

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY
(GRADUATE PROGRAMME)
ENVIRONMENTAL INJUSTICE AND DEVELOPMENT IN AFRICA

BY

JEMAL HUSSEIN

ADVISOR

DR. WORKINEH KELBESSA

JUNE, 2016

ADDIS ABABA

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY

ENVIRONMENTAL INJUSTICE AND DEVELOPMENT IN AFRICA

BY

JEMAL HUSSEIN

**A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES
OF ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENT FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS IN
PHILOSOPHY**

JUNE, 2016

ADDIS ABABA

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY

ENVIRONMENTAL INJUSTICE AND DEVELOPMENT IN AFRICA

BY

JEMAL HUSSEIN

APPROVED BY THE BOARD OF EXAMINER

_____	_____	_____
ADVISOR	DATE	SIGNATURE
_____	_____	_____
EXAMINER	DATE	SIGNATURE
_____	_____	_____
EXAMINER	DATE	SIGNATURE

Acknowledgments

First of all, I would like to express my heartfelt gratitude to my advisor, Dr. Workineh Kelbessa for his indispensable and unreserved scholarly guidance. My thanks goes to my family, particularly to my sister Fatuma Hussein for her provision of both material and moral support. I also would like to thank my friends, Abdulaziz Mohammed, Mufaddal Mohammed, Henok Girma, Mangistu Adunga, Abdeta Mamo and Girmayi G/Hiwot for their moral and intellectual support.

Acronyms and Abbreviations

AFP	Agence France-Press
BFRs	Brominated Flame Retardants
CAI	Computer Aid International
CIEL	Center for International Environmental Law
EHRP	Ethiopia Human Rights Project
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
EPA	Environmental Protection Authority
FDI	Foreign Direct Investment
FIAS	Foreign Investment Advisory Service
GNP	Gross National Product
HDI	Human Development Index
HDR	Human Development Report
HRW	Human Rights Watch
HTW	Highly Toxic Wastes
IMF	International Monetary Fund
LSLAs	Large-scale Land Acquisitions
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
MNCs	Multinational Corporations
MNOCs	Multinational Oil Corporations
MSWM	Municipal Solid Waste Management
NCDA	Nigerian Computer Dealers' Business Association
NGOs	Non-Governmental Organizations
OFC	Oromo Federalist Congress
OI	Oakland Institute

OSA	Oromo Study Association
PCB	Polychlorinated Biphenyl
PVCs	Polyvinyl Chloride Plastics
UN	United Nations
UNCED	United Nations Conference on the Environment and Development
UNDP	United Nations Development Program
UNEP	United Nations Environment Program
UWM	Urban Wastes Management
WB	World Bank
WIR	World Investment Report
WTO	World Trade Organization

Abstract

Many African nations are living in a perverse condition, as they are vulnerable to various problems such as political, economic, and social risks. Also, they are vulnerable to the problems of environmental injustice, which negatively affect their livelihood and overall wellbeing. In this thesis, I explored the connection between environmental injustice and development by examining different dimensions of environmental injustice in Africa. I argued that both environmental justice and development approach share many elements such as recognition, participation, and capabilities in common. I critically explored four instances of environmental injustice in Africa, such as land grabbing, electronic waste importation, overexploitation of natural resources and urban waste management; and their impacts on human development in the continent. Furthermore, the above mentioned instances of environmental injustice have had devastating impacts on economic development, culture, natural environment, sustainability, empowerment and social opportunities. This thesis suggested that meaningful participation of the society and other concerned stakeholders should be in place to solve these and other related problems. This thesis is based on relevant secondary sources.

Keywords: *Development, Environment, Environmentalism, Environmental Injustice, Environmental justice*

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments	i
Acronyms and Abbreviations	ii
Abstract	iv
Chapter One: Introduction	1
1.1 Background of the Study	1
1.2 Theoretical Framework	4
1.3 Objectives of the Study	5
1.4 Methodology of the Study	6
1.5 Significance of the Study	6
1.6 The Scope and Limitations of the Study	6
1.7 Organization of the Thesis	6
Chapter Two: Environmental Justice and Development	8
2.1 Environmentalism	8
2.2 Environmental Justice	11
2.2.1 Dimensions of Environmental Justice.....	17
2.3 The Concept of Development	20
Chapter Three: Environmental Injustice-Development Nexus	30
3.1 Dimensions of Environmental Injustice.....	30
3.1.1 Land Grabbing: The Case of Ethiopia	30
3.1.2 Electronic Wastes Importation.....	38
3.1.3 Over-Exploitation of Natural Resources	42
3.1.4 Urban Waste Management: The Case of Addis Ababa City, Ethiopia.	46
Chapter Four: Summary and Conclusion	50
4.1 Summary	50
4.2 Conclusion.....	52
References	58

Chapter One: Introduction

The problem of “environmental injustice” and “lack of genuine development” are major problems confronting developing countries. In most of developing nations, one of severe human problem is that related with environmental injustice. Likewise, there exist many of environmental injustice problems in Africa which pose a threat to human development. In the continent of Africa, many societies are facing the problems of environmental injustice in the way their resources are used, the unfair relationship between local communities regarding the environmental decision making and distribution of resources, intensified imposition of various externalities like electronic waste importation from developed countries, displacement of poor societies from their land etc. In other words, environmental injustice is resulted from lack of fair distribution of resources, recognition, participation, and capabilities. In this thesis, I argue that these problems of environmental injustice in Africa could negatively affect African development aspect in one way or another. I believe that these problems can only be solved and genuine development achieved by rethinking elements of environmental justice (such as recognition, participation ad capabilities) as also elements of development. Furthermore, inspiring the poor and marginalized communities to participate in environmental decision making is very important issue. Therefore, the starting point to achieve genuine development in Africa is recognition of the linkages between the concept “environmental injustice” and “development”. This thesis further clarifies conceptual issues relating to environmental injustice and development; establish linkages between environmental justice and development; identify the obstacles to achieve the realization of environmental justice and genuine development; and expands the scope of environmental justice and development.

1.1 Background of the Study

Environmental injustice is serious human problem that resulted from the unequal distribution of environmental goods and bads across various societies (David Schlosberg 2007; Kristin Shrader-Frechette 2002; Naguib Pellow 2007). The idea of environmental justice began in the United States of America in 1980s as a response to the distribution of toxic wastes and other environmental racism in the country (Dale Jamieson 2001; Schlosberg 2007; Pellow 2007). Before the coming of environmental justice movement, attention was given to the protection,

restoration and preservation of nature rather than to human beings. The environmentalists cared much about the wilderness preservation whereas environmental justice activists have paid attention to human beings (marginalized communities as a result of unfair distribution of environmental goods and bads that resulted in turn from unequal participation of people in environmental decision-making) (Sandler and Pezzullo 2007; Shrader- Frechette 2002). The scope of environmental justice goes beyond that of environmentalists, as it has been concerned with human, economic, race, culture etc than with ecological issues. Though there has been a difference between the conceptual underpinning of environmental justice and ecological justice, some scholars such as Sandler and Pezzullo (2007) have tried to reconcile them by indicating that the two theories are two sides of the same coin.

A number of environmental justice scholars have tried to discuss the notion of environmental injustice in different ways (Carmin and Agyeman 2011; Adeola 2001; Shrader- Frechette 2002). For instance, Agyeman and Carmin (2011) argue that there has been an unfair distribution of commercial toxic wastes among various communities in the United States of America. This is one form of environmental injustice. It targets the minority communities such as black people, Indians and others as a location of toxic wastes dumps, industrial pollutions and nuclear wastes. There have been different public movements and conferences against toxic wastes dump that laid the foundations for the recognition of environmental justice movement at international level. For instance, Warren County protest in North Carolina against the location of environmental bads (hazardous waste landfills) and Michigan conference that attracted the attention of a number of environmental activists to deal with issues of environmental racism and environmental inequities are among the major incentives to the development of environmental justice movement (Steady 2009; Pellow 2007). The National People of Color Environmental Leadership Summit, Summit I and Summit II, that were held in Washington DC in 1991 and 1992 respectively were crucial events that dealt with environmental injustice issues and encouraged a number of scholars to deal with the given issue (Figueroa and Mills 2001; David E.Newton 2009).

Patricia Kameri-Mbote and Philippe Cullet (1996); and Center for International Environmental Law (2002) argue that there is a strong linkage between environmental justice and development. They also claim that both environmental justice and development share many things in common, as both are concerned with improving the quality of human life and enhancing access to

resources. In this thesis, I am going to defend the view that there is a strong linkage between environmental justice and development. Framing some forms of environmental injustice in to the notion of development is a very significant concern of the thesis. This is because of the fact that various instances of environmental injustice in Africa will have negative impacts on the development of the continent.

Land grabbing is one instance of environmental injustice in Africa. For instance, Tinyade Kachika (2010), Dessaleng Rahmato (2011), the Oakland Institute (2010) etcetera state that many local communities in various African countries are being evicted from their land as a result of land grabbing. This has been done in the name of improving the socioeconomic status of the local societies in the continent. Also, this is a reality for the local communities living in Ethiopia. Furthermore, Rahmato (2011) states that 11,000 hectares of land in Bako woreda in Oromia region of Ethiopia has been offered to Karuturi Indian conglomerate company. This will hamper the development of the given society, as it deteriorates their culture, livelihood, dignity and overall wellbeing in one way or another. Electronic waste importation from developed countries to developing ones is another instance of environmental injustice in Africa. Though Africans have participated in some conferences such as the Basel Convention to prevent the transnational movement of hazardous wastes, they have not been able to control it. David Naguib Pellow (2007) states that when the electronic goods like computers are no longer functional in developed countries, they often be shipped to developing countries including Africa where they are dumped as wastes. This will expose the local societies to health and ecological risks.

Over-exploitation of African natural resources is also another instance that deteriorates the livelihood of poor African nations. For instance, David Makwerere and Ronald Chipaike (2012) state that developed countries in cooperation with African corrupt leaders are exploiting African natural resources without considering the interests of poor nations. The authors even dubbed the situation as a “new scramble in Africa”. This is to mean that developed nations like China and the USA are engaged in a new system of resource exploitation in Africa, which in turn affects the overall well being of the local communities. Poor urban waste management is also another instance of environmental injustice in Africa, as it results in the perverse impacts on human health, ecology and overall being of the poor societies. This is also true for Addis Ababa, capital city of Ethiopia. For instance, Mazhindu and others (2012) state that the poor waste management

in the Addis Ababa city has exposed the city dwellers to various diseases that has resulted in high mortality rates and deepen urban poverty. I will discuss these and other dimensions of environmental injustice and development in Africa in this thesis.

1.2 Theoretical Framework

Different scholars of environmental justice movement defined the concept of environmental justice differently. For instance, Figueroa and Mills argue, “environmental justice refers to the conceptual connections and causal relationships between environmental issues and social justice” (2001: 427). For them, it incorporates two components. First, distributive justice deals with how environmental benefits (goods) and burdens (bads) distributed across different categories of peoples. Second, participatory justice concerns with “how are these distributive decisions made? Who participates in their making?” (ibid). In connection with this, Kristin Shrader- Frechette also explores the same idea. She writes,

It is the attempt to equalize the burdens of pollution, noxious development, and resource depletion. Environmental justice requires both a more equitable distribution of environmental goods and bads and greater public participation in evaluating and apportioning these goods and bads (2002: 6).

Furthermore, David Schlosberg somehow agrees with the ideas of the above scholars regarding environmental justice. According to him,

The argument here is that movements use a wide range of conceptions of justice, and we can find arguments in those movements for distribution, recognition, participation, and capabilities. The environmental justice movement supplies ample evidence that all of these conceptions of justice are used in practice, and that, in fact, a comprehensive understanding of the way that movements define the ‘justice’ of environmental justice must include all of these discourses (2007:5).

Inferring from the above quote, Schlosberg defined the notion of environmental justice in a way that broader than traditional distributive conception of justice and participatory justice. He incorporates other components like recognition, and capabilities. I will develop my thesis on the basis of Schlosberg’s view of environmental justice, which is broader and inclusive. I believe that enlightening African communities all the dimensions of environmental justice will help them

to critically analyze and respond to all the problems resulted from different instances of environmental injustice. One dimension of environmental justice has the impact on the other in a way that, for instance, absence of participation in decision making will affect the distribution of goods and bads across the communities. And this will also have impact on a person's capability since it hinders what human beings want to be or achieve. All these instances will have in turn negative impact on the development. In this case, all the components of justice are in one way or the other also elements of the human development. The instances of environmental injustice show not only the presence of injustice but also they negatively impact human development.

The environment related problem is one of the most sensitive contemporary issues in both developed and developing nations across the globe. In connection with this, Africa is also facing the pressing problems of environmental injustice which in turn negatively affects its development in many ways, though its contribution to global environmental problems is insignificant. Participating in decision making is very important to alleviate, or at least reduce, the problems of environmental injustice in Africa. Furthermore, this thesis aims at broadening the purview of environmental justice to include not only issues of race and waste but issues of development as well.

1.3 Objectives of the Study

The general objective of this thesis is to explore the relationship between environmental injustice and development in Africa. At its core, environmental justice is about incorporating environmental issues into the broader intellectual and institutional framework of development in Africa. I will try to clarify how some forms of environmental injustice are development concerns, and the quest for healthy environment is an integral part of development concerns. Furthermore, the specific objectives of the thesis are:

- to explicate how some manifestations of environmental injustice are negatively affects African development;
- to identify different dimensions of environmental injustice in Africa;
- to indicate how the notion of environmental justice contribute to development in Africa; and

- to show the nexus of environmental injustice and development ; and
- to come-up with the possible remedies for the negative effects of environmental injustice on African development.

1.4 Methodology of the Study

In this thesis, I selected sources relevant to my inquiry based on various books, articles, journals etc. This study emphasizes on a critical examination of the sources that are accessible on the area of study.

1.5 Significance of the Study

After the accomplishment of this thesis, I hope the negative effects of environmental injustice on African development will be addressed. It tries to explore how the concept environmental justice goes hand in hand with the notion of development. Furthermore, it will help different organizations, governments, policy makers, environmental activists and practitioners to make sound decisions regarding environmental justice. In addition, it might help as a research input for concerned bodies who want to study the relationship between environmental injustice and development.

1.6 The Scope and Limitations of the Study

The scope of this study is limited to explicate the relationship between environmental injustice and African development. Because Africa is one of the areas that are exposed to different instances of environmental injustice like air pollution, lack of clean water, land grabbing, overexploitation of natural resources, climate change injustice, lack of proper urban waste management, toxic waste dump from inside and outside the continent. Despite many instances of environmental injustice in Africa, the study covers only some instances of the injustices as they relate to development. The impacts of overexploitation of natural resources, land grabbing, electronic waste importation and poor urban waste management are the only instances that will be covered in the study, because of the inadequacy of space and time, and in which a critical assessment will be made from the development perspective.

1.7 Organization of the Thesis

This thesis is made-up of four parts. The first one is introductory part. The second chapter deals with the concepts environmental justice and development. This chapter analyses the meaning and

clarification of different terms encompassed in the thesis. In addition, the historical roots of environmental injustice and its relationship to the rise of environmental justice movement along with development will be critically analyzed. Environmental injustice, McDonald (2002) argues, is locating a toxic waste site next to a poor, black community simply because it is poor and black, for example, is an environmental injustice that violates basic human rights and democratic accountability, and demands remediation and prevention. Besides his view, I argue, the problem of environmental injustice goes further to the extent of harming the development in many ways. In the same chapter, I will also clarify the diversity of opinions regarding the relationship between human beings and nature around. Finally, I will briefly discuss the concept development. The third chapter deals with the relationship between environmental injustice and development in Africa. In this chapter, I will briefly discuss different instances of environmental injustice that are practically happening in African continent; and how they could play negative role directly or indirectly in the process of development in Africa. Finally, chapter four is about conclusion of the thesis.

Chapter Two: Environmental Justice and Development

2.1 Environmentalism

Before discussing the notion of environmentalism, it is very important to know what the term environment exactly mean. There is no single and precise definition of the term ‘environment’, since different scholars conceive it differently. Despite the fact that there is no unanimous meaning of the environment, Robin Attfield defined it as “objective encompassing system of nature” (2003:2). In this case, it is the environment in a broader sense that encompasses all living things and non living things. The environment is whatever naturally provided to be used as the means of living and it is the home of every creature including human beings. In connection with this, Chris Barrow states, “environment implies the sum total conditions generated by a given interaction between organic and physical factors” (2003:5). He further claims that nature has strong links with the local conditions in which human communities are populated. And nature has direct impact on the communities who are living in it. In addition, Patrick Novotny defines the concept environment as “where we live, work and play” (2000:23). In this sense, it encompasses not only the green, natural and man-made environment but also the socio-cultural, economic, and political environment.

Now let me turn back to the idea of environmentalism. It focuses on the conservation, preservation and restoration of the nature. Environmentalists strive to claim sound relationship between human beings and non-human creature in the world. Environmentalists were discerned with the emergence of environmental ethics. Environmental ethics is a branch of applied ethics that deals with the relationship between human beings and nature. Ben A. Minteer claims that it begun in the early 1970s as a rebuke to anthropocentrism or human-centered views of Western ethical thinking that failed to extend the boundaries of moral implications to non-humans or larger ecological communities (2009:3). In line with this, different environmentalists came-up with opposite views regarding the notion environmentalism. These include: anthropocentrism and non-anthropocentric approaches. Regarding the former approach, Holmes Rolston III argues that the earth and all its nonhuman components exist to satisfy the interests of human beings and human beings are allowed to manipulate the world in accordance with their interests (Rolston cited in Minteer 2009:97). In contrast, nonanthropocentric approach which includes biocentrism,

ecocenterism and deep ecology focuses on protecting the earth rather than human beings who inhabit it. There are intrinsic values in nature which are likely to constrain the interests of human beings unlike the anthropocentric approach (ibid).

Val Plumwood also rejects anthropocentrism, because it promotes various damaging forms of epistemic remoteness by blocking ourselves from nature in order to exploit it, and anthropocentrism failed to understand that we are part of nature (Plumwood, 2003:98). And Plumwood claims that the current ecological crises are the result of irrationality of rationalist forms of reason since it is the consequence of the historical privileging of human mind over nature (physical entities out there) that in turn implies the deficiency of Western epistemology to conceive the role of the body. In other words, she claims that the old reason-centered culture of the West has destroyed many human spheres. She claims that the global ecological crisis is the result of our culture and attitudes toward the environment. The old Western cultures of reason propagate top-down strategies or eco-authoritarian strategies that harm ecological survival. As a matter of current ecological crisis, she claims,

[s]o the problem is not primarily about more knowledge or technology; it is about developing an environmental culture that values and fully acknowledges the non-human sphere and our dependency on it, and is able to make good decisions about how we live and impact on the non-human world (Plumwood 2003:3).

Drawing from the above quotation, democratic cultural change strategies which require broad projects of change have to be developed. In other words, she argues, "the ecological crisis requires from us a new kind of culture because a major factor in its development has been the rationalist culture and the associated human/nature dualism characteristic of the West" (ibid: 4). Here 'human/nature dualism' refers to a system of ideas that offers reason peculiarly to humans and situates humans above other nature to manipulate it. In turn, it shows supremacy of reason that belongs to humans with active mind; but it designates that non-humans have passive bodies. Further, she argues, this is one way of paving the way for humans to dominate both nature and other humans. As a result, she claims, we must either change old Western culture to the new democratic one or face extinction.

But, I argue, tending to focus on protecting the earth rather than human beings who inhabit it, as propagated by many traditional environmentalists, is likely to be monological and it was the agenda of higher class white Western communities. For instance, this is a reality in the USA, as white communities discriminate the communities of color such as Indian American, African American and other poor nations. These upper class communities don't face different environmental crisis since they have an access to environmental benefits (such as an open space, save work place, parks etc) and they don't bother about environmental hazards since they have officially recognized repository sites adjacent to poor peoples. As a result of this, they mainly emphasized preservation of nature rather than human beings who live in it. Furthermore, I argue, such traditions foster monological view that supports absolute autonomy of nature and upper class communities. In contrast, I claim that not only nature does require care but poor and minority communities have to get fair considerations, since they are more likely to be exposed to environmental hazards. Based on this argument, the environmental justice movement emerged in USA, a concept that I will discuss in more depth later. So, I agree with the ideas of scholars who have tried to look for fair relations between human beings and the environment in a way that pays closer attention to the environment that encompasses both higher class and the rest of human communities. For instance, Rachel Carson (1962) in her book entitled 'Silent Spring' tries to address the controversies about the notions of anthropocentrism and non-anthropocentrism (cited in David Schlosberg 2007). Referring to Carson, Schlosberg claims,

Carson was able to bring together these two previously disconnected environmental concerns—that for the natural world and the animals that inhabit it, and the concern for human health and industrial impacts on individuals and communities. Carson helped to inspire a larger and more diverse environmental movement by illustrating the connections between the issues, and so broadening the discourse beyond one or the other concern (2007:7).

Carson tries to advocate an inclusive conception of the environment. Putting other way, Carson tries to bring together environmental and ecological justice into a larger, broader, and more encompassing discourse that can establish a larger frame and that in turn can link both sets of concerns. I agree with Carson's view, since she tries to look for the middle ground for the two

extreme notions of environmentalism. Moreover, I agree with the notion of weak anthropocentrism which is less-aggressive version of human centeredness. It is a direct opposite to ‘strong anthropocentrism’¹. In connection with this, referring to Norton, Minter writes,

For weak anthropocentrists, Norton wrote, nonhuman nature held an important, noneconomic instrumental quality, a good he later described as “transformative” value. The direct experience of nature, he suggested, had the potential to transform selfish human preferences into more enlightened ones: Nature could in effect be “used” as a means to criticize ecologically irrational desires (such as destructively consumptive views of nature) (Minter 2009: 9).

Weak anthropocentrism encourages the harmonious human relations with their environment, now and in the future, in such a way that it tries to remove the extreme sides of both anthropocentrism and non-anthropocentrism. It looks for the middle ground. There is also an argument that claims that both weak anthropocentrism and non-anthropocentrism, despite their different philosophical starting points, embrace values that care for long term ecological sustainability of natural systems (ibid:11). Minter calls this argument “convergence hypotheses.” Also, if we take weak anthropocentric view as the position that explores the full range of human values in the environment like aesthetic, spiritual, recreational, educational etc over time and non anthropocentric view as the one that supports the notion of intrinsic value of the environment, then both will end up supporting the same environmental policy positions (ibid).

2.2 Environmental Justice

The very concept of environmental justice is one of the prominent issues in the history of environmental ethics. According to David Schlosberg, the most often and popular meaning of environmental justice is fair distribution of environmental goods and bads to all humans (Schlosberg2007:12). Finger and Zorzi also state, “[e]nvironmental justice is the recognition of disparities among people in costs and benefits distribution, meaning that the concept is in fact a call for equality” (201:225).According to Victor Munnik, the notion of environmental justice will

¹ Strong anthropocentrism implies extreme human-centrism and it emphasizes on human beings in the environment. Other non human entities will be treated merely as a means of serving the human beings.

be realized when the relations between peoples with themselves and with their environments are fair and equal without imposing unfair or excessive burdens on others and their environments, now and in the future (2007:2). According to Filomina C. Steady, the “[e]nvironmental Justice is the fair treatment for people of all races, cultures and incomes, regarding the development of environmental laws, regulations and policies” (2009:2). Steady argues that the conceptual underpinning of environmental justice is fair distribution of environmental goods and burdens to all peoples irrespective of race, color, culture, income, religion etc in accordance with the environmental laws, regulations and policies (ibid).

The notion of environmental injustice, which is a direct opposite to environmental justice, is the serious human problem that resulted from the unequal distribution of environmental benefits and burdens across different communities because of different factors like race, class, and gender. The idea of environmental injustice begun in the United States of America in 1980s in response to the distribution of environmental hazards like toxic waste and incinerators, adjacent to communities inhabited by people of color and poor people (Steady 2009; Finger, Zorzi 2013; Munnik 2007; Kristin Shrader-Frechette 2002; Schlosberg 2007; Naguib Pellow 2007). This issue has attracted the attention of many environmental activists and scholars at different times in history; they have tried to discuss the notion of environmental injustice in numerous studies (See JoAnn Carmin and Julian Agyeman 2011; Francis O Adeola 2001; Robert D. Bullard 1990). According to Carmin and Agyeman (2011), communities of color (black Americans, Indian Americans and other minorities) and lower income classes in the United States have been at disproportionate risk from commercial toxic wastes or environmental “bads”, such as the site of hazardous waste landfills, polluting industries, hazardous materials, health hazard, work place hazard and the emission of toxic chemicals into the air and water. Similarly, environmental “goods”, such as a safe work place, clean water and air, easy access to natural surroundings or parks and open spaces have been unequally distributed among the general population. In other words, environmental injustice implies the practice of targeting the communities of color in the United States, as a repository of toxic waste sites that end-up in environmental pollution and discrimination.

There is no united and particular national movement that laid the ground for the emergence of environmental justice movement; rather it is a result of distinctive environmental, political and

social movements. In connection with this, Daniel R Faber and Deborah McCarthy argued that Environmental justice activists have primarily emerged out of six popularly based political movements to embrace the mantra of environmental protection and sustainability (Faber and McCarthy 2003): First, the civil rights movement that was led by African-Americans and other marginalized people of color. Second, the occupational health and safety movement that aimed to protect the rights of non-union immigrants and undocumented workers. Third, the indigenous land rights movement that works for the cultural survival and sovereignty of native peoples. Fourth, the public health and safety movement that aimed to prevent toxic waste dumping adjacent to poor communities. Fifth, social or economic justice movement that involved in multi-issue grassroots organizing in oppressed communities of color and poor working-class neighborhoods all across the USA. The last is the solidarity movement that aimed to promote human rights and the self-determination of developing world peoples (ibid: 45-46).

Although the above mentioned movements or organizations for environmental justice are distinct from one another in a number of ways, they all share a passion for linking grassroots activism and participatory democracy to solve the issues of environmental abuse, unsustainable economic development, racial oppression, social inequality and community disempowerment (ibid). According to Kim Allen and others,

The environmental justice movement is composed of tributaries of which the civil rights movement is one, the antitoxins movement is another, and Native American struggles, the labor movement, traditional environmentalism, and the findings of academics are others. Yet, unlike these authors, who liken the movement to a river, we treat the movement as a figured world to highlight the contingent and often contentious processes of meaning creation that make it possible to think, imagine, and act as environmental justice activists. For us, the environmental justice movement continues to produce a collective, meaningful world of environmental action a horizon of meaning against which experiences are interpreted, plans are made and actions are taken (2007:108).

Allen and others argued that the environmental justice movement is a result of collective struggle such as civil rights movement, antitoxic movement, labor movement, traditional

environmentalism, the finding of academics and so forth. For Robert Figueroa and Claudia Mills (2001), environmental justice is the interplay between environmental issues and social justice in a way that both concepts have common conceptual connection and causal relationships. They further argued that before the emergence of environmental justice movement, there were many precursors of the movement in 1960s and 1970s in the USA. Civil rights movement and environmental movement were among the prominent ones. For instance, Martin Luther King and other civil rights leaders observed that people of color suffered from higher pollution and denigrated environment. Many environmental scholars argued for environmental conservation and preservation that laid foundation for environmental justice movement.

After comprehensive studies of environmental issues and many struggles against environmental racism that affected minorities and lower socio-economic groups across USA, different protests and conferences were undertaken. Out of these issues, the environmental justice movement has grown. As many scholars argue, the environmental justice movement has measurably been advanced since its humble beginning in Warren County, North Carolina, where a polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB) landfill ignited protests and over five hundred arrests (Steady 2009:4; Faber and McCarthy 2003:46; Schlosberg 2007; Pellow 2007). Warren County protest took place in 1982 as the first public mobilization to achieve fair distribution of environmental goods and bads. This protest provided the impetus for a U.S. General Accounting Office (US-GAO) that studied the correlation between the sitings of hazardous waste landfills and race and socio-economic status in 1983. The GAO study found the strong correlation between the given issues. Moreover, it shows that “race was found to be the most potent variable in predicting where waste facilities were located—more powerful than poverty, land values, and home ownership” (Steady 2009:18). The other important issue for the development of environmental justice is Michigan conference. A number of environmental activists and higher government officials have participated on September 13, 1990. They presented their ideas and consider possible solutions to the problems of environmental racism and environmental inequities. This conference played a significant role in the recognition of environmental justice movement. As a result, the protest along with the given studies and conferences brought the first National People of Color Environmental Leadership Summit at Washington, DC, in 1991, which produced the document “Principles of Environmental Justice”, outlining the agenda of environmental justice movement that consist of

both distributive and participatory justice (Figueroa and Mills 2001; David E. Newton 2009). It adopted seventeen principles of environmental justice that were inspired as a guide for organizing different government and non government organizations. It is the most important single event in the history of environmental justice movement. The agenda of this summit is not restricted to the narrow antitoxins focus; rather it further incorporates other issues like public health, worker safety, land use, transportation, housing, resource allocation, and community empowerment. A subsequent summit or the Second National People of Color Environmental Leadership Summit, or Summit II, was also held in Washington, DC, on October 23–26, 2002 (Glenn S. Johnson 2009:19). Johnson argues that “Summit II builds on the legacy of the Summit I. It also expands and extends the environmental and economic justice paradigm to address globalization and international issues” (ibid: 19).

Before the emergence of environmental justice movement, Shrader- Frechette (2002) argues, the attitudes and writings of many environmentalists have tended to focus on protecting the earth rather than the humans who live in it. She claims that it seems to encourage disrespect for humans even as they call for a greater respect for nature and the earth. But for her, such attitudes often are exclusively nature centered rather than human centered (anthropocentrism). She claims that the main reason for traditional environmentalists’ emphasis on protection of nature, rather than humans, is their belief that the problem of planetary degradation can be the result of anthropocentrism or human centered values. In contrast, she argues, the two movements are the two sides of the same coin, as environmental justice is an attempt to equalize the burdens of pollution, noxious development, and resource depletion across the nations. Further, she claims, environmental justice requires public participation besides equitable distribution of environmental goods and bads in order to evaluate and apportion these benefits and burdens.

In line with this, one might think that the proponents of environmental justice emphasis on the shift from exclusive concern with issues such as wilderness preservation and protection of endangered species to maintenance of livable environments for people of color and low-income communities that were exposed to hazardous waste sites, polluting industries, occupational hazards, and exposure to other toxic metals; but, somehow, that is not the case, since environmental justice concerns much about environmentally harmed community and this in turn

is one way of protecting nature (Newton 2009). In addition, the concerned communities are part and parcel of nature along with traditional environmental activists that mainly aimed at wilderness preservation, ecological conservation, etcetera; so I don't see any significant conflict between the two (environmental justice movement and traditional environmental activism). To support this view, Ronald Sandler and Phaedra C. Pezzullo argue,

[t]he environmental and environmental justice movements would seem to be natural allies. Indeed, one might expect that a social movement dedicated to environmental integrity and preservation and a social movement dedicated to justice in the distribution of environmental goods and decision making would not be two distinct social movements, but rather two aspects of one encompassing movement. After all, both have chosen the core term of "environment" to name their passions, mobilize their constituents, and send their message to those they aim to persuade. Moreover, there are ample opportunities for joint efforts in the cause for environmental health, sustainability, and integrity (Sandler and Pezzullo 2007:1).

The problem of environmental injustice is not only confined to minority groups in USA, but also it is a reality for many African countries as well. For instance, there is an environmental justice movement in South Africa just like in USA. Because in South Africa there have been different forms of environmental injustice including "forcibly removing people from their ancestral land, without any consultation or compensation, to make way for a game park is wrong by most moral standards" (David A. Donald 2002:4). The Apartheid government spent millions of rands on municipal services for one group of people and refused to provide the most basic necessities to others (ibid). Vector Munnik (2007) also tries to show the manifestations of environmental injustice in Africa, as developed countries [both from the West and East] are interested in exploiting the continent of Africa. Frances O. Adeola (2001:39) also contends that the problems related with toxic waste importations from the developed countries to developing countries [for instance to Africa] is another instance of environmental injustice. Natural resource exploitations and large scale land acquisitions both by local governments and multinational corporations are also other instances which expose the society to serious human rights abuse, ecological disruptions and lame overall well being of the given society. These are what environmental

justice activists have tried to address both in Africa and USA. I will discuss further about different instances of environmental injustice in Africa in the next chapter.

2.2.1 Dimensions of Environmental Justice

There are different dimensions of environmental justice including distribution, participation, recognition and capabilities. Figueroa and Mills (2001) confined to discuss environmental justice framework in terms of two dimensions of environmental justice. First, distributive justice concerns distributions of environmental benefits and burdens across the communities. Second, participatory justice deals with “how are these distributive decisions made? Who participates in their making?”(ibid: 427). Figueroa and Mills claim that the distributive dimension of environmental justice began as a response to unfair distributions of environmental burdens to the people of color, the poor and under-represented groups such as indigenous tribes and nations (ibid). They further argued that this shows environmental discrimination which in turn is socio-economic discrimination in a way that the poor societies face environmental burdens, while others benefit as a result of preventing these burdens. This also implies social injustice or inequity. In connection with this, Peter S.Wenz defines environmental justice only in terms of distributive dimension. Wenz argues, the main concern of environmental justice has to be the distribution of benefits and burdens among all those affected by environmentally related decisions and actions including the division of the burdens of environmental protection between different classes of society, as well as the distribution of resources between peoples (ibid:428).

Distributive dimension of environmental justice has also a connection with John Rawls’s theory of justice who defines the notion of justice in terms of “the appropriate division of social advantages” (Schlosberg 2007:12). Rawls argues that there are two basic and defensible principles of justice: “everyone would have the same political rights, and the distribution of economic and social inequality in a society should benefit everyone, including the least well-off” (quoted in Schlosberg 2007:13). These two principles, he argues, imply “justice as fairness” which concerns a just distribution of social, political, and economic goods and bads. Most literature of environmental justice focuses on mere distributive aspects. Environmental justice scholars like Figueroa and Mills (2001), and Shrader- Frechette (2002) incorporated participatory justice in to the environmental justice framework. Schlosberg (2007) argues that the notion of

environmental justice has to further incorporate other issues like participation, recognition, and capabilities besides distributive aspects.

Figueroa and Mills (2001:428) claim that lack of participation in environmental decision-making can be considered as “discriminatory environmentalism” that excludes environmentally burdened communities from participating in environmental concerns. In this case, they argue, meaningful involvement of people of color, poor people and minority communities in environmental policy-making, representation in local, national and international environmental agencies, and participation in decision-making over the location of environmental burdens and benefits have to be considered under the environmental justice framework (ibid). In connection with this, Shrader-Frechette (2002) also explores the significance of participative dimension of environmental justice. She claims that “it also will be necessary to reform the principles and practices of participative justice---equal rights to self-determination in societal decision-making” (ibid: 24). She further argues that no purely distributive system is sufficient to promote justice, because it tends to ignore the institutional contexts that influence or determine the distributions. Putting other way, she claims, we should not only focus on justice of material distributions but justice of decision-making power and procedures (ibid: 27). Scholars such as Iris Young (1990), Charles Taylor (1994), Axel Honneth (1995, 2001) and Nancy Fraser (1997, 1998, 2000, 2001) challenged the distributional approach that concerns the sole emphasis of distribution without addressing the root causes of misdistribution (cited in Schlosberg 2007:4). In this case, they claim, recognition is the central concern in a way that lack of recognition in the social and political realms shows injustice not only because it constrains people and harms them, but also because it is the foundation for distributive injustice (ibid:14). More specifically, Young argues that the reason for unjust distribution is a lack of recognition of group difference; and distributional injustice comes out of social structures, cultural beliefs, and institutional contexts (ibid: 15).

Schlosberg argues that there is another dimension to the concept and practice of justice in addition to distribution and recognition; that is procedural justice. He claims that procedural justice has also the vital role in realizing the environmental justice horizon. In this context, “justice is defined as fair and equitable institutional processes of a state” (2007:25). Further, he

claims, justice must focus on the political process as a way to address both the inequitable distribution of social goods and the conditions undermining social recognition. Referring to Young, Schlosberg writes, “democratic and participatory decision-making procedures are then both an element of, and a condition for, social justice; they simultaneously challenge institutionalized exclusion, a social culture of misrecognition, and current distributional patterns” (ibid: 26). Moreover, Amartya Sen and Martha Nussbaum attempted to explore how the notion of justice goes beyond the narrow definition of distributive justice. More clearly, they claim, capabilities and functioning have also significant role in the justice framework. Referring to Sen and Nussbaum, Schlosberg claims that “capabilities are about a person’s opportunities to do and to be what they choose in the context of a given society; the focus is on individual agency, functioning, and well-being and, rather than more traditional distributive indicators” (ibid: 30). In connection with this, they claim, functioning refers to various doings (like eating, reading, seeing) and state of being (like being well nourished, being free from disease) (ibid). In other words, functioning implies becoming what people want to be or what they have reason to value to be and doing things that people have reason to value.

I agree with Schlosberg’s position regarding the scope and understanding of environmental justice framework, since it is often broad, plural, and inclusive in a way that definitions and discourses of justice range from those based on individual distributive complaints to those based on the survival of community functioning. He explores and demands a comprehensive understanding of environmental justice which includes dimensions like fair distribution, recognition, participation, capabilities, and functioning for communities as well as individuals (ibid:4-5). I think that his idea is very important, because without meaningful involvement of minority communities in environmental leadership and decision-making (including fostering sound procedural justice) and without promoting their recognition and enhancing their capabilities in the communities, emphasizing on the mere distributive aspect is absurd. This broader dimension of environmental justice framework has significant contributions to African equitable and sustainable human development, since different instances of environmental injustices and delayed human development are manifested therein. Most African nations are exposed to inequitable distributions of environmental goods and burdens; they failed to participate in environmental leadership and decision-making; and they live in a condition where

they cannot choose what to be and to do because of various environmental injustices. Schlosberg claims that “poor communities, indigenous communities, and communities of color get fewer environmental goods, more environmental bads, and less environmental protection” (p.4). For example, developed countries dump toxic wastes in Africa every year. Based on this evidence, developed countries are the major causes of environmental injustice in developing nations including Africa. Toxic wastes dumping by industrialized countries and the work of multinational companies or transnational trade corporations in the nations have the lion’s share. The corrupt governments, local leaders and NGOs are other causes of various problems in Africa.

2.3 The Concept of Development

The term “development” has multifaceted definitions. Because the term development is different to different people; but it is important that we have to consider some working definitions or core perspective regarding its meaning. Michael P. Todaro and Stephen C. Smith (2012: 14) argue that traditional view of development is mainly confined to economic growth through the expansion of production. In this case, problems of poverty, discrimination, unemployment, and income distribution were of secondary importance, as economic growth was given primary attention. Todaro and Smith claim that “during the 1970s, economic development came to be redefined in terms of the reduction or elimination of poverty, inequality, and unemployment within the context of a growing economy. And ‘redistribution from growth’ became a common slogan” (2012: 15). Scholars like David Crocker, Denis Goulet, Mahbub ul Haq, Amartya Sen, Martha Nussbaum and many others disproved the traditional view of development and they came up with broader view of development. Here what I wanted to say is that Africans too should not be deceived by economic growth alone; rather they have to internalize, learn, and apply the modern development theories that have been developed by the above mentioned scholars. If their ideas are logical and convincing, African policy makers and different concerned bodies can benefit from these theories.

Crocker (2008) argues that development ethicists understood the notion of development as a multidisciplinary field that has both practical and theoretical components that intertwine in various ways. Crocker claims that “development ethicists are aware that what is frequently called

development-for instance economic growth-has created as many problems as it has solved” (2008:37). He argues that development can be used both descriptively and normatively. By descriptive,he meant development that is identified in terms of economic growth, modernization, and industrialization that end-up in improving per capita income. In contrast, the normative sense of development shows when the noun is often preceded by a positive adjective such as ‘good’, ‘authentic’, ‘humane’, ‘just’, or ‘ethically justified’. Crocker further claims that although development ethicists understood the term in different ways, they commonly agree that reducing human deprivation and misery in poor countries and regions is their major target. Sen (1999) argues, the narrow definition of development is identifying it in terms of gross national product (GNP), personal income, industrialization, technological advancement and modernization etcetera. However besides the above mentioned issues of development (measuring development in terms of economic growth), Sen argues, it has to further incorporates other issues like political freedoms, social opportunities, transparency guarantees and protective security,and thereby end up in human freedom. Likewise, Gouletalso theorized the concept of development in terms of freedom. He writes,

[i]t is not enough, however, simply to condemn what blocks or slows down development; it is also necessary to reject false or spurious forms of development which assign greater importance to the accumulation of goods than to the "essential good," or which subordinate the value of the human person to mere material goods. Embracing spurious development would eventually lead to the acceptance only of values measurable in monetary terms ; doing so would simply "materialize" human beings, treating them simply as instruments of production, units of consumption, voters, or bearers of arms (Goulet 2006:5).

He claims that fulfilling subsistence or basic needs such as shelter, food and clothes are very important for human life, because life would be impossible without them.He argues, “By owning things, man can become superior to what he was. TO HAVE helps him TO BE” (2006:28). According to Goulet, the notion of having enough is not restricted to the scope of basic needs rather it goes beyond to the extent of proving once potentiality that end-up in self-realization. As a result, economic growth and fulfilling basic needs have a pertinent role in human development. Without them, development would lack meaning since they are the components of development.

However, Goulet argues that economic growth is not an end in itself but a means of development for the reason that modern development goes beyond mere economic growth. Goulet (ibid:103) claims that human development can be realized when people get rid of psychic despair which is destructive of esteem and confidence, and emancipate from various external constraints like servitudes to nature and to ignorance. Overcoming political and economic constraints, which block people's creativity, are also very important issues of liberation (ibid). These external constraints, he argues, would hamper people's capabilities or potentiality to choose among ranges of available human choices.

In connection to this, Todaro and Smith argue that there are three core values of modern development that can be applicable in all societies and culture at all times. Goulet also agrees with them regarding the three core values of development. These are sustenance, self-esteem and freedom. Todaro and Smith (2012:21) argue that the notion of sustenance is concerned with minimum level of living such as food, shelter, health, clothing and protection. They claim that economic development is a necessary condition for the improvement in the quality of life. The realization of human potential would not be possible without continuous economic progress at the individual and societal level. Also, they claim that emphasizing on economic development that is concerned with rising per capita incomes, the elimination of poverty or fulfilling basic needs, greater employment opportunities and lessening income inequalities are the necessary conditions but not sufficient conditions for development (ibid).

The second universal component of good life is self-esteem that could rightly manifest the meaning of modern development. According to Todaro and Smith, the concept of self-esteem concerns "to be a person" that in turn implies "a sense of worth and self-respect, of not being used as a tool by others for their own ends" (2012:21). Further, it is concerned with people's quest for authenticity, identity, dignity, respect, honor, or recognition (ibid). But, nowadays developing countries are suffering from serious cultural confusion when they contact with developed nations. In other words, developing nations are facing difficulty of self-esteem in a way that developed nations are becoming the source of modernizing values across the globe. This situation in turn will pave the way for marginalization of worth with respect to their identity, dignity, culture, respect or honor and so on. Moreover, self-esteem is a very problematic

issue in Africa as a result of external cultural hegemony on one hand and bad leadership from within on the other hand. There is a situation when few peoples in power intentionally oppress, marginalize, disrespect and misrecognize the majority.

The third important component of development is the concept of “human freedom.” Todaro and Smith explored the concept of freedom in terms of “freedom from servitude” or “to be able to choose.” More clearly, they claim, “freedom here is to be understood in the sense of emancipation from alienating material conditions of life and from social servitude to nature, other people, misery, oppressive institutions, and dogmatic beliefs especially that poverty is predestination” (2012:21). They further argue that the concept of freedom also incorporates various components of political freedom such as personal security, the rule of law, freedom of expression, political participation, and equality of opportunity (ibid).

Sen and Nussbaum also briefly explored the broader concept of modern human development. Nussbaum claims that “against the dominant emphasis on economic growth as an indicator of a nation’s quality of life, Sen has insisted on the importance of capabilities, what people are actually able to do and to be”(2003:33). Most of the time, her argument revolves around the issues of gender as one crucial component of human development. In relation to this, she argues that economic growth is a bad indicator of life quality in a way that it fails to consider the deprived class of the community particularly women. In this case, she claims, women are often unable to enjoy the fruits of a nation’s general prosperity because overemphasis is merely given to economic growth as the traditional conceptual underpinning of development. In connection to this view, Sen (1999) in his book entitled *Development as Freedom* states that development is not about mere material fulfillments but about freedom (i.e. preventing different kinds of constraints) that enhances human’s capabilities for carrying out functioning. He argues that besides economic growth, peoples’ need to have access to education, health care, security, equality before the law, the right to have their own property, the right to freedom from various discriminations, oppressions, marginalization, illegal or inhuman treatments and punishments should be fulfilled. He claims that these things will strengthen peoples’ capabilities and talents to achieve their goals and determine their destinies. Sen argues that capabilities provide the sound

basis for thinking about the goals of human development in a way that it comes up with an attractive way of understanding the normative content of the notion of development.

There is no common conceptual understanding of what capabilities and functioning mean though both Sen and Nussbaum advocate the same issue. Crocker (2008:192) argues that both Sen and Nussbaum proposed the same item as valuable capabilities though they understand the status and justification of these capabilities in different ways. In this case, Sen restrained from listing the valuable functioning, whereas Nussbaum prescribes ten universally valid human capabilities as criteria of evaluating the quality of human life (Nussbaum 2003:41). As I tried to discuss earlier, the broader notion of environmental justice encompasses the fair distribution, meaningful participation, recognition, and encouraging the culture of capabilities and functioning. I argue that these components of environmental justice in turn have important contribution to modern human development. Generally, the goal of identifying development in terms of freedom, unlike traditional one, is not economic growth but human development that enable individuals to choose the life that they truly value and have reason to value. Referring to Sen, Crocker writes, “development should be understood ultimately not as economic growth, industrialization or modernization, which are at best means (and sometimes not very good means), but as the expansion of people’s valuable capabilities and functionings” (Crocker 2008:36). In this case, development is considered as freedom in which people can realize their authenticity, identity, dignity, culture, respect or honor, sustainable environment besides being economically strong. In connection to this, sound development should improve the life of everyone in a society starting from grassroots level than concentrating on improving the life of few people.

Mahbub ul Haq also disproved the traditional view of development. Ul Haq claims,

The basic purpose of development is to enlarge people's choices. In principle, these choices can be infinite and can change over time. People often value achievements that do not show up at all, or not immediately, in income or growth figures: greater access to knowledge, better nutrition and health services, more secure livelihoods, security against crime and physical violence, satisfying leisure hours, political and cultural freedoms and a sense of participation in community

activities. The objective of development is to create an enabling environment for people to enjoy long, healthy and creative lives (1995:14).

He argues that the central theme of modern human development goes far beyond economic well-being. The scope of human development, he claims, encompasses all possible human choices like greater access to knowledge, health services, security, clean environment, political freedom, cultural freedom, participating in societal decision making, simple pleasure of life and so forth. And all these issues will enable people to enjoy long, healthy and creative lives. Likewise, the 1990 Human Development Report (HDR) asserts three indicators in Human Development Index (HDI)²: longevity, healthy and creative lives (quoted in Christopher Ryan B. Maboloc 2008: 51). Maboloc claims that human development goes beyond the notion of income and accumulation of wealth. HDR is grounded on the given three indicators in HDI. Further, he claims that “the basic objective of development is to create an enabling condition for people to enjoy long, healthy and creative lives” (2008:51).

Ul Haq argues that “[t]here are four essential components in the human development paradigm: equity, sustainability, productivity and empowerment” (Ul Haq 1995:16). These components “distinguish human development paradigm from the more traditional economic growth models.” For him, equity implies having “equal access to opportunities.” He claims, “If development is to enlarge people's choices, people must enjoy equitable access to opportunities. And development without equity means a restriction of the choices of many individuals in a society” (ibid: 17). By sustainability, he means that “everyone should have equal access to development opportunities now and in the future” (ibid: 19). Productivity, he argues, implies economic growth as one component of human development model. It is an essential component but not the ultimate goal of human development unlike the traditional model of development. Ul Haq claims that it has to be treated only as one part of human development paradigm in a way that giving equal values with other components like equity, sustainability and empowerment (ibid). He claims that the notion of empowerment, as one component of human development, focuses “on development by the people, who must participate in the activities, events and processes that shape their lives”

² Human Development Index (HDI) is an important component of Human Development Report. It was developed by the Pakistani economist Mahbub Ul Haq in 1990 in order to measure the quality of human life around the world.

(ibid). Therefore, human development has to be inclusive and impartial that promotes development benefits for everyone in a society. And development has to be people-centered and empower them rather than marginalizing some groups.

The other important issues about development, which go beyond the scope of traditional view of development, are the notion of sustainable development and Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). According to Brundtland Commission's definition, the notion of sustainable development means "development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs" (quoted in Ul Haq 1995:77). Alan Holland also argues that the idea of sustainability reflects development of a kind that does not prejudice future development and acceptable environmental modification is needed (2001:400). Unlike the traditional view of development, sustainable development concentrates on perpetuating the interest of the present people without harming the interest of the future generations though we cannot be assured of what would be their interest exactly. At least we can guess some points regarding the interest of the future generations based on the interest of the present generations.

Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) are "time-bound goals to free the world from the abject and dehumanizing conditions of extreme poverty, and make the right to development a reality for everyone" (Ajei 2007:89). These goals were adopted by 147 heads of states and governments at the millennium assembly in September 2000. It encompasses about eight goals that have significant role in sustaining human life or development. These goals include: to eradicate extreme poverty and hunger; to achieve universal primary education; to promote gender equality and empower women in a way that eliminating gender disparity in primary and secondary education preferably by 2005, and at all levels by 2015; to reduce child mortality; to improve maternal health; to combat HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases; to ensure environmental sustainability; and the final goal is to develop a global partnership for development (Ibid: 90). Both sustainable development and MDGs aimed at disproving the conceptual underpinning of traditional view of development that was based on mere economic growth. Rather the two concepts came-up with the new dimensions of human development that is broader and inclusive than the earlier one.

Now the question is: how could the principles of capabilities and freedom; sustainable development; and MDGs, as good instances of modern human development, be applicable in developing countries including Africa? Maboloc argues that “most third world societies are beset with problems like corrupt governments, demographic problems, and the lack of innovation in the area of science and technology” (2008:68). This, I believe, in turn will negatively impact the societies in developing countries including Africa, as they are not able to choose what they want to be and to do because of the given problems. More clearly, corrupt governments, demographic problems, and lack of technological innovations in developing countries will hamper development efforts in the area. So, societies in developing countries have failed to realize their potentials; and they would have faced difficulty to apply the very definitions of sustainable development and MDGs because of the problems in the systems. Manoloc argues,

[g]lobal institutions, for instance the World Bank, UNDP, and international NGOs, including rich donor nations, have the moral obligation to promote and protect the central human capabilities of people. Securing the threshold of central human capabilities which is crucial to human development should be the benchmark for global institutions in helping extremely poor societies. Assisting poor societies in this way will help people to a very large extent attain a life worthy of being human. Thus, assistance to poor nations must not only in line with the economic well-being of a society, but should also be on the essential ingredients that make life truly worth living (2008:69).

Inferring from the above, Manoloc argues that different international organizations like World Bank (WB), UNDP, NGOs and rich nations have a moral responsibility to apply different instances of modern human development (like freedom, capabilities, sustainability, MDGs and so forth) in developing countries, including Africa. How could the above international organizations and rich countries solve the above mentioned problems? Manoloc identifies about three mechanisms as a solution to the given problems, which I also accept. First, the above mentioned global institutions and rich donor nations should require developing countries to set laws against graft and corruption and evaluate the implementation of the same to ensure transparency in government. Secondly, “developing or underdeveloped countries should be encouraged to promote gender equality in order to protect the rights of women” (2008:70).

Thirdly, recipient countries should develop democratic cultures that enable them to insure sustainable development in one way or the other.

Furthermore, Manoloc claims that certain development programs should be implemented through local NGOs to help the people in a way that adopting the culture of people-centered projects by NGOs must be supported by the UNDP, the World Bank, and other global institutions to empower communities and the people. According to him, this kind of empowerment likely helps people to evolve into some sort of political maturity. In connection with this, he claims that “an empowered populace will serve as a stronger foundation for a more effective and people-centered government in the future, a government that will be sensitive to the needs of the people” (ibid: 73). The other important component in the development paradigm is gender equality. He claims that gender equality has to be a core component in human capabilities that will play a lion’s share in the equality of all human beings. In connection with this, I argue, gender equality is important in securing a life where women are allowed to flourish; and this will play significant role in the realization of the potential of each person in developing countries including Africa. Therefore, ensuring gender equality in Africa is very important to halt issues like poverty, corruption, dictatorship, and demographic problems; and these will have a significant contributions to achieve sound human development in the continent.

The 2013 Human Development Report (HDR) in one way disproves the traditional notion of development that is economic growth alone does not automatically translate into human development progress. In other ways it provides some areas of focus for sustaining development momentum in developing countries. These include: enhancing equity that encompasses gender dimension; enabling greater voice and participation of citizens that includes youth; confronting environmental pressures; and controlling demographic change (2013:iv). The report also calls for regional integration and South-South cooperation in order to foster sound human development in developing countries. These can be the sources of innovative social, economic policies, trade, investment, and development cooperation partners for other developing countries that will enable people in developing countries to realize their potential in accordance with their interest and choices.

The 2014 Human Development Report (HDR), which is entitled *Sustaining Progress: Reducing Vulnerabilities and Building Resilience*, aimed at securing human progress in one way or the other. It emphasizes on close links between reducing vulnerability³ and advancing human development. The report tries to introduce:

[t]he concept of human vulnerability to describe the prospects of eroding people's capabilities and choices. Looking at vulnerability through a human development lens, we draw attention to the risk of future deterioration in individual, community and national circumstances and achievements, and we put forward policies and other measures to prepare against threats and make human development progress more robust going forward (2014:1).

The report claims that steady human progress could not be achieved unless we recognize multidimensional and intersecting vulnerabilities; and systematically reduce them. Reducing or eliminating vulnerabilities is “the outcomes of vigorous collective action, equitable and effective institutional responses, and far sighted leadership—local, national and global” (2014:4). In connection to this view, I believe, African nations have to learn something from this report on how to reduce, eliminate if possible, different vulnerabilities in the continent that in turn contribute positive role to human development paradigm.

In the next chapter, I will look at the relationship between environmental injustice [by taking some environmental injustice instances in Africa] and development particularly from African point of view in more depth.

³Vulnerability refers to exposure to particular risks. Therefore, the 2014 HDR emphasizes on reducing peoples' exposure to various risks and securing human development.

Chapter Three: Environmental Injustice-Development Nexus

In this chapter, I will discuss the major instances of environmental injustice in relation to the notion of development in Africa. The problem of environmental injustice is not limited to peoples of color in America; rather it further goes to a lot of developing countries (including many African countries) that are exposed to the problem. Historically, Africa is a continent which was exposed to the major problems of environmental injustice though its contribution to the problem is very insignificant one. Some instances of environmental injustice in Africa include land grabbing, over-exploitation of natural resources, electronic wastes importation and urban wastes management. In this chapter, I try to show that various instances of environmental injustice will negatively affect African development. I argue that achieving equitable and sustainable human development in Africa is impossible without securing meaningful environmental justice.

3.1 Dimensions of Environmental Injustice

As stated earlier, there are various dimensions of environmental injustice including land grabbing, over-exploitation of natural resources, electronic wastes importation, urban wastes management, toxic wastes trading and dumping, climate change and global warming etc. Although there are many dimensions of environmental injustice in Africa, I will only examine land grabbing, electronic wastes importation, over-exploitation of natural resources, and urban wastes management in this chapter.

3.1.1 Land Grabbing: The Case of Ethiopia

According to Lorenzo Cotula and others, the notion land grabbing is defined as “large-scale land acquisitions (LSLAs)” which in turn is broadly defined as “acquisitions (whether purchases, leases or other) of land areas over 1,000 ha” (2009:3). It refers to the purchase or lease of vast hectares of land for different purposes such as food securities in a ways that domestic governments, Transnational companies, foreign governments, and private investors from developing and developed countries have tried to own large tracts of land in developing countries in order to produce crops. Likewise, Tinyade Kachika contends:

Some are diplomatically calling the phenomenon “commercial pressures on land,” “(foreign) investment in land,” and “large-scale land acquisitions.” However, some are outrightly naming it “land grabbing.” Land acquisition has been defined broadly to include not only the purchase of ownership rights, but also the acquisition of user rights-i.e. through leases or concessions, whether for a short or a long term. On the other hand, land grabbing has been defined as taking possession of, and or controlling a scale of land for commercial and industrial agricultural production that is disproportionate in size in comparison to the average land holding in the region (2010:15).

Kachika claims that the notion land grabbing or large scale land acquisition in Africa has begun as a response to global food crises from 2007-2008 though scrambling for African land is not a new phenomenon. In response to the crises, many developing countries were opened to foreign direct investment (FDI) especially in agribusiness and tourism. As a result, African fertile land is offered to investors at very low prices. But the new scramble for Africa is based on the common interest of both foreign governments and host governments unlike the old scramble for Africa that used military invention to conquer African land and its natural resources.

As in many African countries, the phenomenon of large scale land acquisition has expanded drastically in Ethiopia. For instance, Oakland Institute (2011) report has made critical assessment of the issue of commercial land investment in Ethiopia. According to this report (2011:1), the land investment has increased food insecurity in the country in a way that all the harvest will be exported to abroad without achieving any significant gain from it. Moreover, local communities are displaced from their farmland without getting proper compensation. There was no meaningful environmental impact assessment.

According to Cotula and others (2009), there are some factors that encouraged the LSLAs. These include food security concerns, biofuels and financial incentive. He claims that the case of food security is related with sky rocketing price of 2007 and 2008 at the global level as a result of limited availability of water and arable land. To solve this problem, the food importing nations started to look for the easily accessible arable land in developing nations. In response to biofuels

crises in 2008 and 2009, many countries are interested in biofuel investments for the reason of the diminishing supplies of non-renewable resources in different parts of the world. To solve the given problem, many countries are interested in obtaining land for the production of agrofuel or biofuel crops such as jatropha, palm oil, maize and soya, since these renewable crops are very important for fuel production. The other factor that opened the way for LSLAs is financial incentive. It implies Cotula and others claim, market instability that resulted from rising agricultural commodity prices at an international level and attracted investors to invest on farmland. All these factors are opened the way for LSLAs in one way or the other. And this land acquisition will have a negative impact on the life of African societies. Cotula and others (2009) claim that there are different factors that undermine the position of local peoples as a result of LSLAs. Among others, these factors include, lack of transparency and of checks and balances in contract negotiations that open the way for corruption and restrict the public interest; insecure use rights on state-owned land; inaccessible registration procedures; legislative gaps; and lack of fair compensation for the small scale farmers. All these factors will end-up in local people losing access to the resources on which they depend for their food security and livelihoods. Rather than solving the local peoples' problem, LSLAs "can undermine the well being of local communities, both in terms of land rights as well as access to food" (Kachika:19). The African governments are engaged in fixing eviction policies that are essentially grabbing land from rural minorities (ibid).

According to the Oakland Institute (2010), in many African countries (like Ethiopia, Sierra Leone and Liberia), there is land market (land grabbing) that transferred the land to foreign investors in the name of improving the countries investment policies. International Financial Corporation (IFC) and the Foreign Investment Advisory Service (FIAS) have provided technical assistance and advisory services to lease their land. The question is 'where is this land coming from?' Many studies explored that most of the land that is given to the concerned investors is already occupied and used by millions of local farmers. In connection to this, Kachika claims that "the land for large scale fuel production must come from somewhere—whether from small farmers' land, communal land, or conservation areas. There is no free land in any of our countries, so communities will inevitably be displaced and denied of their land territories and natural resources" (2010:21). As a result, many local African communities have suffered a lot as a result

of land market as this land is the source of subsistence for these poor communities. And it provides them with food, medicine, construction materials, fuel and other purposes. Furthermore, this action has played a significant role in undermining African development in the name of improving the “investment climates” and “business enabling environments” of developing countries (Oakland Institute 2010). In addition, Dessaleng Rahmato also writes:

According to international media reports, many market analysts are of the opinion that volatility in the world food trade will continue to drive up commodity prices and to cause periodic global shortages for many years to come. There is thus a strong food security element in the on-going global land grab phenomenon. At the same time, the rush for land in Africa by investors from the Gulf countries, India, China and South Korea, has also been driven by the assumption that land is abundant in the continent, land rents and labor costs are low, and there are few regulatory roadblocks restricting production and export (2011:2).

Rahmato argues that many countries in Africa including Ethiopia have given millions of hectares of farmland to investors in the name of large-scale investment, and they believe this will provide opportunities for rapid agrarian development that can play significant role in tackling rural poverty in the continent. In connection with this, he states, the land is owned by the government in Ethiopia. So, government authorities can give away land to investors without consulting farmers and making environmental impact assessment (ibid: 7). Thus, this problem is observable in many African countries. Understanding and looking for solutions for such problems, I argue, can provide a better protection for Africans since there are many possible mechanisms that might help us to alleviate or reduce the given problems.

The notion of large scale land investment is somehow understood as a controversial phenomenon. Different researchers try to find out whether or not this kind of farmland investments can help to the recipient country to develop. In this case, proponents of large scale land investment argued that “this is a new type of development opportunity where foreign direct investments can increase the gross domestic product and create a win-win situation for all parties; the foreign company, the domestic government and local societies”(Riedel2011:2).

Further, the proponents of large scale land investment claim that it will have a positive role in improving societal life like creating job opportunity, ensuring food security, enhancing government revenues etc.

In contrast, “others claim this to be a type of imperialism where poor countries are exhausted of their natural resources” (ibid). Although large scale land investment could create development opportunities for developing countries, inversely it can play a great role in the deterioration of their culture, livelihood, human dignity and wellbeing in general. I will later show the negative impacts of LSLA in developing countries including Ethiopia. Large scale land acquisition will have negative impacts on African different social affairs like undermining culture, religion, livelihood, dignity, wellbeing etc.

The HRW report in 2011 mentioned that since 2008 Ethiopian government has leased out at least 3.6 million hectares of land to both foreign and local investors (cited in Mahaprashasta 2012). And these hectares of land are equal with the size of Netherlands. Further, this report states that 2.1 million hectares of fertile land were reserved in the federal government’s land bank for the commercial investment purpose. According to this report, Gambella region in the south-west of the country is one of the most vulnerable areas for the land investment deals. In this region, approximately 70,000 people were relocated at the end of 2011(Mahaprashasta 2012). According to Ethiopian government, the plan of relocating people is voluntary and it aims to provide them basic socio-economic infrastructure that will have significant contribution in securing their livelihoods (ibid). But the report claims that there is no meaningful consultation and payment of compensation for the relocated communities (ibid). In connection to this, The Oakland Institute (2011) states:

No single land investment has garnered as much media attention as that of Karuturi. Reports surfaced in 2008 that the Indian giant, already active in Ethiopia’s floriculture industry, had acquired 300,000 ha for a 99 year lease in Gambella (3,000 km²/1,150 miles²) for food production. Rents for this massive area were reported to be as low as 15-20 birr per ha (USD 1-1.25). This was one of the first major foreign land investments in Ethiopia, and was negotiated

between Karuturi and the Gambella Regional Council, without the involvement of the federal government (2011:19).

This phenomenon has dragged people from their original place. This is antihuman rights deed in the name of reducing food insecurity in Ethiopia. Rahmato claims that the Karuturi Indian conglomerate company has been also given 11,000 hectares of fertile land in Bako woreda in Oromia region (2011:12). Also, he claims that a number of hectares of lands in Ethiopia were offered to investors for different purposes. For instance, he claims,

Sheikh Mohammed Al-Amoudi, one of the richest men in the Middle East, controls, through his numerous group of companies established in Ethiopia, extensive agricultural land in various Regions. These lands include a large tea estate, over seven large ranches for raising livestock and processing dairy and poultry products both for the home and export market, and extensive possessions for growing food crops. His newly established multi-purpose firm, Horizon Ethiopia Investments, has submitted a request for 100,000 hectares of land in Gambella to grow palm oil and other biofuel crops, and has recently acquired 85,000 hectares of land in Bench Majji Zone in SNNP to establish a rubber plantation (2011:14).

The Elfora Agro-Industries, owned by Ethiopian-born Saudi Arabian billionaire Mohammed al-Amoudi, is the largest livestock company in Ethiopia and it is located in Borana zone in Oromia region (The Oakland Institute 2011). The report states that the company nowadays has the capacity to produce 65,000 head of cattle and 400,000 head of sheep and goats per year. And it supplies these products to the largest hotels, enterprises, and the military camp in the country; and to the Gulf States. Further, the report claims that as a result of the Elfora Agro-Industries, the Borana local pastoralists have been evicted both from their lands and livelihoods as they have lost access to their dry-season grazing land since the company started operations there (ibid).

Is land grabbing really important for development as it is propagated by the local governments? Or do the policies of land investment, in Africa or Ethiopia, fit with what is happening on the ground in local communities? Rahmato argues that the major objectives of LSLA in Ethiopia or Africa include:

a) produce export crops and hence increase the country's foreign earnings; it is also expected to expand production of crops needed for agro-industry such as cotton and sugar cane; b) create employment opportunities in the localities concerned; c) benefit local communities through the construction of infrastructure and social assets such as health posts, schools, access to clean water; d) provide the opportunity for technology transfer; and e) promote energy security (2011:13).

On the contrary, he claims, LSLA intensified poverty in local communities by displacing societies from their land, which is the backbone of their survival, and there were no feasible technology transfer, meaningful compensation, adequate food, job opportunity, agricultural support, and health and education facilities for evicted people. In addition, the arbitrary eviction from one's own land has serious implications to the violation of the right to development and the right to free from poverty (ibid). The Oakland Institute (2011:1) also identified the large discrepancies between publicly stated positions, laws, policies and procedures and what is actually happening on the ground concerning the issue of land grabbing in Ethiopia. The Ethiopian government argues that "for all land deals consultation is being carried out, no farmers are displaced and the land being granted is unused" (ibid). In contrast, the report debunked that the OI team did not find a single evidence of community consultation and every investment site it visited involved the loss of local farmland. Further, OI team claims that every investment area manifests certain sort of socio-cultural/ecological values associated with it prior to land investment (ibid).

According to the UN's 2007 report on Ethiopia, the issue of land grabbing in the country is also the concern of human rights violation, as it has placed the minority communities due to factors like resettlement, conflict, assimilation, cultural dilution, environmental factors and loss of land (ibid:5). As a result of this, the report claims that land grabbing is also serious human rights violation that in turn negatively affects the overall development of the country. The Oakland Institute also states, "African land grabs are nothing new, but the scale at which they are occurring is unprecedented. We are at the crossroads" (2010:5). This implies that African governments are not transparent rather they are corruptor and this in turn is enable the poorest populations more vulnerable. Jan Egeland, who is the HRW's Europe director, claims that "the Ethiopian government's villagisation program is not improving access to services for Gambella's

indigenous people but is instead undermining their livelihoods and food security” (cited in Mahaprashasta 2012:54). Egeland claims that the Ethiopian government has to suspend the program until it consults people and compensate for their lost lands; and proper infrastructure is in place for the evicted people (ibid).

In short, land grabbing will have negative impacts on development because of different reasons. These reasons include: lack of meaningful consultation, low quality of compensation, defective contracts, monopoly of water resources, lack of adequate social services etcetera after they evicted from their land. The aim of land investment in Ethiopia is to shift from small-scale to large-scale farming that has been dominated by foreign investors. But LSLA in Ethiopia will “pose a serious threat to the long-term sustainability of the rural economy, the livelihoods of peasants and pastoralists, and to the goals of achieving food security” (Rahmato 2011:25). And the LSLA will steadily marginalize the small-scale farmers and bring unequal and antagonistic social classes. In other words, it creates a wide gap between the haves and have-nots in rural communities (those privileged by the program and those disadvantaged by it) (ibid). Here the question is “what needs to happen to reverse this dangerous trend?” In response to the LSLA, the News Embargoed Dec. 6, 2011 report entitled *Understanding Land Investment Deals in Africa* states:

There is still a chance to stop the momentum of this dangerous trend by demanding responsible policy shifts in rich countries and supporting the ability of African farmers to protect themselves from these land grabs. Players such as the World Bank and development agencies such as USAID, the Commonwealth Development Corporation and NORFUND must recognize the harmful impact of their current approach to development (2011:3).

The report claims that developed countries and various international organizations such as the World Bank, USAID, the Commonwealth Development Corporation and NORFUND are responsible to solve the problems of land grabbing in developing countries, including Africa, by changing their policies regarding the given issue.

3.1.2 Electronic Wastes Importation

As I discussed in the second chapter, environmental injustice is directly conceivable in Africa, as dominant states (developed countries) are able to impose environmental hazards and other externalities on the weaker states (particularly in Africa). Even if Africa participated in the world conferences in order to prevent the importation of toxic wastes from developed countries to developing ones, the agreements between the two did not make any change. To support this view, Kristin Shrater- Frechette (2002:10-11) argues, Africans participated in the 1989 Basel Convention in order to control trans-boundary movement of hazardous wastes. But they were not able to prevent the transportation of hazardous wastes from developed countries to developing countries. Rather, the developed countries have continued to export the toxic wastes, including the e-wastes to the developing countries.

Developed Nations particularly Western Europe and North America are the richest countries in the world. They are the most modernized and technologically advanced societies. All their everyday life conditions are tied-up with electronic materials; while access to this technology in Southern nations [developing world] is considerably lower, although growing. As a matter of fact, there are different electronic goods that were produced for different purposes in the developed world. Apparently, a number of these goods would be obsolete or outdated after usage. These obsolete electronic goods would be changed to electronic waste or e-wastes. Jennifer Gabrys states that “E-waste—trashed electronic hardware, from personal computers and monitors to mobilephones, DVD players, and television sets—is, like the electronics industry, growing at an explosive rate” (2011:2). David Naguib Pellow (2007:185) for his part reports that when computers and other electronic goods are discarded, this “e-waste” is often shipped to developing nations particularly to Africa where societies disassemble them for sale in new manufacturing processes or where they are simply dumped as wastes.

Pellow further claims that Africa continues to serve as a dumping ground for the global north; particularly electronic waste exports from Europe to West Africa. West African nations like Nigeria are becoming hosts for extraordinary volumes of electronic wastes that create human health and ecological risks throughout the region. Nigerian Computer Dealers’ Business Association (NCDA) explores that these exports are more about dumping waste than feeding

global South recycling operations, as 75 percent of the imported electronics material received in this nation are beyond use and unsalvageable (ibid:201). The majority of these waste flows from North to South are in the name of development; though its manifestation is really environmental burden and inequality.

Bashir Mohamed Hussein also reports that “Somalia has been used extensively by foreign companies and their partners as a dumping ground to dispose large quantities of highly toxic wastes (HTW) from the industrialized countries” (2010:3-4). Beginning from the early mid 1980s, the country is dubbed as “toxic colonialism” because of the extensive illegal export of the hazardous toxic wastes, including highly toxic chemicals and radioactive wastes, from the industrialized nations to Somalia (ibid). The UNEP explores that UN agency issued an official statement according to which “Somalia’s coastline has been as a dumping ground for other countries’ nuclear and hazardous wastes for many years as a result of the long civil war and, thus, the inability of the authorities to police shipments or handle the wastes” (ibid:7-8). In response to the given problem, Agence France-Press (AFP) reported in July 2009 that the UN special representative for Somalia Mr. Ahmedou Oud Abdallah has declared: “I’m convinced there is solid waste and probably nuclear(...) it is disaster out the Somali coast, a disaster for the Somali people and their environment”(quoted in Hussein 2010:8).

Further, a Greenpeace 2010 report reports that Somalia has received a countless shipments of illegal nuclear and toxic waste dumped along the coastline; and most of them were exported to Somalia in containers and disposable leaking barrels which ranged from small to big tanks without assessing their impacts on the environment and health of local population. These wastes include: uranium, radioactive waste, lead, cadmium, mercury and other toxic wastes. As a result, mountains of wastes accumulated in Somalia that paved the way for serious human health problems and environmental hazards. There are some reasons that have exposed Somalia for the given problem. Among them, Hussein claims, the major reason is lack of proper central government to effectively manage the waste disposal in the country. More clearly, Hussein argues, in the last two decades the country has faced numerous problems like political violence and civil war, mass displacement, lawlessness and the lack of effective public institutions, natural disasters and unprecedented environmental degradation (2010:4).

Pellow (2007) argues that e-waste dumping from developed countries to Africa is made sometime in the form of “charity” or “donations”. Western donors prefer this method because they do not have to pay for disposal of computers they donate to nations and all the process is tax free. Pellow further claims that nonprofit organizations like Computer Aid International (CAI) ship older computers to schools in many African countries with the aim of teaching or providing computer access for illiterate children who live in the poor countries. After a short period of time, the donated electronics would malfunction and then the users have to throw them away. So, the intention is not charity but it’s about dumping e-wastes in Africa in the name of development. To support this view, Wil-fred Baanabakintu, the public relations officer for the National Environment Authority in Uganda, stated, “In the guise of giving us aid . . . there’s a tendency of dumping here computers and this is probably because of our poverty . . . we are vulnerable to waste from these hi-tech countries”(quoted in Pellow 2007:200).

Pellow also claims that e-waste pose problems not only because of its quantity but also toxic substances that it contained can cause another long term problem for creatures on the land. For instance, toxic substances like the lead, beryllium, mercury, cadmium, polyvinyl chloride plastics (PVCs), hexavalent chromium, and brominated flame retardants (BFRs) cause major occupational and environmental health threats. Further, he puts,

Computer or television displays contain an average of four to eight pounds of lead each. The 315 million computers that became obsolete between 1997 and 2004 contained more than 1.2 billion pounds of lead. When these components are illegally disposed of and crushed in landfills, the lead is released into the environment, posing a hazardous threat to current and future generations. Consumer electronics already constitute 40 percent of lead found in landfills. About 70 percent of the heavy metals (including mercury and cadmium) in landfills come from electronic equipment discards. These heavy metals and other hazardous substances can contaminate groundwater and pose other environmental and public health risks. Lead can damage the central and peripheral nervous systems, the blood system, and kidneys in humans. It also accumulates in the environment and has highly acute and chronic toxic effects on plants, animals, and microorganisms. Children suffer developmental effects and loss of mental

ability even at low levels of lead exposure. Mercury leaches when certain electronic devices such as circuit breakers are destroyed (ibid:187).

Likewise, Hussein (2010) further claims that toxic wastes or e-wastes dumping in Africa or Somalia are potentially devastating in many ways both in the short and the long term. And these wastes have extremely adverse effects on health, livelihoods and the future prospect of sustainable development of the local population. For instance, it has serious negative impacts on both human and animal health. The UNEP had debunked that the people were even exposed to a number of unusual diseases like “acute respiratory infections, heavy dry coughing, mouth bleeding, abdominal hemorrhage and unusual chemical skin reaction” (quoted in Hussein 2010:11). Likewise, he claims, a number of medical doctors working in Somalia have mentioned that high rate of cancer, unknown diseases, spontaneous miscarriages of the pregnant women and child malformation are available there (ibid).

Based on the above mentioned issues, there is no doubt that e-waste importing to Africa every year could undermine African development in all aspects of life: social, political and economic aspects, since all issues are interrelated. This situation clearly indicates one way of committing environmental injustice in developing countries or global South, particularly in Africa. It seems that developed nations prefer to live in the clean environment by dumping their wastes in the South nations, particularly in Africa. In relation to this, Pellow writes that “the policies of industrial countries are designed to turn the lands of Africa and other Third World nations into landfills—the garbage dumps of prosperous industrial powers—in order to keep the Western world beautiful” (2007:13). Here I argue that this dumping e-waste in Africa is unfair. This in turn would intensify more accumulation of debt and poverty so long as e-waste has serious impacts on different aspects of human life in Africa. In fact, it is impossible to ensure equitable human development in Africa unless Africans look for solutions for these adverse problems of environmental injustice. This can be done, I think, by creating justice and fair condition that enable everybody to participate in the issues related to prevent the transnational waste trading and dumping irrespective of the difference among various communities.

3.1.3 Over-Exploitation of Natural Resources

Africa is blessed with vast natural resources and rich environments. It is generously endowed with productive land and with valuable natural resources, which include renewable resources (such as water, forestry, and fisheries) and non-renewable resources (minerals, coal, gas, and oil). Natural resources dominate many national economies and are central to the livelihoods of the poor rural majority. These resources are the basis of income and subsistence for large segments of Africa's population and constitute a principal source of public revenue and national wealth (African Bank 2007:1).

Africa has 120 bn barrels of oil reserve that is no less than half of Saudi Arabia; and 600 million hectares of uncultivated arable land that is half of the world total (African Bank 2013). The Bank further explores that the continent's natural resources will contribute over \$ 30 bn per annum to government revenues over the next 20 years. Despite Africa being a player in global resource game and with plenty of natural resources, the continent has been unable to use her resources wisely. The African Bank (2007) further claims that though Africa has plenty of natural resources that can generate large revenues for governments, it is paradoxically characterized by economic stagnation and political instability. The Bank designates this situation as "resource curse", which implies the inverse association between development and natural resource abundance. More clearly, Africans are losing their resources and the majority of the people in the continent are living in poverty because of internal problems [local governments' corruption] and external problems [foreign exploitation].

Raf Custers and Ken Matthysen state that there is a paradox between Africa's natural wealth and its relatively limited level of economic development, for the fact that resource sectors of African countries are still to a large extent determined by external factors in the sense that "Extractive industries in Africa tend to be export-oriented and contribute disappointingly little to local development" (2009:3). In fact, having abundant natural resources is reasonably blessing; but in the case of Africa, the issue is the reverse. As a result, this situation implies the paradox of having plenty of resources hosting economically weak nations in the continent. Custers and Matthysen further claim that "Depletion of minerals causes tension between exploitation and

(sustainable) development. Over-exploitation can hinder the use of resources by following generations” (ibid: 9). In connection to this view, World Investment Report (WIR) states that mineral wealth can be a source of revenue, economic growth and prosperity, but that it is not evident for the fact that the achievement of economic development through mineral exploitation will result in the greatest challenge for the achievement of long-term sustainable development (ibid).

According to David Makwerere and Ronald Chipaike (2012), developed countries and Multinational Corporations (MNCs) are engaged in exploitation of African natural resources in a way that make a deal with corrupt and dictator leaders for huge amount of US dollars without considering the interests of the majority of local nations that are implicitly or explicitly affected by the situations. Makwerere and Chipaike claim that the African continent is exposed to a new system of resource exploitation which has been designated as a “new scramble” for African resources particularly by China and the USA. These two countries try to get access to strategic resources in the African continent; therefore, there is even a sort of cold war between them in need of controlling natural resources in Africa. They systematically try to conquer African resources; for instance, the USA has tried to stretch its invisible hand of exploitation to Africa for the purpose of controlling markets, exploiting resources and ensuring its security interest therein. In addition, to secure her hegemony in the region, the USA proclaimed military intervention in African countries in the name of fighting terrorism (ibid). Makwerere and Chipaike further claim that the situation of new scramble for Africa can be dubbed as neo-colonialism in such a way that they aimed at colonizing African resources in one way or another. But there are slight differences between old scramble that traces back to the era of colonialism and new scramble which is happening now in 21st century. The old scramble for Africa was based on strong arms strategies whereas the new one is based on indirect systems such as propagating bogus investments in infrastructure and provision of aid for Africa. In addition, the new scramble for Africa favors rampant bribery of top government officials for resource exploitation (ibid).

Vector Munnik (2007) also contends that the “new scramble in Africa” is driven by the interests of outside powers like China, India and Brazil in need of African natural resources that will increase environmental injustice in a way that excludes local communities from decision making processes. Munnik further claims that extracting wealth from the continent is made by leaving its

people in poverty and ruined environment. And this situation has a political purpose that aimed at systematically excluding local people from political structures through a process of conquest, subjugation and selective integration of white settlers into colonial administrations particularly in South Africa (ibid:6).

Africa is facing over exploitations of natural resources in different place by both multinational companies and local governments. Nigeria is the richest country in natural resources but has low development status because of exploitation of its natural resources by foreign companies. For instance, the Niger Delta region in Nigeria has been exploited as it has oil fields (Francis Adeola 2001; Max Stephenson Jr. and Lisa A. Schweitzer 2011). Regarding the Niger Delta oil, Stephenson and Schweitzer write:

The nation collects all royalties and taxes in the country. This arrangement arose during a period of largely military rule from 1966 to 1999. During those roughly three decades the national government negotiated agreements with the multinational corporations that produce, refine, and export oil from the Delta, including Shell, Chevron, and British Petroleum, among others. The central government does not itself operate or own exploration, production, transport, or refining facilities. Instead, it has contracted with these and other corporations to bring its petroleum to the global market (quoted in JoAn Carmin and Julian Ateman 2011:54).

Oil accounts more than 90% of Nigerian export and more than 70% of the government's revenue. The export of Nigerian oil is made through foreign companies and the local community has not benefited from the given oil rather the benefit goes to the pockets of multinational corporations and federal governments. For instance, the value of Nigerian oil production rose from \$250 million to \$11.2 billion in four years; but it does not mean that Nigeria is on good performance of development in comparison to its abundant oil resources. "The nation's petroleum revenues topped \$45 billion in 2005. When the price of oil skyrocketed in 2008, the nation received a fresh revenue bonanza" (ibid:54).

The extraction of oil in Nigeria has devastating impacts on local communities. These powerless indigenous communities have faced severe social, economic, human and environmental costs without achieving relevant benefits (Adeola (2001, 2009)). Adeola (2001) claims that different Multinational Oil Corporations [MNOCs] such as Agip Corp, Chevron Corp, Elf, and Mobil have extracted oil estimated over 30 billion dollars from Ogoniland that exposed indigenous people to devastating ecological ruins, human rights violations, destitution, environmentally induced illnesses and shorter life expectancy. Despite all these extraction of oil and petrochemicals by multinational corporations, the area lacks basic infrastructures such as roads, electricity, pipe-borne water, hospitals, and schools. Adeola further contends,

Appropriation of communal lands for oil extraction, environmental degradation, destruction of habitats, decimation of the modes of subsistence of the indigenous population by oil production activities, plus inequitable compensation for oil and gas minerals, and the destruction of farmlands and fishing waters are among the contentious issues (2009:136).

The multinational corporations as colonizers would manipulate, oppress, evict, and marginalize the indigenous subordinated communities that in turn have pervasive impacts on the development of the given societies as well. In other words, the cultures, even languages, traditions and overall truly experiences of the indigenous communities would be under question as a result of the colonizers. So, what is the solution? What needs to be done to combat the impacts of multinational corporations over all life conditions of developing countries? Adeola contends, “there is a need to develop a systematic close monitoring of environmental and human rights records of MNCs operating in non-core nations and companies with dismal environmental and human rights records should be sanctioned through higher environmental tax, fines or prohibition” (2001:54). I share Adeola’s view because the problems of over exploitations of African natural resources need both international and regional integration of human rights in order to combat them. Also, it is important to consider a given problem in the policies of environment and development.

3.1.4 Urban Waste Management: The Case of Addis Ababa City, Ethiopia.

The other instance of environmental injustice in developing countries is the problem of urban wastes management (UWM). Although there have been signs of increasing economic development, urbanization and improvement of living standards in most of African cities, there is also an increase in the quantity and complexity of generated urban waste that in turn becomes the major challenge to the given areas (Nigatu Regassa et al 2011:179). It is true that as cities are generating more solid wastes, the effectiveness of their solid waste collection and disposal systems are declining over time. Regassa and others further claim that in many urban centers of Africa, less than half of the solid wastes produced is collected, and 95 percent of that amount is either thrown away at various dumping sites that are found at urban periphery, or at temporary sites that are found throughout the cities. Elias Mazhindu and others (2012:21) also claim that one of the common features that manifest in developing nations is the imbalance between rapid population growth and sanitation infrastructure provision. This is resulted from a poor waste management practices that deteriorates ecosystems of the rapidly transforming cities in developing countries. This can be dubbed, Mazhindu and others argue, as “urbanization without health” which manifests overcrowding, growth in illegal settlements, uncontrolled household waste, the absence of water, sanitation and other basic facilities which are visible in many urban centers in Africa. Millions of urban poor in Africa are living adjacent to poorly managed urban wastes that are hazardous to their everyday health and general wellbeing (ibid).

As in many urban areas of Africa, the problem of UWM is visible in Addis Ababa (the capital city of Ethiopia). This means that Addis Ababa city like other cities in the developing world has poor waste management systems. Matthew Cheever (2011:5) claims that the increase of solid waste, in Ethiopia in general and Addis Ababa in particular, is a result of rapid urbanization and population booming. Cheever further claims that the amount of solid wastes in Addis Ababa has been increasing over time that mainly resulted from rapid population growth rate, as more and more people have been moving to the city. The communities in some parts of the city use the Akaki River running through Addis Ababa as a dumping site for solid wastes. If this is so, the likelihood of water borne chemical diseases rises dramatically that will in turn affect human health. In addition, the situation will result in devastating impacts on the environment, human health and overall sustainable human development (Cheever 2011:5).

Regasa and others claim that Addis Ababa city's solid waste collection service is unsatisfactory for the reason that wastes are scattered all over the city (Regasa et al 2011). They say that the population in the city has an awareness regarding improper functioning of the municipal solid waste collection service. As a result of this, they are willing to cooperate with concerned authorities to collect wastes. Though people have a willing, the landfill situated at one corner of the city is an obstacle to improve waste management in the city, as only those people close to landfills dump their wastes.

Dump sites and trucks for solid waste disposal are insufficient in the city. Regasa and others further claim that "in densely populated Kebeles, the majority of people live 0.5 – 1.00 km from accessible roads where transfer containers are located, when the recommended distance is 150 m from the housing units" (2011:179). Furthermore, the same authors also contend that due to inadequate solid waste management system, Addis Ababa city has faced a problem related to solid waste collection and disposal, because the existing infrastructure for solid waste collection in Addis Ababa city is not proportional to the amount of solid wastes generated from institutional, commercial and residential sources. According to Mazhindu and others,

The health of the residents of Addis Ababa is imperiled by the pitiable physical environmental conditions that are presently characterized by poor shelter, overcrowding in squalid housing and neighborhoods, unsafe drinking water, poor sanitation, water pollution, indoor and air pollution and poor waste management. This poor urban environmental fabric, worsened by the low priority accorded to sanitation, has been largely blamed for the high incidence of waterborne pathogens in the catchment interface of Addis Ababa that are responsible for the spread of communicable diseases such as cholera, typhoid, and amoebic infections, mainly dysentery (2012:22).

They further explore that the poor waste management in the city can lead to the expansion of various diseases that expose society to high mortality rates and high prevalence of urban poverty. This is somehow resulted from the weakness of municipal waste management interventions that expose the majority of low income households to the problem. The majority of residents in Addis

Ababa live in slum areas with dangerous environmental problems due to low environmental services such as sewers, drains, and services to collect solid and liquid wastes (ibid). In connection with this, the 2010 United Nations report reports that it was estimated that Addis Ababa city collects only 0.4kg/capita of waste per day (Cheever 2011). For the purpose of collecting the waste, the city is divided into 549 zones and one municipal waste crew is designated for each zone. Unfortunately, only 65 percent of the waste generated in the city is collected, while the rest is disposed in open sites, drainage channels and rivers (ibid).

The major environmental institution in Ethiopia is the Environmental Protection Authority (EPA). The EPA is responsible for federal level environmental protection. It formulated the national environmental policy. Its authority goes to the extent of evaluating other federal organizations such as the Ministry of Agriculture, the Ministry of Mines; the Ministry of Energy; and the Ministry of Water Resources whether they implemented environmental policies that compatible with the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia's Constitution. The Solid Waste Management Proclamation No. 513 was released in February 2007. It aimed to promote community participation in order to prevent the adverse effects of solid wastes and to enhance the benefits resulting from them. Article 3.7 addresses issues related to human settlement, urban environment and environmental health; Article 3.8 addresses issues related to the control of hazardous materials and pollution from industrial waste; and Article 3.9 addresses atmospheric pollution and climate change. To ensure community participation, the proclamation states that the solid waste management action plans has to be designed by, and implemented at, the lowest administrative units of urban administrations (ibid). It also states that all urban governments are obliged to implement safe and effective mechanisms to handle, transport, and store municipal wastes (ibid).

According to United Nations Environment Programme (2005), as the degradation of the environment increase, the quality of human life will get lower and lower from any dimensions. The UNEP further claims, “[t]he effort to preserve or enhance environmental quality should at least be commensurate with that afforded to the attainment of advance in development” (2005:3). This implies that proper waste management contributes to development. Bizazu Mengistie and Negga Baraki (2008:103) claim that proper waste management and good sanitation are fundamental to human development and security. They also write, “Lack of provisions to proper

sanitation facilities can hinder the development of a country. This may be a challenge to achieve Millennium Development Goals” (2008:103). So, proper waste management can contribute to the reduction of poverty and sustainable development program. They further state that “provision of adequate sanitation facilities is not only a socioeconomic and developmental issue, but also an issue of self respect, human dignity and public health” (ibid).

Generally, the poor waste management in the Addis Ababa city has perverse impacts on the health, environment and ecosystems, development, and general human wellbeing. So, what needs to be done to alleviate the problems of poor waste management in the city? The UNEP (2005) claim that different government’s sectors, NGOs, and city residents will have final jurisdiction and responsibility for overall policy and for the management of the municipal solid wastes. Cheever further claims that “NGOs can play a role in helping to address Ethiopia’s waste-health crisis by building latrines in rural areas, building lined covered landfills in cities, and stimulating private sector involvement in urban areas” (2011:4). Mazhindu and other (2012) also argue that in order to address the stated problems, recognizing the waste management as an integral component of human development policies and programmes is very significant. Regarding mitigations of solid waste management, the United Nations Conference on the Environment and Development (UNCED) puts, “solid waste production should be minimized, reuse and recycling maximized, environmentally sound waste disposal and treatment promoted and waste service coverage extended” (ibid:23). Both government and NGOs should take measures to construct modern lined and capped landfills which will greatly reduce human waste from contaminating water sources, and this in turn will prevent disease and illness. And it can also play a great role in the development of a city in one way or the other.

In this chapter, I have explored that the relationship between environmental injustice and development by looking at four different instances of injustice and their negative implications for the realization of human development. I tried to show that all the environmental injustice instances discussed implicitly or explicitly hamper human development. Based on different examples, I conclude that different instances of environmental injustice negatively affect African human development. To put it other way, I argued that achieving genuine human development in Africa needs meaningful environmental justice framework.

Chapter Four: Summary and Conclusion

4.1 Summary

This thesis explores the relationship between environmental injustice and development in Africa. The central argument of this thesis is that linking development approach and environmental justice's framework is very important for the reason that various instances of environmental injustice will have devastating impacts on human development in Africa.

As I have shown in the second chapter of this thesis, the notion of environmentalism refers to the view that concentrates on preservation, conservation and restoration of the environment. In line with this, I have shown that anthropocentrism and non-anthropocentrism are different approaches. Anthropocentrism advocates human centrism whereas non-anthropocentrism deals with nature centrism. I also stresses that the notion of environment is home of all living things and non-living things. Furthermore, the environment is considered as the place where human beings live, work and play. In this sense, the environment encompasses nature, man-made entities, politics, socio-culture and it goes beyond to the extent of either negatively or positively affecting the enjoyment of equitable and sustainable human development.

In the same chapter, I have explored the concept environmental justice, which focuses on reducing (eradicating if possible) the injustice committed in human communities. The disparities or injustices among people are resulted from different factors such as race, gender, class, geographical location and so forth.

I also showed that there are various dimensions of environmental justice. It means that, more broadly, environmental justice has both narrow and broader dimensions. The narrow dimension solely emphasizes distributive justice that emphasizes fair sharing of environmental benefits and burdens. In contrast, the broader dimension goes beyond the distributive justice to encompass notions such as participation, recognition and capabilities. Here, environmental justice recognizes significant contributions of meaningful participation of all people in the environmental decision making process that in turn will contribute to the realization of peoples' functioning and capabilities. The situation in Africa reveals that a number of Africans live in the

situations of perverse environmental injustice that constrains to achieve their capabilities. This situation has had negative impacts on the development of the continent.

As I have shown in the same chapter, there are two versions of development paradigm. These are traditional and modern notion of development. Traditional development outlook concerns with ensuring economic growth and improving per capita income; whereas the scope of modern approach to development is broader than the traditional one. The modern approach encompasses the overall social well-being such as economic, cultural, spiritual and attitudinal change, healthy environment, sustainability, empowerment, political freedoms and social opportunities. Sen, as an advocator of modern view of development, defined development in terms of freedom. He claims that economic growth is not the end of development but the means. Rather, freedom is the end of development, which enables people to realize their capabilities and functioning. Modern approach of development and broader notion of environmental justice (discussed above) share same common central themes such as enhancing equity, freedom, inclusion, capabilities and functioning, transparent institutions, participation, halting environmental pressures and so forth. So, there is no doubt that various components of environmental injustice constrain human development. In contrast, adopting meaningful environmental justice framework has a potential to realize modern view of human development such as freedom, capability, and sustainable development.

Chapter three of the thesis analyzed different instances of environmental injustice such as land grabbing, electronic wastes importation, over-exploitation of natural resources, and urban waste management. I have shown how these instances have impacts on human development. These dimensions of environmental justice are common in most African countries, and they have negatively affected human development directly or indirectly. In different parts of Africa, some people suffer from various types of environmental injustice. As shown earlier, the Oromo and Gambella of Ethiopia, the Ogoni people of Nigeria, Somali people; and many other nations in Africa have continued to bear disproportionate burdens of environmental injustice. They lack their modes of subsistence, basic human rights, culture, language, and etcetera that hamper overall wellbeing including human development. Multinational corporations in collaborations with local corrupt leaders in the continent have contributed to environmental injustice. I have also discussed that poorly managed wastes in Addis Ababa city have exposed the residents of

many problems to unsafe drinking water or water pollution, poor sanitation, poor shelter, air pollution and many other problems that negatively affect their health, environment and development.

In the same chapter, I have also dealt with the linkage between development and environmental justice in more depth. I have argued that both concepts are compatible and share many things in common, as one is an integral component of the other and vice versa. They share in common, for instance, minimizing or halting the problems related with social services including access to water, health care, sanitation, education, transportation, freedom from poverty, securing livelihoods and improving overall quality of life. But there are some factors that constrain the tendency of realizing development-environmental justice nexus in Africa. Among others, the problems of nationalism and gender inequality are major obstacles to realize the relationship between development and environmental justice. What is the solution for this problem? I believe that in order to achieve better relationship between the two issues, meaningful participations of concerned government organizations, non-governmental organizations, researchers, judiciaries, academicians and broader public participations are required.

Finally, in this thesis I have tried to explicate that addressing different forms of environmental injustice require the cooperation of different stakeholders and rethinking of development approach. Although it would be important to examine other aspects of environmental justice and development issues in Africa, I could not fulfill this because of financial and time constraints. I hope that some of my findings will encourage various individuals, policy makers, development professionals and organizations to conduct further research on the issues I attempted to discuss in this thesis. I also hope to continue my research using different methods of research in the future to come up with better solutions to the problems of environmental injustice in our societies.

4.2 Conclusion

Undoubtedly, there is a strong link between environment and development as protection of the environment is a prerequisite to economic development. For instance, a healthy workforce and sustainable access to natural resources are the foundation of any economy (Stephen O. Andersen cited in Low 2005:326). But when the environment [including human beings] is corrupted by

different factors like various instances of environmental injustice, as discussed in the previous sections, it will be an obstacle to the development of a given society.

Center for International Environmental Law (CIEL) (2002) states that issues like respect for human rights, social justice, economic development, and environmental protection are interdependent components of both environmental justice and sustainable development (the modern view of development). And this situation in turn implies that there is a strong linkage between development and environmental justice, as both components are entirely compatible and share many things in common. And environmental justice can be seen as an integral component of sustainable development. As issues like fair distribution, recognition, participation, capabilities, and functioning are important components of environmental justice. They can also play an important role in realization of African development. Furthermore, environmental justice and development commonly share issues like freedom from poverty, secure livelihoods, good health and quality of life, access to good water, health care, sanitation, education, transportation, energy in the form of fuel etc.

Likewise, Patricia Kameri-Mbote and Philippe Cullet (1996:1) further argued that environmental justice and development have more in common. For instance, central to both is the intra- and intergenerational distribution of costs and benefits of development that also concerns the improvement of the quality of life of people and enhanced access to resources. According to Kameri-Mbote and Cullet, “like sustainable development proponents, advocates of environmental justice are concerned about the changes that development occasions in access to environmental goods. Both seek to have integrated into the development process mechanism for ensuring access for all” (1996:1).

Despite the strong linkage between development and environmental justice, there are some obstacles to realize this link particularly in developing countries like Africa. CIEL (2002) claims that the ideals and benefits of sustainable development and environmental justice remain a dream for billions of citizen are of the world because of various reasons. Among others,

[d]ifferences in perceptions and needs between the Global South and the industrialized North; the growing preoccupation with market strategies; the rise of

corporate globalization, including increasing control over mass media; growing disparities in income, wealth, and educational opportunities; widespread corruption; and over-consumption (2002:21).

Furthermore, there is some unhealthy tendency that poses inter-ethnic tensions and intentionally inflaming prejudices. That is excessive nationalism that strives to divide us. This means that nations strive to maintain and enhance their power and privilege over others without even trying to apply the principles of environmental justice and development. Nationalism continues to deepen in many political, social, environmental, and economic spheres of life. Nevertheless, it can be an obstacle to the realization of a globally shared sense of purpose and responsibility, like issues of environmental justice and development, especially when it becomes an agenda of governments and citizens (ibid). The other important obstacle is lack of gender sensitivity, because women are frequently overlooked in decision making process regarding sustaining and keeping natural resources, which is the base in realizing development and environmental justice in Africa. It means that women are marginalized from decision making despite the fact that environmental justice has a particular significance for them (ibid).

The integration of Addis Ababa, the capital city of Ethiopia, with the surrounding area is one form of environmental injustice in Ethiopia. According to Amnesty International (2014:7) report, the ‘Addis Ababa–Finfinne⁴ Integrated Development Plan’ (‘Master Plan’) or shortly ‘Integrated Master Plan’ that aims to expand the capital, Addis Ababa, into Oromia regional territory is another example of land grabbing or forced eviction in the country. The report claims that the ‘Master Plan’ began in April and May 2014. And it was proposed to integrate Addis Ababa with its surroundings in Oromia regional state in the name of ‘Integrated Development.’ In contrast to the Ethiopian government’s ambitious plan, the peaceful protests broke out across Oromia against a proposed ‘Integrated Master Plan’ for the fear that it will lead to the eviction of thousands of farmers and other people from their lands and settlements. Though the protest was peaceful, the government responded to it with unnecessary and excessive force like firing live ammunition on peaceful protestors and beating hundreds of peaceful protestors at different

⁴ Finfinne is another name of Addis Ababa as the Oromo call it.

places in the region. The report also states that the protests resulted in deaths, injuries and imprisonment of many people all over the state.

Ethiopia Human Rights Project (EHRP) (2016:1) report indicates that the ‘Master Plan’ aimed to occupy 1.1 million hectares of land that is approximately twenty fold the current size of Addis Ababa and its implementation will result in the eviction of millions of farmers and families from their land. The report also shows that the 2014 protests against the Master plan was dubbed as the first protests that mainly involved students of Oromia regional state in April/May/June 2014. The report claims that the protests erupted again beginning from mid November 2015 and continued for the consecutive 100 days. Unlike the first protests that mainly were undertaken by the students in the region, this phase of the protests is broader than the first one, as it encompasses all segments of the communities across the region from students to teachers, government employees to farmers, town dwellers to rural dwellers, doctors to street children, Oromo nations living in the country to diasporas etc.

The Oromo peoples’ protests that began in response to Master Plan were not confined to the questions of the Plan. Rather it goes beyond this and included the question of democracy and human rights (ibid: 7). Boldly perceivable ruling party’s growing trend of repression and human rights violation in the region are the major components of the protests. That is why the protests have continued even after the regime announced that the plan would not be implemented (ibid). The main reason for the protests as the Oromo Federalist Congress (OFC), the leading opposition political party in Ethiopia, made public in April 2014 is:

The fact that the new development plan aimed to enlarge the size of Addis Ababa city will have multidimensional problems beyond taking lands from the surrounding areas of Oromia State. It will affect the right to education of the population with their own lingua franca, it will affect their culture and it may have a gerrymandering effect (quoted in EHRP 2016:5).

This quotation implies that the moment “Integrated Master Plan” is implemented, it will have negative impacts on Oromo communities’ life situations like affecting the right to education in their own language, history, identity and etcetera that will in turn end up even in laming their overall development concerns in one way or another.

Henok Gabissa, the President of Oromo Study Association (OSA), forwarded certain ideas during the OSA Symposium held in Washington-DC on January 16, 2016. Henok argues that though the Addis Ababa Master Plan, as propagated by Ethiopian regime, plays in the name of “Integrated development”, it has another hidden agenda such as dividing the Oromo land in to two: west and east. This hidden strategy, if succeeded, will significantly distort the physical and cultural oneness of great Oromo nation. The other hidden agenda is political scheme that aimed to systematically transfer land from the hands of poor farmers to others. In other words, the plan aimed to dislocate, dispossess and disfranchise the Oromo people who live in Addis Ababa and its surrounding without significant compensation and consultation with them. He claims that when the plan is implemented, it will remove all 6 million Oromo people from 17 surrounding towns and rural districts. As a result of this situation, the language and social fabric; identity and the very existence of Oromo will be put in the complete political vacuum. To substantiate this he asks, “Why wouldn’t the government in power give access to the Oromo investors?” If so, the development is lead under the ownership of the Oromo themselves. But it does not give chance for Oromo investors rather it evicts the Oromo people from their lands (Henok Gabissa 2016).

Also, Henok states that the plan violates the Oromo right to sustainable development and the right to live in the clean and healthy environment. And it violates economic rights such as property and food they produce on their land; it violates freedom of information and opinion; and the right to education. Therefore, Henok believe that the plan is an anti-thesis to development and causes anti-existential threat to the economic security and property rights of the Oromo people that in turn is an anti-thesis to urbanization and urban growth (ibid).

I agree with his view and I argue that there is no reason for the Oromo community to deny development that will positively change their life. There is no society that denies genuine development. But the case of “Integrated Development Master Plan” is different from genuine development project. More clearly, the Ethiopian government is telling the Oromo people about the positive aspect of the master plan. It doesn’t mean that the Ethiopian government should not interfere in Oromo case. But they can interfere by consulting them about the issue in a more transparent and logical way, unless, the issue is like let me know more about you than you know yourself, or let me decide more closely on your livelihoods than you decide over yourself. The regime didn’t even understand the moral value that the Oromo society has regarding their land.

For the Oromo people land is considered as sacred, venerated and respected form of property. So, what kind of development government would think to bring about by evicting the people from their land? I think that rather than calling it development, backwardness is proper term to be used in this situation.

As EHRP noted, it is very serious instance of the human rights violations penetrated by the government security forces in response to the protests in Oromia region (EHRP 2016). The report claims that the protests were peaceful and legal. Nevertheless, the Ethiopian government argues that the protests were violent. The Ethiopian government labeled the protests as an act of terrorism that needs violent reaction. As a result, it used excessive force, heavy weapons like helicopters and tanks that caused the death of and an injury to the children from the age of eight to elderly aged seventy eight (ibid: 30). I believe that this action of the Ethiopian government was really immoral, inhuman and savage.

What I want to recommend to realize environmental justice and proper development in Africa is meaningful involvement and active participation of government at different levels---local, national and global. Moreover, broad public participation and access to information, meaningful involvement and active participation of judiciaries, academicians, and researchers are also other components which enable us to realize sound environmental justice and development in Africa. In addition, all major groups: women, children and youth, indigenous peoples, non-governmental organizations, local authorities, workers and trade unions, business and industry, the scientific and technological community, and farmers, as well as other stakeholders, including local communities, volunteer groups and foundations, migrants and families as well as older persons and persons with disabilities are significant components in realizing environmental justice and development. Furthermore, all concerned people are responsible to influence the government through different means in order to realize the relationship between environmental justice and development in Africa.

References

- Adeola, Francis O. (2001) "Environmental Injustice and Human Rights Abuse: The States, MNCs, and Repression of Minority Groups in the World System." *Human Ecology Review*, No.1, V. 8, pp. 39-59.
- _____ (2009) "From Colonialism to Internal Colonialism and Crude Socio-Environmental Injustice: Anatomy of Violent Conflicts in the Niger Delta of Nigeria", in Steady, F.C. (ed.) *Environmental Justice in the New Millennium: Global Perspectives on Race, Ethnicity, and Human Rights*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 135-164.
- African Bank. (2007) *Africa's Natural Resources: The Paradox of Plenty*. Tunis: Tunisia.
- _____ (2013) *Africa's mineral wealth: A blessing or a curse?* Tunis: Tunisia.
- Ajei, Martin Odei. (2007) "Africa's Development: the Imperatives of Indigenous Knowledge and Values." Ph.D. Dissertation: University of South Africa.
- Allen, Kim, Daro, Vinci, and Holland, Dorothy C. (2007) "Becoming an Environmental Justice Activist", in Sandler, Ronald and Pezzullo, Phaedra C. (eds) *Environmental Justice and Environmentalism: The Social Justice Challenge to the Environmental Movement*. Massachusetts: The MIT Press, pp. 105- 135.
- Amnesty International. (2014) "Because I am Oromo: Sweeping Repression in the Oromia Region of Ethiopia." London: United Kingdom.
- Andersen, Stephen O. (2005) "Opportunities for Africa to Integrate Climate Protection in Economic Development Policy", in Low, Sum P. (ed) *Climate Change and Africa*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 326-330.
- Attfield, Robin. (2003) *Environmental Ethics: An Overview for the Twenty-First Century*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Barrow, Chris. (2003) *Environmental Change and Human Development: Controlling Nature?* London: Oxford University Press, Inc.
- Bizatu, Mengistie and Negga, Baraki. (2008) "Community Based Assessment on Household Management of Waste and Hygiene Practices in Kersa Woreda, Eastern Ethiopia." College of Health Sciences, Haramaya University. Ethiopia.
- Bullard, Robert. D (1990) *Dumping in Dixie: Race, Class, and Environmental Quality*. 3rd ed.

- Central Avenue, Boulder, and Colorado: Westview Press.
- Carmin, JoAnn and Agyeman, Julian (eds.). (2011) *Environmental Inequalities: beyond Borders. Local Perspectives on Global Injustices*. Cambridge, MA and London: The MIT Press.
- Center for International Environmental Law (2002) *One Species, One Planet: Environmental Justice and Sustainable Development*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Cheever, Matthew. (2011) “Environmental Policy Review: Waste Management in Ethiopia. Environmental Policy Group in the Environmental Studies Program.” Colby College in Waterville, Maine.
- Cotula, Lorenzo, Sorja, Vermeulen, Rebeca, Leonard, and James, Keeley. (2009) *Land Grab or Development Opportunity? Agricultural Investment And International Land Deals In Africa*. London/Rome: IIED/FAO/IFAD.
- Crocker, David (2008). *Ethics of Global Development: Agency, Capability, and Deliberative Democracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Custers, Raf and Matthysen, Ken. (2009) *Africa's Natural Resources in a Global Context*. Antwerp: Fatal Transactions Press.
- Ethiopia Human Rights Project. (2016) “Oromo Protests: 100 Days of Public Protests.” Addis Ababa. Ethiopia.
- Faber, Daniel R. and McCarthy, Deborah. (2003) “Neo-liberalism, Globalization and the Struggle for Ecological Democracy: Linking Sustainability and Environmental Justice”, in Agyeman, Julian et al (eds.) *Just Sustainabilities: Development in an Unequal World*. UK and USA: EARTHSCAN Publications Ltd, pp.38-63.
- Figueroa, Robert and Mills, Claudia (2001) “Environmental Justice”, in Jamieson, Dale (ed.) *A Companion to Environmental Philosophy*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, pp.426- 438.
- Finger, Marina de Oliveira and Zorzi, Filepe Bortoncello. (2013) “Environmental Justice.” V1, pp.222-243.
- Henok, Gabissa. (2016) “Master Plan and the Oromo Protests. OSA Symposium, Washington-DC.” (www.oromostudies.org)
- Gabrys, Jennifer. (2011) *Digital Rubbish: a Natural History of Electronics*. USA: Michigan

- University Press.
- Goulet, Denis. (2006) *Development Ethics at Work: Explorations—1960-2002*. London and New York. Routledge: Taylor and Francis Group.
- Greenpeace International. (2010) *The toxic ships: The Italian hub, the Mediterranean area and Africa*. Greenpeace Italy report: Amsterdam, the Netherlands.
- Holland, Alan (2001) “Sustainability”, in Jamieson, Dale (ed.). *A Companion to Environmental Philosophy*. Massachusetts and Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, pp.390- 401.
- Hussein,B. Mohammed. (2010) *The Evidence of Toxic and Radioactive Wastes Dumping in Somalia and Its Impact on the Enjoyment of Human Rights: a Case Study*. Geneva: Paper presented at the United Nations Human Rights Council (Geneva) 14thSession Panel discussion on Toxic Wastes.
- Johnson, Glenn S. (2009) “Environmental Justice: Brief History and Overview”, in Fillomina, Steady (ed.) *Environmental Justice in the New Millennium: Global Perspectives on Race, Ethnicity, and Human Rights*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, pp.18-46.
- Kachika, Tinyade. (2010) *Land Grabbing in Africa: A Review of the Impacts and the Possible Policy Responses*. (Unpublished)
- Kameri-Mbote, Patricia and Cullet, Philippe. (1996) *Environmental Justice and Sustainable Development: Integrating Local Communities in Environmental Management*. International Environmental Law Research Centre Working Paper. Geneva: Switzerland
- Maboloc, Christopher R. B. (2008) “The Concept of Human Development: A Comparative Study of Amartya Sen and Martha Nussbaum.” MA Thesis in Applied Ethics, Linköping Universitet.
- Mahaprashasta, J. Ashirwad. (2012) *World Affairs: Recolonising Africa: Ethiopia witnesses large-scale forcible displacement of villagers in what has become the norm in the past decade in Africa*. U.S. Frontline.
- Makwerere, David and Chipaika, Ronald. (2012) “China and the United States of America in Africa: A New Scramble or a New Cold War?” *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 2(17): pp. 311-319.

- Mazhindu, Elias, Gumbo, Trynos, and Gondo, Tendayi. (2012) *Waste Management Threats to Human Health and Urban Aquatic Habitats – A Case Study of Addis Ababa, Ethiopia*. A report published by INTECH Press.
- McDonald, David A.(ed.).(2002) *Environmental Justice in South Africa*. Athens: Ohio University Press.
- Minteer, Ben A. (2009) “Unity among Environmentalists? Debating the Values- Policy Link in Environmental Ethics”, in Minteer, Ben A.(ed).*Nature in Common? Environmental Ethics and the Contested Foundations of Environmental Policy*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, pp.3-17.
- Munnik, Victor. (2007) “Solidarity for Environmental Justice in Southern Africa.”A Report for groundwork. Available from <http://www.groundwork.org.za/Publications/SolidarityforEJinSA.pdf>
- Newton, David E.(ed.).(2009)*Environmental Justice: Contemporary World Issues*.2nd ed. California and Oxford: ABC-CLIO, LLC.
- Nigatu, Regassa, Sundaraa,Rajan, and Bizunesh, Bogale. (2011)“Challenges and Opportunities in Municipal Solid Waste Management: The Case of Addis Ababa City.” Central Institute of Environment,Gender and Development, Hawassa University, P.O.Box 679, Hawassa, SNNPR,EthiopiaE-mail: negyon @yahoo.com, Phone: 251-046-2206975Department of RuralDevelopment and Agricultural Extension,Haromaya University, Ethiopia.
- Novotny, Patrick. (2000) *Where We Live, Work and Play: The Environmental Justice Movement and the Struggle for a New Environmentalism*. London: Praeger Publishers.
- Nussbaum, M. C. (2003) “Capabilities as Fundamental Entitlements: Sen and Social Justice.” Routledge: Tayler and Francis Group, pp. 33 –59.
- Pellow, David N. (2007).*Resisting Global Toxics: Transnational Movements for Environmental Justice*.Cambridge, Massachusetts and London: The MIT Press.
- Pezzullo, Phaedra C. and Sandler, Ronald(2007) “Introduction: Revisiting the Environmental Justice Challenge to Environmentalism”, inPezzullo, Phaedra C. and Sandler, Ronald (ed.) *Environmental Justiceand Environmentalism: The Social Justice Challenge to the Environmental Movement*. Massachusetts: The MIT Press, pp. 1-24.

- Plumwood, Val. (2002) *Environmental Culture: The Ecological Crisis of Reason*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Rahmato, Dessalegn.(2011) *Landto Investors: Large-Scale Land Transfers in Ethiopia*.FSS Discussion Paper, Forum for Social Studies, Addis Ababa.
- Rawls, John (1971). *A Theory of Justice*. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Riedel, Karolina (2011) “Land Grabbing in Ethiopia-Welfare or Farewell: Is it a Story Painted In Black and White?”, MA thesis (Sweden).University of Gothenburg.
- Rolston, Holmes III. (2009) “Converging versus Reconstituting Environmental Ethics”, in Mineer, Mineer, Ben A.(ed).*Nature in Common?Environmental Ethics and the Contested Foundations of Environmental Policy*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, pp. 97-117.
- Schlosberg,David.(2007) *Defining Environmental Justice: Theories, Movements, and Sen, Nature*.New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sen, Amartya (1999) *Development as Freedom*. New York: Anchor.
- Shrader- Frechette, Kristin (2002) *Environmental Justice: Creating Equality, Reclaiming Democracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Steady, Filomina C. (2009) “Introduction”, inFillomina, Steady (ed.) *Environmental Justice in the New Millennium: Global Perspectives on Race, Ethnicity, and Human Rights*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, pp.1-16.
- Stephenson, Max and Schweitzer, Lisa A. (2011) “Learning from the Quest for Environmental Justice in the Niger River Delta”, in Carmin, JoAnn and Agyeman, Julian (eds) *Environmental Inequalities Beyond Borders: Local Perspectives on Global Injustices*.Massachusetts: The MIT Press.
- The Oakland Institute. (2010)*(Mis)investment in Agriculture:The Role of the International Finance Corporation In Global Land Grabs*. Oakland: USA.
- _____. (2011a)*Understanding Land Investment Deals in Africa: Country report: Ethiopia*.Oakland: USA.
- _____. (2011b) *Understanding Land Investment Deals in Africa: FAQs on How Land Grabs Contribute to Hunger and Conflict*.Oakland: USA

- Todaro, Michael P. and Smith, Stephen C. (2012) *Economic Development: The Developed and Developing World*. 11th Edition. New York: Pearson Press.
- Ul Haq, Mahbub. (1995) *Reflections on human development: How the focus of development economics shifted from national income accounting to people-centred policies, told by one of the chief architects of the new paradigm*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- UNDP (2013) *The Rise of the South: Human Progress in a Diverse World*. New York: UNDP.
- _____(2014) *Sustaining Human Progress: Reducing Vulnerabilities and Building Resilience*. New York: UNDP.
- United Nations Environment Programme. (2005) *Solid Waste Management*. CalRecovery, inc. V.1 Concord, California: USA.