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Abstract
This paper focuses on contested notions and practices of development and resettlement in Ethiopia with particular reference to the implementation of resettlement programs in Gambella. Since 2010, the Ethiopian government launched large scale development plans as part of the Five Year Growth and Transformational Plan. Within this context, the government embarked on resettling pastoral and agro-pastoral communities in the peripheral regions of the country under the broader "vision" of improving the livelihood of the people. On the other hand, the resettlement program was criticized and interpreted differently by actors with competing perspectives and interests for its lack of consent (participation) of the people concerned and for its multidimensional socio-economic and environment consequences. Therefore, this study was conducted with the general objective of identifying the conflicting perspectives up on the program, seeing the process and impacts of the program, and its connection with Villagization from the views of different actors. To this end, interview, personal observation, and focus group discussion were intensively used with all concerned government officials, non-government actors, investors and local people during the data collection. As a method of data analysis, the Michael Carneal's resettlement based model has been used for analyzing the current and potential risks of the program. The findings of the study revealed that the implemented resettlement program and the resultant outcome called "Development" is conceived and defined differently by different actors. Moreover, the process of the program implementation was based on pseudo-participation where the process of implementing the program was based on informing the people and pseudo-voluntarism principle; where the local community were deceived by unfulfilled promises of government official. Finally, based on the data-based model analysis, it has been found out that the resettlement program has resulted in complex sets of consequences that demand policy response from all concerned bodies.

Keywords: Resettlement, Development, Villagization, Competing interests
Introduction

Development is a concept which is contested both theoretically and politically, and is inherently both complex and ambiguous (Thomas, 2004). Even though, [a] common theme within most definitions is that ‘development’ encompasses the notion ‘good change’ in a variety of aspects of the human condition and “development” is all about good change, questions arise about what is good, what sort of change matters and whether ‘bad change’ is also viewed as a form of development (Kanbur, 2006: 5, Chamber, 2004). Consequently, many things on in the world in general and the conditions of millions of people in the so called developing countries in particular make us to wonders us if “this is development ” (Chambers, 2004; Shanmugaratnam, 2001).

This is due the fact that development has mixed consequences. On the one hand, there is accumulation of wealth and enhancement of freedoms and well-being, of the people. On the other hand there is impoverishment, marginalization, reinforcement of oppressive power structures, violations of human rights, the spread of destructive internal wars – which claim thousands of civilian lives, force millions out of their homes and produce an abominable gun culture which brutalizes society – and environmental degradation which in many instances has contributed to dispossession and estimated forced migration of 250 million people worldwide in the name of "Development" over the past 25 years (Shanmugaratnam, 2001; Kate and Jennifer, 2007). In addition to the controversial debate over what constitute development, there are, also, emerging and ongoing perspectives on how, when and by what apparatus to achieve development in a society.

Consequently, in Africa in general and specifically in Ethiopia, governemntally designed and implemented projects, policies and programs are becoming the center of discourse for different development actors, and concerned bodies like government, international institutions, politicians, scholars, interest groups, local communities, and civil society organizations. The current five year Growth and Transformational Plan (2010-2015) of Ethiopia identified targets to be achieved in the five years in line with the national goal of becoming a middle income country in between 2020-2030. In this plan “villagization” which leads to “resettlement” was identified as target program, especially in pastoralist areas. In terms of regional share about 500,000 people in Somali, 500,000 people in Afar, 225,000 in Benishangul-Gumuz and 225,000 in Gambella will move into resettlement locations in the respective regions and the program is under its implementation in Gambella region since 2010 (Davison, 2011). In the process of implementing the program, the present Ethiopian government marked the third phase of resettlement in Ethiopian history. Thus, the debate over the purpose, process and impact of the program has dominated the national and international Medias. The government’s justification for
the program is for provision of social services by collecting the people together and, Various government progress reports indicate that the implementation process was smooth and successful. However, different actors like, international research institutions,, Human Right organizations , civil society organizations and political activist argued that the program has other objectives beyond providing social services (like making the land free for large scale commercial farming, getting people together for political objective). According to the latter perspective the process of program implementation has been with full of human rights abuses, not constitutional, people are not voluntarily moved to villagization sites and it was not with the participation of the local people and their institutions (OI, 2011, HRW, 2012).

Although different studies show that development is complex both in concept and practice Thomas (2004) and as it is with mixed consequences to the extent that it is difficult to say there is development or not (Todaro 2006:5 Shanmugaratnam, 2001), it is possible to draw some common denominators/ elements of development from different insight of concerned actors and scholars. Thus, according to Todaro, Amartaysen (Narayan et al. 2000, pp. 4-5 in Wayne 2006) Dudley Deers (1979 pp. 3-4 in Wayne, 2006 ), Ray (Ray, 1998: 27-29 cited in Monenus , 2011), Wayne ( 2006; 16) and other development scholars, "development" can be defined and described by what happened to poverty, hunger and humiliation, illiteracy, and unhealthiness , basic infrastructure, and basic public service, unemployment, to inequality, productivity, and empowerment, and to participation. Hence, if the type of development needed in the region and the type of development which the government claiming is the development which is defined within the above context ; the resultant outcome of development must be also, considered , justified and measured within this context.

Therefore, for this paper and for this context, the contextually identified components of development from development scholars were used as a means to evaluate the nature of development in the region. To this end, even though the research is not evaluative research which assesses the success and failure of government plans and programs, it is imperative to see the impact of the programs up on the common components of "Development” listed above.

The context in Gambella region

Gambella, also officially known as Gambella Peoples' National Regional state, is one of the nine ethnic based regional state in Ethiopia formed under the post 1991 political and administrative reconfiguration of the country. Gambella national regional state is located in south western part of Ethiopian lowlands surrounded by Oromia Regional State in the North, North East and East, by Southern Nations , Nationalities

The nine regional states are : Tigray, Afar , Amhara, Oromia, Somali, Benshangul , Gumuz , S.N.N.P, Gambella , and Harari.
and People's Regional State in the South and Southeast and by the Republic of South Sudan in the Southwest, West and Northwest (Hailemariam et al, 2011). The Gambella regional state is a home land for five indigenous ethnic groups; namely Anywa, Kumo, Majangar, Nuer and Opo (GPRS, 1995)

Administratively Gambella regional state is divided into three zones along the three major ethnic groups: (1) Anywak zone, (2) Majanger zone and (3) Nuer zone (CSA, 2007). Socio-economically, until recently the region and its people, as with other peripheral regions and peoples, have been among the most marginalized communities – in terms of government services – in Ethiopia. However, since 1991 with the transformation of the former Gambella province into a regional state, social services were expanded to rural areas (Dereje, 2006). Nonetheless, comparatively the region is still labeled by the government as one of the four emerging regions in Ethiopia.

Politically, Gambella was one of the regions with the claimant of independency for statehood up to 1991. Consequently, as the region has been suspected to be the rock and home for the anti-government rebels to the past consecutive regimes (Emperor Hailesillasie and Derg) and, the regimes used to consider the region as a threat to their governance system. Also, having the liberation front (GPLF) under both emperor and Dergue regimes, the region had been struggling both to be independent state and reduce the interference and maltreatment of the central governments. Hence the relationship of the center and the region was very weak and, the quarrel was visible and bold. Despite these all, under the federal government system established in 1991, the region is recognized as one of the nine regions of the country, and regional and federal system of relationship has been developed. The federal system established since 1991 put the regional sovereignty to all regions to make any social, economical and political decisions in their territory. But, as the region is classified as one of the emerging regions, the region could not be free from federal interference in one or the other way of decision making in the name of developmental- where the federal government is interfering in planning, designing, and implementing developmental activities out of which villagization program is the typical one.

Under the present government, villagization and Displacement program was planned to resettle up to 1.5 million people in Ethiopia. The movements in Afar and Somali are all one-year programs, while Gambella and Benishangul-Gumuz are three-year programs that started in the latter half of 2010 (Davison, 2011). Specifically, one of the most drastic experiences in Ethiopia is the case of Gambella Region. This is due to the following reasons. Firstly, there are still debates and varying views over the purpose and the result of the program among different actors. Secondly, due to the concurrent occurrence of villagization, resettlement and large scale commercial
farming in the same region within the same period. Hence, in Gambella, villagization program planned by federal government and implement in co-operation with regional government became the point of discussion and debate for both national and international medias. This is due to the fact that the purpose and impact of the program stated by the government is not the same with the descriptions and analysis given by the non-governmental actors. Therefore, the study tried to negotiate the extremists' view by providing scientific analysis of empirical data gathered through different instruments.

**Figure 3.1: The map of Gambella Regional State**
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Source: Human Right Watch, 2012

**Methodology of the study**

In Gambella regional state, out of twelve woredas (Godere, Mengeshi, Gog, Abobo, Gambella, Dima, Jor, Itang, Jikawo, Wantwa, Lare, Akobo) with in which Villagization program is implemented, as a sample seven woredas were selected for the study. These woredas are Gambella, Abobo, Gok, Lare, Etang, Makwe, Kikwo, Matwar. These seven of them were selected purposively because of their highest (more than 70%) population share and their centrality as the site to the program’s implementation.

Data sources: the study used both primary and secondary sources. Primary data was gathered through observation, interview and focus group discussion. And, Secondary Data Sources like books from library, international legislations and guidelines, FDRE constitution, journal articles, magazines, organizational and institutional research results, like Human Right Watch Reports, Oakland Institutes Reports, UN Reports,
AU Guidelines and Reports, Government Progress Reports and Plans were properly utilized. And, as an instrument of data collection: semi-structured interview was intensively used to gather data from local community leaders, resettled people, Administrators (woreda, zonal, regional and federal level administrators), Ministry of Federal Affairs officials, Ministry of Agriculture experts, Foreign and local investors, while Focus Group Discussion was used for villagers to collect data about the process of implementation, the facilities in the village, and the impact of villagization. At last, the researcher used observation as a method to observe the resettlement sites and social services provided by the government.

4. Results and Analysis

Villagization and resettlement program was one of the programs designed by the government to be implemented in Gambella regional state in the years of 2011-2014 with the objective of resettling 45000 households. From the government point of view the program has been intended solely for making the people the beneficiary of basic infrastructural facilities, shifting their lifestyle, and the government argued that its implications resulted in the improvement of the life of the people. On the other hand, the real purpose and motive of the program, the process and its resultant outcomes were differently interpreted by different actors with both positive and negative implications. Despite the differing perspectives up on the objectives and results of the program are continuing, the program has been implemented and the people were resettled in to formed villages. Therefore, this part of the paper commits itself to substantiate the differing notions of development by different actors and give scientific conclusion up the purpose, process and impact of the program based on empirical data gathered through different instruments.

4.1. The Objectives/Purpose/ of the Program

A political and professional activist of Gambella People, based his living in UK, Mr. Nyikaw Ochalla (on international conference held in India), argued by saying:

“As I stand in front of you, hundreds of thousands of small-scale farmers and pastoralists are being denied access to arable farmland, grazing and water points, and hunting grounds—and at best, they are being turned into day laborers doing back breaking work while living in extreme poverty. The government is moving ahead with its plans for so-called “progress,” which relies on tactics of widespread human rights abuses including harassment, rapes, arbitrary detention and imprisonment without trial, displacement, increased food insecurity, destitution, and destruction of the environment (Ochalla, 5 February, 2013).

In addition, the Human Right Watch, in its report, and commentary letter to Ethiopian government, UNDP Country Representative,
Karaturi and other concerned bodies, described that the resettlement program being implemented was unconstitutional, involuntarily, and it has been supported with different human right abuses. And, the social services promised by the government are yet not provided and the service objective has not been achieved. Moreover, the report boldly described that the government is making the land free to be grabbed by investors (HRW, 2012).

For the warning and commentator letter written by HRW (2012) to Ethiopian government with the subject of “Villagization and Rights Abuses in Ethiopia’s Gambella Region”, Ethiopian Government (ministry of federal affairs) described the main purpose of the program as follows’

“….the villagization (commune program) program in Gambella regional state has single objective: Improved livelihood within the framework of national growth and development plan. The targets are to provide efficient and effective economic and social services (safe drinking water, optimum, health care, education, improved agronomy practices, market access etc). Create an access to infrastructure (road, power, telecommunication etc.) and ensure the citizen’s full engagement in good governance and democratic exercises (Human Right Watch, 2012).

Similarly, all Woreda administrators, Ministry of federal affairs Gambella office representative, and Gambella Villagization Program Officer, confirmed the same thing with the letter written by the government. Whereas, villagers argued that they are not yet clear with the purpose of the program due to different reasons. Firstly, the promises of the government about full service provision and other compensations are yet not provided. Secondly, activists and some government officials have been officially protesting and informing villagers that their land was going to be taken by investors but yet not taken by investors. Hence, villagers are confused of the program's purpose. Because of the fact that both governments and activist's arguments were propagated to villagers side by side but neither of them became realized.

Moreover, the interviewed non positioned (non-appointed and politically not committed) officers argued that the government has put in place the program’s for having a political control over the people by grouping them as a villagers and making land free for commercial farming. And they stated that the service objective was not the primary objective of the program. Furthermore, the administrators were crosschecked by asking the future fate of the land from where the farmers fled to the villages formed. And, they stated that either it will be used by the owner or will be given for investors for commercial farming.
Therefore, based on the above data and observations made by the researcher, the study puts the program as it was with short term objective which was explicitly stated as infrastructural service provision and long term objective which was implicitly projected for making land free for commercial farming and having political control over the people as the area is very important for security. And, the triangulated data from government and non–government respondents confirms the existence of means-end relationship in between the programs (Service provision and villagization as a means for achieving political and developmental objective), but failed due to the reactions of the people and other actors. Hence, the land from which villagers fled to the village formed became an idle land–neither used by villagers not used by investors and government. Because, the government and investors are in fear of the people to invest on it, though, in the long run, the more the ressetlers will fled to the formed village, the more the land for investment will be free and call investors for large commercial farming. Hence as administrators clearly stated in the long run, the long run objective( using land for commercial farming) will be achieved, but, presently neither the explicitly stated not the implicit one is achieved.

4.2. Program formulation and implementation process in Gambella

According to Gambella Villagization Program Officer, the process followed in program formulation and implementation took the following ways; Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development designed villagization program for collecting scattered pastoralist and semi-pastoralist people in Gambella, Benishangul Gumuz, South Omo, Afar and other regional states. In Gambella, in the first phase, the ministry’s assessment result and the way forward policy was presented for regional and federal level higher officials. The presented alternatives were welcomed by regional and federal officials, then, in the second phase they decided on how to move forward by giving special responsibilities: for regional government to be led by vice regional governor, to be handled by Villagization program officer under the umbrella of regional agricultural office and, to be supported by Ministry of federal affairs.

After finishing the first workshop held in between federal and regional officials, the regional government started to initiate the policy by preparing stages of discussion with woreda and zonal administrators. In parallel to the regional government, the Ministry of Federal Affairs also provided its supportive functions of facilitation, coordination, initiation, and expertise consultation and supervision roles. Then, the facilitation, initiation and mobilization of the community for the program has been carried out by the collaboration of woreda administrators, zonal administrators, regional government, villagization program office in collaboration with Agriculture office. While, different private and Non-governmental organizations had participated specially in supporting the
provisions of services. From this, it is possible to conclude that the concerned bodies followed Top-down Approach in formulating resettlement program. Because, the program was given to regional governors as a mission, and the regional officials and administrators were used as a mission accomplishes, while the people were taken as mere beneficiary rather than legitimate claimants.

4.3. The level of Peoples’ participation in the Villagization and resettlement program

According to IDMC (2010) document, state undertaking or enabling a development project are obliged to inform communities fully of its nature and consequences, to consult them adequately and effectively and to allow them to participate meaningfully in all parts of the process, including the planning phase - on issue that are relevant to their lives. Also, as per Human Right Approach to resettlement Nederveen Pieterse (2001) cited in Fasika (2013:25), stated that any kind of development oriented resettlement should be conducted within an inclusive and participatory framework-that views the affected communities not simply as beneficiaries of development but its rightful and legitimate claimants.

Moreover, article 43 (2) of Ethiopian constitution entitled with “the right to development” states that “…Nationals have the right to participate in national development and, in particular, to be consulted with respect to policies and projects affecting their community…”. Accordingly, Woreda administrators and villagization program officer stated that the process of the program formulation and implementation was with full participation of local people. They stated that, after receiving the mission from MoARD they had arranged a number of meetings with local people to inform and dictate them that the program was going to be implemented and to tell them that it would benefit them.

Moreover, the interviewed local villagers confirmed the existence of a number of meetings in the process of program’s implementation. One of my respondents from Mathar said:

“…. They arranged a meeting and said to us, it is already approved by the government to resettle you in a new place where you can find everything. And, on that meeting they said; “if you deny going there, first no service would be provided for you in this village (previous)… second you will be affected by Morlee2, so…it is up to you and no one will look after you”.

The other respondent from Etang said that:

---

2 Morlee is a group from south Sudan know by flowing to Gambella region which terrorize the people of Gambella having guns, exercising rape, and other illegal and bad practices up on local people
“....... We were informed by government officials that we had to prepare our self and our materials for resettlement.... three month after they came to us, and they told us that there would be land distribution in the new village they have selected by themselves (this village).

And, all respondents reflected the same idea that they were called in a meeting which has the intension of “externalization” -by saying “the government has decided, the government has planned ” and “transferring order “ from the above ( top decision makers ) rather than giving them the chance to reflect on the issue with the sense of “ Participation”. Hence, it is possible to say that the process has been based on the principle of "Informing Villagers to go" not giving the chance of participation in the process.

Also, the HRW (2012:26) stated that villagers were engaged in some kind of "consultation"- which took the form of government officials “informing” people that they would be to move to a new location not to reflect and comment on the process. Hence, it is possible to say that the program formulation and implementation cracked the views and privilege of IDMC (2010), and Ethiopian constitution which state that development project must allow the people to participate meaningfully in all a parts of the process, including the planning phase and , the view of Human Right Approach to resettlement concept which states that the affected communities must be seen as not simply as beneficiaries of development but as rightful and legitimate claimants. This is due to the fact that , participation is not having the right to be informed , rather it is the act of taking part in an activity or being involved in making decision about one's own concern.

Therefore, even though it is very difficult to call this type of acts as a Participation, Pretty (1994) developed seven levels of participation and gave level for such kind of acts. So, out of the seven levels of participation described by Pretty (1994) cited in George (2006) , the level (step) of participation exercised in the process of villagization program implementation in Gambella is known as passive Participation or nominal participation , where villagers had participated by being told what is going to happen or has already happened, which is described as ‘tokenism’ or as ‘manipulated’ participation or as ‘pseudo’ participation by Hart, (1992), Bordenave (1994) or White et

---

1 Pretty’s (1994) seven-step participation ladder cited in George (2006), includes: a) Passive participation; where People participate by being told what is going to happen OR has already happened)Participation in information giving where People participate by answering questions posed by extractive researchers using questionnaire surveys (c) Participation by consultation where People participate by being consulted or answering questions, and external people listen to views d) Participation for material incentives : People participate by providing resources, such as labour, in return for food, cash and other material incentives. e) Functional Participation People participate by forming groups to meet predetermined objectives related to the project. f) Interactive Participation :People participate in joint analysis, which leads to action plans and the formation of new local institutions or the strengthening of existing ones. (g) Self Mobilization : People participate by taking initiatives independent of external institutions to change systems
al., (1994) respectively. This type of participation is the minimal type of participation where the control of the project and the power to make decisions rests with planners, administrators and the community’s elites, the extent of people’s participation is limited to being passive listeners to what is being planned for them by external agent.

4.4. Voluntary and Involuntary nature of the Program Implementation

In describing the voluntary and involuntary natures of the process different activists, medias and social networks have been presenting the involuntarily nature of the program implementations. For example letter written for Ethiopian government by Human Right Watch (2012:98) letter revealed that:

"......the villagization process is not voluntary, and is accompanied by various human rights abuses. Government soldiers frequently beat or arrested individuals who questioned the motives of the program or refuse to move to the new villages. Community leaders and young men were targeted. There have also been credible allegations of rape and sexual assault by government soldiers. Fear and intimidation was widespread.".

The Ethiopian Government response to this letter indicated that the report is allegation and described the reality in the following way:

"The villagization programs as well as other development interventions were implemented in accordance with FDRE constitution and relevant democratic principles. It was fully conducted on voluntary basis and with the full consent and participation of the beneficiaries. The sites for commune program were selected with full study in to the availability of surface and ground water and adequate arable and grassing land. At most care taken to make sure the critical social and economic services i.e water, health service, education and improved agronomy practice are put in place before the beneficiaries were relocated to the new areas."

(ibid).

Whereas, the sample interviewees from villagers were asked whether they came in to the new village by force or by their interest, was any military force intervention in the process of villagization or not?. And, they depicted that except peace keeping Militias (deposited only to maintain peace from which majority of them are local people with gun) nobody has forcibly enforced them to come to the new village, no military forces were deposed there, no beating, no any kind of rape, or any other kind of torture that they have had experienced due to the reluctance to accept the policy. Even, they added that some of their friends and families have returned back to their original place and
also, if they need to return back nobody will ask them. Despite this, they all agreed that they were fully deceived by the government officials. Because, government officials used to create abstract or ideal village where everything could be full, where there would be no food shortage, no disease, where everything would be with free cost, where tractors would be used to plough, where flour mill would be used freely. And the followings are the testimonies of the respondents:

One of the respondents from Etang said:
"....look my son….you know that in our previous place we used to plough by hand, very poor health serves, educations services, and poor water services there, then , when the officials came up with the proposal that :

"You will be given with full water service
"You will be given with full education and health service
You will be given with 3-4 hectares
You will be given with tractors
You will be given with full flour mill freely
You will become modern person"
How you reject these all offers? We said, ok, but now except water and education none of the services are provided for us., no sufficient land, no flour mill ...pleases leave it they laid us and we were cheated by their speech."

Similarly the other respondent from Nyignyag stated by saying:
"...no police force enforced me to come to here (New village) Even, it is our right to return back, but the problem is that all our gardens are already destructed , and also, the government officials warned us that no government institutions and services will look after us if we return back ".

Moreover community leaders had actively participated in the mobilization process, and they were used by the government as an instrument to make people to believe and accept the program. And they depicted that not only villagers, even they themselves (community leaders) were misled by government officials and, in return they mislead the local people.

One of the selected community leaders from Mahathir said:
".... In the mind of my neighbors and by friends and families I’m their leader and their representative, and they believe me very well. One day I was called by woreda administrators and being told about the policy and strategy. They told me all issues about free services and then, I returned back to my families, friends taking this Good news and, they accepted and believed me without any reservation."
Thus, it is impossible to say that the process has been involuntary because villagers came to the new villages by their interest not by force and even they revealed that they have the right to return back to their original place. And, also it is incredible to say that the process was voluntarily, because the process of program implementation has been supported and undertaken with fabricated information and unrealistic promises by government officials. Hence, it is likely to conclude that the government has done neither direct human right attack as it has been described by activists (private and local and international NGO’S), nor voluntary based practice as it has been described by the government. Rather, it is deceitful practice exercised by government officials. Hence, how the government officials will be asked legally for this wrongful practice will be the other research areas which the study wants to show for concerned bodies.

In addition, beyond promising the ambitious and unfulfilled promises, the government officials warned villagers by indicating that if they deny to move to the newly created village; no service would be provided for them and nobody would look after them and, secondly they warned them that if morlee affected their life or their property the government security force would not protect them. Therefore, villagers were enforced to relocate themselves due to; unfulfilled promises of government and the fear of morlee due to the absence of government security. Hence the process was neither voluntarily nor involuntarily rather it can be called as induce resettlement (push) or deceived resettlement or persuaded or provoked resettlement.

5. The impact of Villagization and Resettlement

In any means the policy formulated and implemented within one community will result in a given change- either it helps the people to flourish or it result in the destitution of the people. Accordingly, the villagization program implemented in Gambella region has resulted in a given result –however the result is described by different actors differently. From the side of government, the program has resulted in the flourishing of the people where they are enjoying new life style with full and free services (GRSVPR, 2006), while others (activists and other concerned bodies) like OI, HRW, are arguing that the program has resulted in the impoverishment of the people (HRW, 2012, 38-54). To this end, this study has used Micahel Carneas model in assessing the impact of the program up on the community.

5.1. The Eight interlinked potential risks of resettlement in Gambella region

According to Scudder, (19960), several rural resettlement studies have documented high failure rates; demonstrating resettlement is a distinctive and complex type of development intervention. There are three victims of inadequately designed and purely planned rural resettlement schemes: the resettlers, the host population, and the physical environment. The success and failure of resettlement schemes highly depend on how settlers can

---

4 Morlee is a group from south Sudan know by flowing to Gambella region which terrorize the people of Gambella having guns, exercising rape, and other illegal and bad practices up on local people.
best adopt their new environment and to what degree they become self-sufficient. But, scientifically studied facts about resettlement reveal that, in many countries of the world, the state sponsored resettlement schemes lacks sound policy, and legal frameworks to fully protect the rights of the resettlers and host population (Mathur, 1996).

Thus, the study utilized two models recognized and accepted by World Bank as standard to deal with resettlement issues. These models were Micahel Carneas’ Eight Identified Interlinked Potential Risks intrinsic to displacement model and the Socio- Economic Rights of villagers in the New Resettlement Villages Model. Thus, the following discussions are made based on the interview conducted with all concerned government official, deep Focus Group Discussion and interview undertaken with villagers, and observation made by the researcher.

A. Landlessness: According to Carnea (2000) Expropriation of land removes the main foundation upon which people's productive systems, commercial activities, and livelihoods are built. In addition to the carnea's view of landlessness (the resettled people must be given enough land for farming, grazing, housing,) Art 40(5) of Ethiopian constitution states that pastoralists and semi-pastoralists have constitutional right have to free land for grazing and cultivation

Accordingly, Villagization Program Officer, Woreda Administrators and report prepared by Gambella Regional state show that the Promised Land (3-4 hectare) has been allotted to all villagers. However, except in Abobo Woreda, villagers in all woredas’ revealed that they were given only with the land which they used it to construct their home to live in and for garden. While the land (3-4 hectare) promised to be given as a compensation for the lost grazing and cultivation land is still not given for them.

Accordingly, one of the villagers’ respondents from Etang said that:

“...I do not know the hectare that you are saying, but as per my calculation the Land that I had previously even as a garden could be three times than the land given for me for all purpose now (Garden, farming and grazing).”

Even due to the absence and unproductive nature of land distributed (hardness to plough by hand), some of the villagers have changed their means of income from farming to wood selling, charcoal selling and other activities like selling atturbub (local alcohol) while some of them have joined Investors' company as a laborers and some of them are even in fear of about what they will give for their as inheritance

Accordingly, one of the respondents said that:

"... Firstly we were given with land for constructing our tukuls. Then, we were informed by the government official that we have to relocate our self-there and, we would be given with land for other purpose. But, after relocation to the new place no one has approached us and asked us how we are living ... now we are surviving by preparing local..."
alcohols like selling wood, burning charcoal, selling tukuls and atturbu. Therefore, it is possible to boldly conclude that landlessness is the most visible problem in Gambella region due to unfulfilled promise of government. But, the landlessness happened is not because of the absolute absence of land in Gambella regional state. Rather it is to mean due to improper selection of sites for resettlement, the land given is not fertile and productive.

B. Joblessness: According to Carneas, unless and otherwise it is managed very well, Joblessness is one of the negative outcome of resettlement. In the same token, Villagers’ interviewed depicted that in their previous place no body used to sit without work, even where there was no work to be done they used to go to forest to search for wild animals, prepare home equipment’s, fishing’s, keeping their cattle's and etc. Whereas, now after they came in to new village, since land provided as compensation is not sufficient for farming, grassing and using it for other purpose, they revealed that they are suffering from joblessness.

In one of the Focus Group Discussions arranged I asked them why they sit without work and whether they had this experience in their previous place or not? After making thorough discussion by using FGD one of the discussant said:

"....we are here playing together, and having cultural alchol (akoyo and atturbud) together. We are sitting here because we do not have something to do. And, we are waiting for time to reach for releasing time of cattle. Previously, we used forest for bees keeping, searching our food, to prepare farming and house equipment both for selling and for household usage. But, now always in the morning we meet each other here we play, we eat something together. We become busy only after may...even after May since the land we have is less than the man power that we have ....it does not make us this much busy enough.

Exceptionally, the response of villagers from Abobo woreda is different from all villagers and the researcher has also, observed visible difference in between other villages and villages in AboboWoreda. While villagers in the others villages were observed by the researcher sitting without work, playing, taking local cigarette, local alcohol, the villagers in Abobo woreda like in Tegni were observed being busy as busy as bees. One of the respondents from Tengi said:

"...here, even if the land provided is not sufficient, the provided one is softy to dig, and it is productive. In addition, we are expanding the land by our own, the government has provided us with the necessary materials... here the condition is good to work more and more".

The other respondents confirmed by saying:

".... Here we are encouraged by the government more and more, because the government has provided with the species of
Hen, goat, Banana and other seeds of vegetables...for further production. In addition we are given with 3 hectare of productive land for better life."

Therefore, it is possible to conclude that the except in Abobo woreda villagers in all woredas' observed are suffering from joblessness due to: the absence of sufficient land, farness of the villages from the forest and river, and also the hardness and unproductiveness of the land provided.

C. Food Insecurity: The research also tried to address the impact and correlation of villagization program with food insecurity. To this end, the researcher used simple food insecurity measurements like their yearly production, daily consumption and year to year consumption. For this, villagers were asked, whether they do have sufficient production, whether there is any kind of change in their consumption pattern?. And, whether their yearly production is sufficient for their yearly consumption or not. Hence, except from Abobo woreda, all respondents from sample woredas, depicted, Firstly, due to the failure of the government to provide the promised land. Secondly the hardness of the land in newly created village and, thirdly due to the absence optional food due to the distantness of the resettlement sites from the forest and river, the production of the villagers’ is lesser compared with their production level. These and other factors resulted in the existence of extreme production differences- which has directly lead to consumption change (decreasing consumption pattern).

One of the respondents from Etang said that: “....I do have six children and previously except my last child, everybody could cover its own food from the forest, because the forest is there with full of leaves to be eaten, mangos, Bananas freely, fishing freely and etc. In addition my previous garden is very broader and softy. But now the land I have is harder to plough, the production is lesser and lesser, no fishing, no forest for optional foods. And, mostly we finish our yearly production within five month after production and I used wood selling and charcoal burning for my survival with my children’s.”.

Adding to this, the other respondent said: “...We were told by officials as we would be very productive if we relocate our self, but now just my family members are suffering from lack of food. Mostly, we finish our yearly production within five to seven months and the left moths would be so difficult months for us. Assume burning charcoal, gathering and selling wood at this age it is really very difficult (women with the age of 40’s). Previously, we eat three times per day.... But now food consumption change is feasible for example I haven’t ate my breakfast today (at 6:30 local time)”.
Therefore, it is possible to say that the villagization program implemented in the region resulted in the reduction of production and productivity of the people. This also confirms the prediction made by OI about food insecurity due to villagization program (OI, 2011:41) and the conclusion of Human Right Watch that food insecurity has happened in the region (HRW, 2012:23). But food insecurity condition in the region also, excludes Abobo Woreda. Because, out of the seven sample woredas selected for the study this woreda is the only successful woreda in implementing the program and managing the resultant outcomes. Even, this woreda is the only and the most widely used woreda by government Medias (newspaper, television, Radio) as a means to justify that villagization program implemented in Gambella region is successful and resulted in the improvement of the life people.

Accordingly, one of the respondents said:

“…..land given for us is softy and easy to plough, due to this I have utilized all hectares given for me. Now, the productivity is encouraging. Moreover, we do have optional income from Hen, goat bearing, Honey production. And also, Baro River is here for us and we use it for producing different vegetables. So, our yearly production is sufficient for our yearly consumption, our daily Consumption is also good, and I can say we are not in hunger”.

Also, the researcher has observed some indications of woreda's productivity. And, the following Photos are taken from the garden of farmers in Tenyi Village (one of the successful village in Abobo woreda)

Source: Own Field observation, May 2014

D. Homelessness: According to Carneas' analysis homelessness is another resultant outcome of resettlement. In addition to Corneas model of impoverishments elements of homelessness the UN Committee on the ICESCR has openly defined the components of the right to housing under General Comment No. 4. Accordingly the Committee stated that a house should
not be constructed as just as a roof over one’s head, but it has to meet a number of conditions and facilities like (UNHABITAT and OHCHR, cited in Fasika (2013: 57-58). And, the committee listed: Security of tenure, Availability of services, materials, facilities and infrastructure, Affordability, Habitability, location Wise and the cultural adequacy requirements as standard to be considered as housing facilities. 

As the Gambella regional state is dominated by pastoralist and agro-pastoralists it is hardly possible to use and measure the housing condition of the people by international housing standard. But it is possible to see the difference in their housing condition before and after relocation. In the process of housing construction the Woreda Administrators’ revealed that they used to support villagers in by providing them with wood, huts and other materials for the construction house in the newly created villages. Even though, the support of the government is confirmed by for the question, is the house you have can be equated with the previous one? The villagers stated that their previous home was better than the present one. Because, the previous one was well built, with hard material and they used to have more than one houses to live in , while the present houses are mostly not more than one in number, with poor in quality -due to a very limited time and land given for the construction of home, and the insufficiency of the materials provided.

Hence, Out of the criteria’s listed above by the committee, the right to education, the right to health and the right to work are discussed separately in the next section while the housing issues will be seen from the areas of its security of tenure, Availability of service, habitability, affordability, availability to weaker section, location, and cultural adequacy’s’ are taken as point of discussion. 

In relation to the security of tenure, from the beginning one of the government's ways of deceiving people was giving certificate of land for local people and registering their own part. But, villagers revealed land certification is given in a very limited area and they are still open for such unexpected program oriented resettlement. Hence, there is no security of tenure for villagers, and, also the availability of service is problematic as it will be discussed in the next section. Although, since no payment has been made for both materials used, for the land used for construction, the housing system was affordable by villagers.

However the houses constructed meet the cultural adequacy as far as their style and nature is concerned , the interview result and, observation by the researcher revealed that the present housing system would not fit habitability (it has to provide adequate space, as well as protection against the cold, damp, heat, rain and wind) criteria due to the following reasons.

- The space given for house construction is less than the previous one
- Mostly, the garden is 2-3 times less than the previous one
Since the time given for house construction was very short, the quality is very poor.

- The materials used were not selective and strong.
- The capacity of the houses to protect the rainy, cold and wind is very less.
- Very poor quality, without door, without protection.

E. **Marginalization:** According to Carneas' analysis, marginalization occurs when families lose economic power, if many individuals cannot use their earlier-acquired skills at the new location; human capital is lost or rendered inactive or obsolete, and, he added that improperly managed resettlement may result in the marginalization of the people. Consequently, except in Abobo woreda, the FGD result in almost all villages taken as a sample shows that the following are the characteristics of the process and outcome of the implemented villagization program:

- **Very limited land for plough**
- **Very hard and un productive land provided for them.**
- **Absence of alternative means of income.**
- **Change from farming to charcoal selling and wood selling, being employed under different investment as a laborers.**
- **Higher Joblessness.**
- **Psychologically stress by remembering the previous life condition.**

Less production

Accordingly, one of the respondents stated that:

“……..I came here with more than 25 castles. My friend here with came with 35 cattle’s and. But, our castles failed to cope up with the environmental challenges, and also, there is no more broader land for grassing. Due to this, my friend and I left with 7 and 5 cattle respectively. Not only this, look at my hand and my legs (showing to the researcher) I was so strong person there because I work more, and I eat more , ... now we fear for our self and no more being rich , being strong…”

Therefore, if there is limited production and limited means of income, it is possible to say that there is less economic power. If there is less economic power, if their previous resource is destructed, if their dominating economic activity is affected by the program, if there is no job to be done, the probability of being under marginalization would be very broad. But, this result also, excludes Abobo woreda. Because the villagers revealed that, their economic power is increasing, no joblessness, there is good production and productivity; they do have a lot of alternative means of income compared with others.

F. **Social Disintegration:** In pursuit to see whether any social organizations were destructed by the program, villagers...
revealed that they lost a number of social organizations and social relationships. Though, they now re-formed other social organizations and social integration systems with the new villagers, the communal social relationships and systems developed for a long period of time is being dismantled, and resulted in the social, cultural and spiritual crisis of the people—which has more of incalculable costs/consequences.

G. Loss of access to common property: In Gambella regional state, the resource available is more of communal and it belongs to all. Due to this forest, water, land is defined as the matter of survival by Gambella people. The villagers revealed that the left these all to their previous place, and due to their coming and the absence of care for these resources many Pastures, forest lands, water bodies, burial grounds, quarries were deteriorated which even resulted in the significant deterioration of income and livelihood levels. As it is already discussed specially in the food insecurity part, this program has resulted in loss of common property.

In testifying this one of my respondents said that:

“…In our culture, forest, water bodies are very meaningful asset. In addition assume leaving your father, your grandfathers, may be your children’s burial for risk and living in another place, even we have been worshipping under our own cultural and spiritual materials and trees under which we present our worshiping sacrifices and celebrate our ceremonies. we lost all the resource we had been proud of it.

Therefore, except in Abobo woreda (Tendi, cubo. Oman kebeles) in all other selected sample woredas; landlessness, homelessness, Joblessness, marginalization, and food insecurity are the main problems identified by the assessments, whereas loss of common property, Social Disintegration problems are the common problems seen in all study areas including Abobo woreda. Hence, it is possible to conclude that the policy argued to be the way for the improvement of the life of the people has resulted in the impoverishment of the people with multiple consequences.

6. The availability of Promised Socio-Economic service in the Villages

The right to water, the right to housing, the right to school, the right to health were described as a Socio-Economic Rights in the New Resettlement Villages by different national and international institutions and legislations like the FDRE constitutions, UNDHR, ICCPR, CEDAW, ICERCR UN respective departments, and CRC General Assembly, and etc (Fasika : 2013). Since the right to housing has been discussed in the above sections, the right to water, education, the right to health of the new settlers will be discussed in the following sections.

I. Water service Availability

Although the right to water is not directly mentioned under the bills of human right (UDHR, ICCPR and ICESCR), it has been recognized as a human right by different
human rights instruments and interpretations of authoritative human rights bodies. Different organizations like ICESCR, the UN Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights CEDAW, CRC General Assembly Resolution Directly or indirectly stated the importance and the necessity of drinkable water for the survival of human being (ibid). Also, as it has been discussed in the first section, the explicit purpose of the Villagization and resettlement program was, to make the pastoralist and semi-pastoralist people to be the beneficiary of social services. Therefore, for the questions is there sufficient water service provided by the government? The FGD and interview result revealed that the water service provided by the government is sufficient. Especially during the day time no one would use it (it is free), however, they stated that during holydays, during morning (2:00-4:00 o’clock LT) and evening (11:00-12:30 LT) since everybody wants to use it before and after work respectively, it becomes busy, even they stated that sometimes there was conflict over the pump to be used. Therefore, even though it is difficult to say that the service provided is “fully sufficient “, the study found that this progress as a remarkable change due to :the progressive nature of development and, due to its visible change compared with the past document available about water provision - especially for pastoralist those who have been living without such services.

II. Education service availability
Art.41. (3) of FDRE constitution states that every citizen of the country has the right to equal access to publicly sponsored social services. And, art 90(1) specifically states that, to the extent that the country’s economic status permits the government Policies should aim in providing service like education, clean water, housing and food and social security. In addition to this, access to education, especially free and compulsory primary education, is one of the fundamental rights recognized by ICESCR, CRC and other binding human rights instruments (Fasika, 2013:60). Moreover, from the governments point of view the purpose of the program is to provide public services for villagers. Therefore, it is villagers' right to claim to get the service promised by the government constitutionally in general and, as program’s objective in specific.

Hence, for the question, is education service available, and is the service provided is with good quality, and sufficient for villagers? In answering the question, Villagers confirmed the existence of schools, they revealed that, schools constructed were by a very poor materials and rooms without chairs, poorly prepared blackboards, teachers, poorly prepared blackboard, rooms without doors and window. Also, confirmed the problems and they raised the cause for the problem as the quick/immediate nature of resettlement process as a reason. And, for the problems and lacks going on they said that they are re-constructing poorly constructed one, and constructing new schools by allocating budget for it.
Hence, even though the qualities of the facilities available in the schools are still in question, it is possible to conclude that the access of school in the study area is good compared with the past experience. But, the absence of the facilities needed in schools selected is enough ground to possibly say the quality of education is poor and needs the attention of the government.

**III. Health Service Availability**

With the same Article, the EDRE also, states the right of its people to have health facilities. However, the government is claiming that health service provision is reached 100% in terms of reaching unreached by health service; even GRSVR (2013) is stating that health sector service reached more than 95 percent, the testimonies revealed by villagers was quite different. According to the observation, in depth interview and FGD conducted with villagers, there are four natures of health center and services going in selected villages:

- Some of health centers are started to be constructed but yet not completed due to contactors reluctance
- Some of them are well built with no medical service, and equipment and professionals
- Some of them are used for different purpose
- Some of them on the way to demolish.

And, the photos taken from field work shows that the health service provided is not sufficient, and it needs the intervention of government non-government actors of development. The following photos are the facts practically seen there;
The above Photos describe the health services of the woredas selected for the study. One of which is on the way to demolish, the health service with started service but stopped due to the absence of professionals and equipment, medicines and materials, the health center given for police forces working under Wild Life and forest Management Authority, and the well started but un finalized project due to the reluctance of the contractors for Pic (a), Pic (b) Pic (c) Pic (d) respectively. Therefore, it is possible to boldly conclude that the health centers nature in the region especially in the selected samples can be classified under one of the four natures structured by the researcher.

In general, the Carneas model assessments and Socio-Economic Model showed that the resettlement program resulted in a number of social problems and the problems are open for any kind of support from any concerned bodies working in supporting local communities in crisis. And, Except Abobo woreda, all woredas are the same with respect to the social services provided in the area of villages and with respect to the progress going with respect to landlessness, joblessness, marginalization, food insecurity, production and productivity. But, Abobo woreda is totally different with all aspects. According to villagers, this difference is happened due to the following reasons.

- Soft nature of the land provided
- The existence of Baro river to farm vegetables

- The existence of good governance compared with other woreda
- The provision of special seeds for farmers
- The provision of 2-3 hectare of land, and its productivity nature.

From this it is possible to understand that there is a problem of site selection in all others, and also, the negligence of administration system. Because, in all others unproductive nature of land, the hardness of land, and also, un provided promised land were raised as a problems of villagers.

7. Conclusion

It is difficult to give clear picture whether the development rhetoric of the government has been translated into practice or not. This is because, first and foremost, development is by itself a contested notion and it depends on the views and interests of different actors. Secondly, the empirical data from the field shows contradictory results, this is due to the fact that in some cases the resettlement program impoverished local communities though there are also some promising prospects in areas such as education, health and water service.

Another point of conclusion is the objectives, process and nature of the resettlement program. In this regard, the program was implemented by the government with explicit and explicit objective to be achieved in the short and long run respectively. Though the explicitly stated government argument focuses on the
service provision, there are evident cases that the resettlement programs are also the part of the government’s intention to promote development through leasing land for domestic and foreign investors and having a complete control over the region in the long run. Moreover, the process of program formulation and implementation contradicts the national and international standards available for policy formulation and implementations. Hence, it can be concluded that the nature of program design and implementation used mainly top-down approach with pseudo-participation or nominal form of community participation that ultimately lead to limited involvement of local communities in the process. As a result, the interest, views and knowledge of local communities were not taken into consideration. And, the process of program implementation was neither voluntary resettlement nor involuntary resettlement; rather it was deceived resettlement or provoked resettlement where the people were deceived by the unfulfilled promises of the government officials.

Lastly, the program implementation and the resultant outcome of the program was another point of discussion. The Villagization and resettlement program mainly caused Shortage of land the majority. This condition resulted in two consequences. Firstly, Shift in means of income from farming to Charcoal, wood, lack of land which can be given for their future generation, being labour in investors camp. Secondly, it has resulted in unemployment and non-productivity of the man power. On the other hand, Shift in the means of income caused deforestation and marginalization of the people, while unemployment and non-productivity caused poverty, hunger and humiliation. These poverty, hunger and humiliation leads to inequality, powerlessness, under-empowerment, unemployment, marginalization, while the deforestation and marginalization lead to the difficulty of the achievement of sustainable development. And, at the end the inequality, powerlessness, and lead to the questionability of the Development by itself which retrospectively leads questionability of sustainable development.
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