction, social justice and human-centeredness were not taken into consideration.

## **5.2. Recommendations**

Multiple recommendations can be made so as to enhance the situation of the displaced households.

One of the most important recommendations is to support the rights under the FDRE constitution as well as international human rights law of Gambella's indigenous populations both prior to and after any further villagization program.

The other ones include implementation of just, fair and equitable compensation procedures, reliable land tenure registration system, sufficient redress for the resettled households, genuinely voluntary resettlement, involvement of members in all aspects of planning and decision making in future villagization program without fear of being targeted and mistreated for being against the government's decisions; and to uphold the resettled populations with taking on adaptation means and strategies.

As confirmed by the findings, the resettled villagers in nine research villages were entirely not supported with provision of new material inputs (fertilizers, tools, etc) and new activities to enhance their lives. These material inputs and activities are however fundamental since

agricultural activities which are traditional ones became largely incapable of being carried out after the villagization program.

Much more support need to be given to augment the resettled population's adaptive capacity, by rendering them the means, skills and knowledge to select and take on the suitable adaptation strategies.

In order to grant the right assistance, it is important that the resettled population's demand get considered and voices get heard. This is to mean that the one-way information transfer (e.g. from the program developers and the government to the resettled populations) that used to be the only way of information transfer during the villagization program, is not enough.

The government, its concerned officials and project developers need to fit the villagization program to the capacities, customs and needs of the resettled people. Therefore, research findings (like the ones in this particular thesis) could play a fundamental role in rendering this information. In addition to this, the research is also a very important source to apprise the general public about the issues of the displaced, which could augment (international) public pressure to ameliorate the situation of the displaced people. Lobbyists such as public pressure groups play a crucial role in spreading this information. The internet, as mentioned by Michelle (2011) can be used as tool to disseminate and share this information. State rules and regulations, however, have to seriously be taken into consideration when diffusing or sharing information concerning this particular topic.

In order to enhance any future villagization program, it is very important that the national villagization and resettlement policies are actually implemented or amended if need be. Any of the bottlenecks that prevents the just and effective execution and amendment of these policies, like corruption (as identified by Michelle, 2011, for example) need to be dealt with via debarment, legislation, integrity pacts and so on.

Sound and just 'Risks Reversals' such as community rebuilding, social inclusion, reemployment, improved health care, house reconstruction, adequate nutrition, restoration of services and community assets, compensation, etc, can be achieved by blending the aforementioned recommendations.

Lastly but not the least, it is crucial to emphasize that involuntary development-induced resettlement of people should always be avoided as much as possible. This is because the free,

prior and informed consent (FPIC) will be violated no matter what since people cannot make a decision to stay in their place of interest, because they do not have the freedom to shape their own lives.

This particular thesis has scrutinized to what extent displaced households were vulnerable to human rights violations seen in light with risks of landlessness, joblessness, food insecurity, a bit of health issues, lack of access to common property such as forests and rivers and lack of access to public services such as electricity and school). The researcher feels that in every risk which has been undertaken to study the whole villagization process, the element of human rights violation existed in each of the risks and denial of adequate compensation and other promised facilities by the government confirms that the human rights were violated. However, there were instances where some of the respondents approved the villagization and were beneficiaries but a large population of the researched villages was deprived of the benefits.

More research could be carried out regarding the other risks that are not investigated here (e.g. marginalization and homelessness). In addition to this, the risk 'health' could be investigated further by experts (students and researchers) of this area. This is because although health issues have slightly been identified or touched, it remained obscure whether these issues were direct causes of the villagization program. Moreover, more research could be carried out in Anywaa zone, concerning the difference in impact of villagization on the human rights of other ethnic groups since part of the population who were affected by the villagization program here is Majager/Majang ethnic group.

## References

- Aalen, L. 2002. *Ethnic Federalism in a Dominant Party System: The Ethiopian Experience 1991-2000*. Chr. Michelson Institute, Development Studies and Human Rights
- Abebe Zeleul, (2001), *Urban Renewal in Addis Ababa: a Case study of Sheraton Addis and Casanchis Projects* Addis Ababa: Ethiopian Civil Service College.
- Abraham Sewonet, 2002. *Breaking the Cycle of Conflict in Gambella Region: UN-Emergencies Unit for Ethiopia*.
- Adams, J., Khan, H. T. A., Raeside, R. & White, D. (2007). *Research method for graduate business and social science students*. USA: Sage Publications Inc.
- African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights, Case 276 /2003, Centre for Minority Rights Development (Kenya) and Minority Rights Group International on behalf of Endorois Welfare Council v Kenya (February 4, 2010),  
[http://www.hrw.org/sites/default/files/related\\_material/2010\\_africa\\_commission\\_ruling\\_0.pdf](http://www.hrw.org/sites/default/files/related_material/2010_africa_commission_ruling_0.pdf);  
<http://www.hrw.org/en/news/2010/02/04/kenya-landmark-ruling-indigenous-land-rights>).
- Artati, Y. (2011), *Water-induced displacement in ThuaThien Hue province: the impacts of hydropower dams on livelihood of forest dependent people*. University of Utrecht.
- Bahargava, R. 2005. 'The Evolution and Distinctiveness of India's Linguistic Federalism'. In: Turton, D. (ed.) *Ethnic Federalism: The Ethiopian Experience in a Comparative Perspective*, James Curry.
- Berhanu Zeleke, (2006), *Impact of Urban Redevelopment on the Livelihood of Displaced People in Addis Ababa: The case of Casanchis Local Development Plan*, Addis Ababa.
- Bisht, T.C. (2009). *Development-Induced displacement and women: The case of the Tehri Dam, India*. *Asia Pacific Journal of Anthropology* 10 (4), pp. 301-317.
- CSA (2007) Office of Population and Housing Census Commission, Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, "2007 Gambella Census", 2007, <http://www.csa.gov.et/>.
- CSA (2007). *Gambella Census*," <http://www.csa.gov.et/>, and "1994 Population and Housing Census of Ethiopia: Results for Amhara Region," vol. 1, part 1.
- Cernea, M.M. (1997). *Hydropower Dams and Social Impacts: A Sociological Perspective*. The World Bank.



Cernea, M.M. (2000). Risks, Safeguards, and Reconstruction: A Model for Population Displacement and Resettlement. In Cernea, M.M. & C. McDowell (eds.) (2000), Risks and Reconstruction: Experiences of Resettlers and Refugees. Washington, DC: The World Bank.

Cernea, M.M. (2003), For a new economics of resettlement: a sociological critique of the compensation principle. *International Social Science Journal* 55 (175), pp. 37-46.

Cernea, M.M. (2008), Compensation and benefit sharing: Why resettlement policies and practices must be reformed. *Water Science and Engineering* 1 (1), pp. 89-120.

Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (CESCR), General Comment No. 7 on the right to adequate house; forced evictions (1993), para. 3.

Conclusions and Recommendations of the Committee against Torture regarding the fourth periodic report of Greece, UN Doc. CAT/C/CR/33/2 (10/12/2004), sec. 5(j), Annex 31.

Constitution of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, No. 1/1995, art.40(5).

Chambers, R., & Conway, G., (1991). Sustainable Rural Livelihoods: Practical Concepts for the 21st Century. (Online) Available at: <http://www.smallstock.info/reference/IDS/dp296.pdf>

Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, General Recommendation 23 on Indigenous Peoples (Fifty-First Session, 1997) U.N. Doc. A/52/18, Annex V.

Courtland Robinson, W. (2003). Risks and Rights: The Causes, Consequences, and Challenges of Development-Induced Displacement. Washington DC: The Brookings Institution.

Dao, N. (2010). Dam Development in Vietnam: The Evolution of Dam-Induced Resettlement Policy. *Water Alternatives* 3 (2), pp. 324-340.

Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, G.A. Res. 61/295, U.N. Doc. A/RES/47/1 (2007)).

Denney M., (2012): Land Investment, Development, and Environmental Protection in Gambella, Ethiopia.

Dereje Feyissa, (2009): A National Perspective on the Conflict in Gambella. In: Proceedings of the 16th International Conference of Ethiopian Studies, ed. by Svein Ege, Harald Aspen, Birhanu Teferra and Shiferaw Bekele, Trondheim 2009.

De Wet, C. (2002), Improving outcomes in development-induced displacement and resettlement projects. *Forced Migration Review* 12.

Drydyk, J. (2007), Unequal benefits: the ethics of development-induced displacement. *Georgetown Journal of International Affairs* 8 (1), pp. 105-113.

Enon, J.C (1998), Educational Research Statistics and Measurement. Kampala: Makerere University Press.

Gambella Peoples' National Regional State Villagization Program Action Plan (2003 EFY), August 2002 E.C Gambella.

Gebre Selassie S & Sisay H (2001), Transformation of Conflict and Local Capacity for Peace in Gambella Region: Ethiopia, Addis Ababa University, January, Addis Ababa.

Genocide Watch, "The Anuak of Ethiopia" (2004) <http://www.genocidewatch.org/Ethiopia.TheAnuakofEthiopia.pdf>, and Human Rights Watch.

Global Forest Coalition (2008). Indigenous peoples and the right to free, prior and informed consent [online]. <http://www.globalforestcoalition.org/wp-content/uploads/2010/12/Short-Guide-to-Indigenous-Peoples-Rights.pdf> [Cited: 14-2-2014].

Hagmann, T. 2005 "Confronting the Concept of Environmentally Induced Conflict," *Peace, Conflict and Development*, Issue

Human Rights Watch/Africa, *Evil Days: Thirty Years of War and Famine in Ethiopia*, (New York: Human Rights Watch, September 1991), <http://www.hrw.org/reports/1991/09/01/evil-days-thirty-years-war-and-famine-ethiopia>.

Inter-American Commission on Human Rights, "Indigenous and Tribal Peoples' Rights over their Ancestral Lands and Natural Resources," 2009, <http://www.cidh.org/countryrep/Indigenous-Lands09/Chap.VI.htm> (accessed October 22, 2013)).

Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre, "Ethiopia: Monitoring of conflict, human rights violations and resulting displacement still problematic," January 20, 2011,

<http://www.internaldisplacement.org/8025708F004CE90B/%28httpCountrySummaries%29/ABE954230B08D5B5C125781700374C91?OpenDocument&count=10000>.

International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), adopted in December 16, 1966, G.A. Res. 2200A (XXI), 21 U.N. GAOR Supp. (No. 16) at 52, U.N. Doc. A/6316 (1966), 999 U.N.T.S. 171, and entered into force in March 23, 1976

International Labour Organization, Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention, 1989 (No. 169), art.1(2)).

Jason. S (2003). Financing Matters: Where funding arrangements meet resettlement in three Mexican dam projects RSC Working Paper No. 14. United Kingdom University of Oxford.

Keller, E. 2002. Ethnic Federalism, Fiscal Reform, Development and Democratisation in Ethiopia. African Journal of Political Science. V.7, N.1

MacKay, F. (2004). Indigenous peoples' right to free, prior and informed consent and the World Bank's Extractive Industries Review. Sustainable Development Law & Policy 4 (2), pp. 1-42.

Maldonado, J.K. (2012). A new path forward: Researching and reflecting on forced displacement and resettlement. Journal of Refugee Studies 25 (2), pp. 193-220.

Martínez-Cobo, (1986). The Study of the problem of discrimination against indigenous populations, E/CN.4/Sub.2/1986/7, 1986 (known as the Martínez-Cobo Study).

McDonald-Wilmsen. B. & M. Webber (2010), Dams and displacement: Raising the standards and broadening the research agenda. Water alternatives 3 (2), pp. 142-161.

McLindenNuijen, M. (2011), Power to the people: hydropower resettlement compensation, democratic land governance and participation in NôngDân village, Central Vietnam.

MulatuWubne, "Resettlement and Villagization," in Thomas P. Ofcansky and LaVerle Berry, eds., A Country Study: Ethiopia (Library of Congress Federal Research Division, 1991), <http://lcweb2.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/r?frd/cstdy:@field%28DOCID+et0056%29>.

Nebiyu Baye, (2000), *The Impact of Development-Induced Urban Resettlement Scheme on Relocated Households: The case of Sheraton Addis Hotel Project*. MA Thesis, Addis Ababa University, and School of Graduate Studies: Addis Ababa.

- Nowak, M. 2005. UN Covenant on Civil and Political Rights: CCPR Commentary (Kehl: NP Engel, 2005, 2nd ed.), p. 651).
- Oakland Institute, “Understanding Land Investment Deals in Africa: Country Report: Ethiopia,” 2011, <http://media.oaklandinstitute.org/understanding-land-investment-deals-africa-ethiopia>, (accessed December 4, 2014).
- Parlak, Z.G. (2007). Dams and sustainable development. Bursa: Uludag University.
- Penz, P. (2002), Development, displacement and ethics. *Forced Migration Review* 12, pp. 4-5.
- Penz, P. (1997). The ethics of development-induced displacement. *Refuge* 16 (3), pp. 37-43.
- Price, S. (2009), Prologue: Victims or Partners? The Social Perspective in Development-Induced Displacement and Resettlement. *The Asia Pacific Journal of Anthropology* 10 (4), pp. 266-282.
- Proclamation No. 455/2005, Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, <http://www.ethiopian-law.com/federal-laws/substantive-law-legislations/property-and-land-laws/land-laws/150-expropriation-of-land-for-public-purposes-proc-no-455-2005.html> (accessed August 13, 2014).
- Sandra Steingraber, “Resettlement and Villagization – Tools of Militarization in SW Ethiopia,” *Militarization and Indigenous Peoples: Part 2 Africa, Asia, and the Middle East*, 1987, <http://www.culturalsurvival.org/ourpublications/csqa/article/resettlement-and-villagization-tools-militarization-sw-ethiopia>.
- Scudder, T. and Colson A. M. (1996), 'Water management for the conservation of the Kafue wetlands, Zambia and the practicalities of artificial flood releases', pp. 101-6 in Acreman, M.C. and Hollis, G.E. *Water Management and Wetlands in Sub-Saharan Africa*. Gland, Switzerland: IUCN.
- S. James Anaya, 1996. *Indigenous Peoples in International Law*, Oxford University Press: New York, pp. 104-107
- Stanley, J. (2004). *Development-induced displacement and resettlement*. Refugee Studies Centre.
- Suberu, R. 2006. ‘Federalism and the Management of Ethnic Conflict: The Nigerian Experience’. In: Turton (ed.) *Ethnic Federalism*.

T. Assefa, “Resettlement Impact on Environment and Host Communities,” unpublished paper, December 19, 2005, Forum for Social Studies).

Teck-Hong, T. and Waheed, A.(2011).*Herzberg’s motivation-hygiene theory and job satisfaction in the Malaysian retail sector: The mediating effect of love of money.* Asian Academy of Management Journal, Vol. 16, No. 1, 73–94.

Tesfaye Teklu, 2005, “Land Scarcity, Tenure Change and Public Policy in the African Case of Ethiopia: Evidence on Efficacy and Unmet Demands for Land Rights,” 2005, <http://homepages.wmich.edu/~asefa/Conference%20and%20Seminar/Papers/2005%20papers/Tesfaye%20Teklu%20on%20Land%20Tenure%20in%20Ethiopia.pdf> (accessed November 20, 2014), p.6.)

The African Charter on Human and Peoples’ Rights also called the African [Banjul] Charter on Human and Peoples’ Rights, adopted June 27, 1981, OAU Doc. CAB/LEG/67/3 rev. 5, 21 I.L.M. 58 (1982

The Mayagna (Sumo) AwasTingni Community v. Nicaragua, Judgment of August 31, 2001, Inter-Am. Ct. H.R., (Ser. C) No. 79 (2001), secs. 151-152,<http://www1.umn.edu/humanrts/iachr/AwasTingnicase.html>)

UN Commission on Human Rights, Resolution 1993/77, para. 1

UN Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, Fact Sheet No.25, Forced Evictions and Human Rights, Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action (Part 1, para. 30 (A/CONF.157/24 (Part 1), Chapter 3. (<http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Publications/FactSheet25en.pdf>, (accessed June 22, 2014)).

Universal Declaration of Human Rights, G.A. res. 217A (III), U.N. Doc A/810 at 71 (1948), art. 17.- Banjul Charter, art. 14, “The right to property shall be guaranteed.

United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues, “Frequently Asked Questions: Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples,” <http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/documents/FAQsindigenousdeclaration.pdf> (accessed December 10, 2014)

United Nations, Report of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights and fundamental freedoms of indigenous people, Rodolfo Stavenhagen, UN Doc. A/HRC/4/32 (2007), sec. 79, annex 15

World Commission on Dam (2000). Dams and Development A new framework for decision-making. London: Earthscan Publications Ltd.

USAID Land Tenure and Property Rights Portal, “USAID Program Brief: Land Tenure and Property Rights in Ethiopia,” 2011, <http://usaidlandtenure.net/usaidltp/products/program-briefs/program-brief-ethiopia> (accessed October 11, 2014), p. 1.

World Bank (2004). Involuntary Resettlement Sourcebook: Planning and Implementation in Development Projects by the World Bank. Washington DC: World Bank.

## Appendices



**Appendix 1:** Map Gambella People National Regional State. The heavily shaded part of the map shows the three districts (Gambella Zuria, Abobo and Gog) of the proposed research.

Source: UNOCHA (United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs)

## Appendix 2: questionnaire for household survey

### Questionnaire information

Name of interviewer	
Questionnaire number	
Date of interview (dd/mm/year)	

### General information of respondent

#### 1. Village:

- 1- Abol-Kiir
- 2- Nyikwo
- 3- Kobon
- 4- Chobo-Kiir
- 5- Pokedi
- 6- Abari-Meti
- 7- Pochalla
- 8- Gog-dipaach
- 9- Thatha

#### 2. Amount and type of household members:

Type	Respondent	Age	Gender	Education	Occupancy
Husband					
Wife					
Children					

#### 3. Resettlement process

##### Part 1: Free prior and informed consent

##### 1. Place before resettlement:

.....

##### 2. Period of resettlement (dd/mm/year):

.....

##### 3. Were you informed about the resettlement process prior to this event?

- 1) Yes



2) No (continue with question 10)

**4. When were you informed about the resettlement process? (dd/mm/year):**

.....

**5. Information sources of the resettlement process:**

- a) Village leader
- b) Neighbor(s), friends, family
- c) Printed media
- d) People's committee
- e) District leaders

**6a. what did you know through these sources about the resettlement process?**

.....  
.....  
.....

**6b. what was promised by these sources?**

- 1) Money
- 2) Land
- 3) Training
- 4) Other(s), namely.....
- 5) Nothing
- 6) 2 and 4

**7. Did you give your consent regarding the resettlement process?**

- 1) Yes
- 2) No

**8. Did you participate in decision-making regarding the resettlement process?**

- 1) Yes
- 2) No

9. Were your 'resettlement' wishes/needs/demands taken into account? Please use the following Likert scale table to tell your feeling

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1. Your 'resettlement' demands were taken into account	5	4	3	2	1
	Very positive	positive	uncertain	Negative	Very negative
2. Tell your opinion about the resettlement process	5	4	3	2	1

**Part 2: Compensation**

1. Have you received any form of compensation?

1) Yes

2) No, but land (continue with question 1 in the landlessness' table)

3. If applicable, for what purpose(s) has the financial compensation been used? (more answers possible)

- a) Housing..... Birr
- b) Furniture.....Birr
- c) Savings.....Birr
- d) Daily expenditures.....Birr
- e) Land.....Birr
- f) Others, namely.....Birr

**Risks**

**Landlessness**

Question No.	Questions	Former village	Current village
1	How much land do you have?	.....ha	.....ha
2	What is the main	1) Agriculture .....ha	1) Agriculture .....ha

	type of land use of your land? (more answers possible)	2) Forestry .....ha 3) Garden ..... ha 4) Other(s), namely.....ha 5) 1 and 3	2) Forestry ..... ha 3) Garden .....ha 4) Other(s), namely.....ha 5) 1 and 3
3	What kind of crops do you plant on your agricultural land? (more answers possible)	1) Maize 2) Sorghum 3) Other(s), namely..... 4) 1,2 and 3	1) Maize 2) Sorghum 3) Other(s), namely..... 4) 1,2 and 3
4	Do you sell your crops or use it for own consumption?	1) Selling crops 2) Using crops for own consumption 3) Both	1) Selling crops 2) Using crops for own consumption 3) Both
5	How is the condition of your land?	1) Very good 2) Good 3) Bad 4) Very bad	1) Very good 2) Good 3) Bad 4) Very bad
6	Is your land registered?	1) Yes 2) No	1) Yes 2) No

**Joblessness**

Question No.	Questions	Former village	Current village
1	Average monthly household income (Birr)	-----	-----
2	Main household sources of income (per month on average in Birr)	a) Agriculture ..... b) Garden ..... c) Forestry..... d) Fishing .....	a) Agriculture ..... b) Garden ..... c) Forestry..... d) Fishing .....

		e) Livestock ..... f) Construction ..... g) Small scale business ..... h) Other(s), namely ..... i) 1,2,3 and 4	e) Livestock ..... f) Construction ..... g) Small scale business ..... h) Other(s), namely ..... i) 1,2,3 and 4
--	--	---	---

**4. Has the resettlement process led to a loss of income sources?**

- 1) Yes
- 2) No

**5. Which economic activities have been lost due to the resettlement process?**

.....

.....

.....

.....

**Food security & Health**

Question No.	Questions	Former village	Current village
1	How much food crops do you produce (kg per year)?	..... kg per year	..... kg per year
2	How much food crops do you produce for own use/consumption (kg per year)?	..... kg per year	..... kg per year
3	Does the food crop production satisfy your own nutritional needs?	a) Yes b) Partly c) Not at all	a) Yes b) Partly c) Not at all
4	How much of the households monthly income is spent on food (Birr)?	-----	-----

**6. Did your household experience any diseases after resettlement which were absent or less intensive before resettlement? If so, which one(s)?**

.....

.....

**Loss of common property**

Question No.	Questions	Former village	Current village
1	Do you have access to common property?	a) Yes b) No	a) Yes b) No
2	What type(s) of common property do you use?	a) Forests b) Rivers c) both forests and rivers	a) Forests b) Rivers c) both forests and rivers
3	What kind of activities is the common property used for? (more answers possible)	a) medicine b) food c) Other income generating activities, namely..... d) construction e) fishing, irrigation, bathing and washing, etc f) firewood g) hunting h) all of the above	a) medicine b) food c) Other income generating activities, namely..... d) construction e) fishing, irrigation, bathing and washing, etc f) firewood g) hunting h) all of the above
4	How much do you earn from these activities per month (Birr)?	-----	-----

**7. Are you satisfied with current common property resources?**

1- Yes

2- No

3-Partly,

because.....

.....

.....

**Public services**

Question No.	Questions	Former village	Current village
1	Does your household have access to clean drinking water?	a) Yes b) No	a) Yes b) No
2	Does your household have access to sanitation facilities?	a) Yes b) No	a) Yes b) No
3	To what extent are you satisfied with the available sanitation facilities?	a) Very positive b) Positive c) Neutral d) Negative e) Very negative f) No opinion	a) Very positive b) Positive c) Neutral d) Negative e) Very negative f) No opinion
4	Does your household have access to electricity?	a) Yes b) No	a) Yes b) No
5	If your answer to the above question is yes, then to what extent are you satisfied with the electricity facilities?	a) Very positive b) Positive c) Neutral d) Negative e) Very negative	a) Very positive b) Positive c) Neutral d) Negative e) Very negative
6	Do your children go to primary school?	a) Yes b)No, because.....	a) Yes b)No,because.....

7	To what extent are you satisfied with the primary educational services?	a) Very positive b) Positive c) Neutral d) Negative e) Very negative	a) Very positive b) Positive c) Neutral d) Negative e) Very negative
8	Do your children go to secondary school? (if applicable)	a) Yes b) No, because..... .....	a) Yes b) No, because..... .....
9	To what extent are you satisfied with the secondary educational services? (if applicable)	a) Very positive b) Positive c) Neutral d) Negative e) Very negative	a) Very positive b) Positive c) Neutral d) Negative e) Very negative
10	On whose land do you generate income?	a) Own land b) Land of others c) Common property d) Shifting cultivation e) 1,3 and 4 f) 1 and 3	a) Own land b) Land of others c) Common property d) Shifting cultivation e) 1,3 and 4 f) 1 and 3
11	Whose land do you use for own food consumption?	a) Own land b) Land of others c) Common property d) Shifting cultivation e) None	a) Own land b) Land of others c) Common property d) Shifting cultivation e) None

8) Did you witness or hear any suppression of dissent in your village or other villages regarding villagization?

1- Yes

2- No

**9) What did you that happened to the people who showed dissent the villagization?**

- 1- Dismissal from job
- 2- Demotion
- 3- Beating
- 4- Imprisonment
- 5- Isolation or harassment
- 6- Others

**10) Did you know or hear of people who fled to other villages, the bush or to another country just to avoid being targeted by authorities for not supporting the villagization program?**

- 1- Yes
- 2- No

**11) How do you describe the resettlement process?**

- 1) Voluntary
- 2) Forceful

**12) Which village do you prefer to live between the old and the new one?**

- 1) Old
- 2) New

**12) Who owns your former land currently?**

- 1) I still own it
- 2) One of the foreign or local investors
- 3) I don't know



## **Interview guide for the Government workers**

### **Social-legal issues**

- a) Has there been any displacement from the old villages?
- b) If yes, what people were displaced and when?
- c) Were there any guidelines set down by the government to follow during the exercise?
- d) Were the local people aware of those guidelines? If yes did they ask for them?
- e) Are there any international legal requirements regarding displacement that Ethiopia had to follow at the time of displacement and were they observed during evictions?
- f) In your opinion were the legal requirements observed in the process of displacement?
- g) What happened to these people after they were displaced from their original area?
- h) Can you tell me how relocation and resettlement has affected these people's livelihoods?
- i) In your capacity, what have you so far done to help them?
- j) Have your pleas to help these people been heard by both National and international governing bodies?
- k) What recommendations would you give to the government to better manage these programmes?

### **Distribution of land during the resettlement exercise**

- a) What were the grounds for land allocation in the new area?
- b) What were the conditions for eligibility to receive land?
- c) What was the procedure for choosing those conditions?
- d) What does the nature of distribution of plots in the resettlement areas say about gender equality?

### **The legality of displacement under the Ethiopian law**

- a) Who owned the land from where the people were evicted?
- b) Was their ownership recognized under the law?

- c) Under what conditions can displacement be acceptable?
- d) Were there any kind of agreements between the government and the displaced people and if yes of what nature were they?
- e) Do you think the people were on equal footing with the government in the agreement process?
- f) Were the displacees presented with other alternatives options than resettlement?
- g) What roles did the displacees play in making the terms of evictions and resettlement?
- h) Was there any kind of arrangement for the dissatisfied local people to seek redress?
- i) Do you feel the displacement/resettlement was carried out according to the law at the time?

**Dissemination of information**

- a) Did the government disseminate information to the affected people before actual displacement or resettlement took place? If yes, how was it carried out?

**Appendix 3:** Anywaa zone officials cutting construction grass in the intimidating presence of the police forces during the villagization program.



Resting after collecting the grass in one place.



A walk to construction grass site



Collectiong grass in one place



Back into the tall grass to cut some more



One of the women carrying her bundle. *Dividing grass cutting scissors in front of Abobo district council office. To the right is the the researcher*

