

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

COLLEGE OF SOCIAL SCIENCE

DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY

***THE NEXUS BETWEEN POWER, JUSTICE AND ENVIRONMENT: THEORETICAL
ANALYSIS OF THE ISSUES IN AFRICA***

BY: DIRIBA DEMISEW

ADVISOR: DR. TENNA DEWO

June, 2015

Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY

**THE NEXUS BETWEEN POWER, JUSTICE AND ENVIRONMENT: THEORETICAL
ANALYSIS OF THE ISSUES IN AFRICA**

BY:

DIRIBA DEMISEW

**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, 2015

Addis Ababa

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY

**THE NEXUS BETWEEN POWER, JUSTICE AND ENVIRONMENT: THEORETICAL
ANALYSIS OF THE ISSUES IN AFRICA**

BY:

DIRIBA DEMISEW

APPROVED BY THE BOARD OF EXAMINERS

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

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First and foremost I praise the Almighty God. Next, I would like to express my heart felt gratitude to my thesis advisor, Dr. Tenna Dewo for his tireless encouragement, guidance, constructive comments and useful suggestions.

I also thank my partners and colleagues, Mulgeta Teshome and Mangistu Adugna for their unreserved moral and intellectual support.

I am indebted to Ketema Wakjira (PhD candidate at AAU, department of Federal Studies) who contributed a lot to my intellectual development.

The encouragement and support that my fiancé, Alemtsehay Bekele, provided me is always appreciated. My family deserves special appreciation for their continuous moral and material support.

**The Nexus between Power, Justice and Environment: Theoretical Analysis of the Issues in
Africa**

Table of Contents

Contents	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	i
Table of Contents	ii
Acronyms and Abbreviations	iv
<i>Abstract</i>	v
Chapter One	1
Introduction	1
1.1 Background of the Study	1
1.2. Statement of the Problem.....	2
1.3. Objectives of the Study.....	4
1.4. Research Questions.....	5
1.5. Methodology of the Study	5
1.6. Significance of the Study	6
1.7. Limitation of the Study	6
1.8. The Scope of the Study.....	6
1.9. Organization of the Thesis.....	6
Chapter Two.....	8
Environmental Ethics and Environmental Justice	8
2.1. Environmental Ethics.....	8
2.2. Traditional African Environmental Ethics	10
2.2.1. Land Ethics	10
2.2.2. Animal Ethics	13
2.2.3. Forest Preservation	16

2.3. Environmental Justice.....	17
2.3.1 Dimensions of Justice	20
2.3.2 The Environmental Justice Movement (EJM).....	23
2.4 Issues of Environmental Ethics and Environmental Justice.....	25
Chapter Three.....	27
Theoretical Analysis of the Nexus between Power, Justice and Environment in Africa.....	27
Introduction	27
3.1. Colonialism: External and Internal	27
3.2. Globalization.....	33
3.3. Impacts of Multinational Corporations (MNCs)	36
3.4. Capitalism and Its Impacts on African Environment	41
3.5. Civil war.....	43
Chapter Four	46
Environmental Injustices in Africa	46
Introduction	46
4.1. Land grabbing	47
4.2. Toxic Waste Importation	51
4.3 Climate Change and Global Warming.....	55
4.4 Over Exploitation of Natural Resources.....	58
Chapter Five.....	61
Summary and Conclusion	62
Bibliography	

List of Acronyms

CPA	Comprehensive Peace Agreement
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
EJ	Environmental Justice
EJM	Environmental Justice Movement
EJNF	Environmental Justice Network Forum
GAO	The US General Accounting Office
HRW	Human Rights Watch
IMF	International Monetary Fund
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
MNCs	Multi-National Corporations
MNOCs	Multinational Oil Companies
OBCs	Oil Bearing Communities
OECD	Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development
OPEC	Oil and Petroleum Exporting Countries
OPNs	Oil Producing Nations
POPs	Persistent Organic Pollutants
UNEP	United Nations Environmental Program
UNHCR	United Nations Higher Commission for Refugees
USA EPA	the United States Of America Environmental Protection Agency
WB	World Bank
WTO	World trade organization

Abstract

The nexus between power, justice and environment in Africa from theoretical perspective is the central focus of this thesis. The thesis particularly examines the traditional African environmental ethics prior to its contamination with different and subsequent global systems. It also discusses the underpinnings of global environmental justice. Towards this end, pertinent literatures and case study researches have primarily been utilized. In doing so, the broader theory of environmental justice which embeds the key elements of justice comprising capability, participation, and recognition than the one solely dependent on distributive issue has been expounded. The different environmental injustice in Africa needs comprehending these elements and the nexus that exist between them. The thesis goes on to analyze the impacts of four different global systems: colonialism, globalization, multinational corporations (MNCs), and capitalism on the wellbeing of African environment. Finally the thesis identifies and discusses the issue of land grabbing, toxic waste importation, climate change & global warming and exploitation of natural resources as instances of environmental injustices threatening the livelihoods of innocent poor people of Africa.

The study contends that these environmental injustices have been caused by the developed nations of the global North against the poor and powerless indigenous communities of Africa.

The appropriate use of power along with strong justice system, therefore, could bring about global environmental justice in the contemporary Africa.

Key words: Environmental ethics, Environmental justice, Power, African environment, global environment

Chapter One

Introduction

1.1 Background of the Study

In this thesis, I am going to argue that the incompatible relationship between power, justice and environment in contemporary Africa causes severe environmental problems.

The concept of environmental justice began with environmental justice movements in the United States of America. It emerged in the 1980s as protests develop against the unjust dumping of toxic wastes in communities where people of color and the poor are the majority (Bullard 1990; Bullard and Johnson 2000; Steady 2009; Shrader-Frechette 2002). Prior to that time the concern of environmentalists' was the protection of nature in relation to its interaction with human beings. Since it was evolved among the black communities in America at a very local level according to Victor Munnik, the environmental justice movement which first started as a protest against pollution goes further beyond the boundary of USA and begun to emerge with others. For instance, in 1992, the concept of environmental justice (EJ) was imported to South Africa at the Earth life Africa conference where the Environmental Justice Network Forum (EJNF) was established (Munnik 2007); and this was one witness that indicate the transcendence of the issue beyond the place where it started.

The idea of environmental justice comprises the matters of participation, and recognition dimensions of justice, despite traditional definitions focuses on distribution alone. Environmental practices and policies affect different groups of people differently. In this case, the social status, economic background and political power of a state and/or group of people expose them to varied environmental benefits and burdens.

According to Jameison (2001), environmental justice refers to the conceptual connections and causal relationships between environmental issues and social justice. The notion of environmental justice, however, is not confined to the normative distributive theory of justice. Instead, environmental justice embeds a number of additional ways of comprehending developments in the theory of justice and/or injustice. Alluding to this, Iris Young (1990), Nancy Fraser (1997, 1998, 2000, and 2001), and Schlosberg (2007) underscores that justice should ponder on the issue of justice. Equally, the study has to dwell on the processes that construct mal-distribution it. These scholars have focused on the importance of individual and social recognitions that legitimize attaining of justice.

Increasingly, contemporary theories of justice profoundly dwell on the concept of participation as a kernel expressing of justice even beyond what has been a distributive aspect of it.

In this line, if the definition of environmental justice is limited only to distributive perspective, then it will be inadequate. Hence, the concept of justice in general and environmental justice in particular has to constitute participation and recognition beyond distribution. Schlosberg (2004) puts, most understandings of environmental justice refers to the issue of equity, or the distribution of environmental ills and benefits. But defining environmental justice in terms of equity alone is incomplete, as activists, communities, and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) call for much more comprehensive conceptualization of justice beyond distributional understandings.

The global environmental justice, therefore encompass three interconnected dimensions: one, equity in the distribution of environmental risk; two, recognition of the diversity of the participants and experiences in affected communities; and three, participation in the political processes which create and manage environmental policy. The existence of these three dimensions of justice at a time demonstrates the plausibility of a plural yet unified theory and practice of justice (Schlosberg 2004). Environmental justice cannot be realized without taking into account the important dimensions on the one hand and social justice on the other hand. Therefore, environmental justice obtains its full meaning when harmonious relationship between people and their environment is maintained on the basis of fairness and principle of equality in sustainable manner. That is to mean there should be a common understanding that every person is equally responsible for the protection of natural environment and has also equal right to enjoy all kinds of benefits gained from it.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

The nexus between power, justice and environment is incompatible in Africa. The power balance in a global system, abuse of power and injustices have resulted in problems of environment in Africa; and these environmental problems have been affecting the indigenous communities of Africa whose life directly relies on environment.

My argument goes from environmental justice theorists like David Schlosberg, Daniel Faber, Dale Jameison, Robert Bullard, Robin Attfield, Francis O. Adeola, Iris Young and others.

Environmental Justice from the point of view of these scholars goes beyond the narrow distributive conception of justice, and it pursues to incorporate other more elements such as participation, recognition and capabilities.

In most cases, the developed nations of the world dominate the decision making power in the issues of the world. They dominate because of their wealthy and political power through which they influence all human activities. They decide whatever they need though justice need all to participate equally in decision making. According to Daniel Faber, the worsening ecological crisis in the global South is directly related to an international system of economic and environmental stratification in which the United States and other advanced capitalist nations are able to shift or impose the environmental burden onto weaker states (Faber 2008). The idea of weaker states implies, the lack of capacity to cope up with the existing global economic system, and this has made global South the place for dumping wastes. Countries of the global South are with little power in global environmental policy making. The institutions which are specifically mandated to make decisions with regard to environment are also predominated with the majority from powerful nations of the global North.

Within a people of global South itself, there has been absence of equal participation in decision makings related to environment. This has left their voices unheard; as a result they remain exposed to imposition from the global North. There are common instances where individuals handling power in their hands either by the will of people or through military forces endorse the same mechanism of the counter Westerners. Therefore the quest is for equal participation and recognition in addition to distribution. The method thus may allow all to have their representation in assigning environmental benefits and burdens.

In the course of time, environmental justice now appears to be the issue of global concern. However, it became so serious in Africa in recent days especially as the continent is facing many environmental injustices because of its lagging behind in many ways. The issue of environmental racism gets stage to be debated on, as this form of environmental injustice developed in relation to the distribution of environmental burdens and benefits. Especially the exclusion of people of color from the institutions those are most responsible for the distribution have become common today. The concept of environmental ethics in accordance with ecological problems of this type,

therefore is the most serious that is threatening human survival that should be called up on discussion.

Ecological threat should be focused because of its global nature on the one hand and the world is not yet ready to seriously cope up with the problem. The situation is especially critical in the poor countries of the Third World which have pursued an environmentally hostile paradigm of material growth borrowed from developed countries and which, finding themselves under an enormous burden of debt to the Western World, are lacking necessary funds for any systematic policy of environmental conservation (Oruka 1994).

The problem of ecology with regard to the survival of human looks very worrying now than ever before. The existing reality indicates that the degree to which it is bringing the life of human under question is most frightening in the so called Third World countries. The reason is that the growth and transformation policies followed by the Western World are simply imposed up on these Third World countries without any harmonizing methods and techniques, and thus it resulted in the destruction of indigenous environmental ethics that has been working in traditional Africa.

Development policies that are functioning in Africa are almost copied from developed countries of the West, without considering the implication of such policies local community's environment. Local communities have to say their views; they have to discuss the merits and demerits of the policies that are going to be applied. Especially, in contemporary world where the language of investment is common, the communities have to have an opportunity to discuss the benefits they would get and burdens they would shoulder. Often, they are excluded, and the few with power make decisions and execute policies against local community and their environment.

1.3. Objectives of the Study

The general objective of the study is to analyze the nexus between power, justice and environment in Africa from theoretical perspective.

The specific objectives of the research are to;

- ❖ Examine the nexus between power, justice and environment in the context of Africa
- ❖ Identify and analyze the status of the nexus between power, justice and environment in Africa under the variegated global system
- ❖ Examine the implication of power on the environmental injustice against indigenous communities of Africa.
- ❖ Offer how power and justice systems render environmental justice in the contemporary Africa

1.4. Research Questions

In order to attain the above objectives, this study answers the following basic questions:

- ❖ To what extent does power affect the right to fair distribution of environmental goods and bads?
- ❖ What explains the nexus and compatibility between power and environmental justice? How does the global power system produce environmental injustice in Africa?
- ❖ Who are the major actors of environmental injustice in the global world? What measures are to be taken to bring the balance of these Actors?
- ❖ How the linkage between power, justice and environment do affects the situation of environmental degradation in Africa?

1.5. Methodology of the Study

This study is based on qualitative research approach. In as much as the study centers on the theoretical discussion of the nexus between power, justice and environment; and its application on the state of environmental injustice in Africa, I have primarily employed pertinent secondary data sources. Thus this study reviews existing literatures produced from the case studies conducted by researchers at different places at various times; and analyze them from theoretical perspective of the nexus between power, justice and environment in Africa. However, empirical evidences witnessed by the researcher are also going to be taken into account.

1.6. Significance of the Study

After the completion of the study, I do hope that the conclusions and suggestions that are going to be forwarded would help in various ways regarding the nexus between power, justice and environment in African context. Among others, the findings will assist individuals that have direct or indirect interest to the issues of power, justice and environment. The outcome of the research will help policy and decision makers on the area of environmental justice in order to bridge the gap and provide solution. Different corporate organizations and institutions may also use the outcome of the study. Finally, the study would provoke further researchers that need to be undertaken by taking both primary and secondary data sources.

1.7. Limitation of the Study

There are a number of challenges to the study. Among others, financial and time constraints are the major limitations of the study. In as much as the continent is so huge, it needs sufficient money and excess time to conduct profound research in the area of the nexus between power, justice and environment.

1.8. The Scope of the Study

The scope of the thesis is limited to the analysis of the nexus between power, justice and environment in Africa. Because of the inadequacy of space and time, and also since most of the environmental issues in the Continent is bounded by the relations of these three concepts, the study covers only some instances of the injustices resulted from inharmonious relationship of these concepts. The impacts of toxic waste disposal, land grabbing, over exploitation of natural resources, and climate change are the only instances that will be covered in the study and in which a theoretical analysis will be made from African perspective.

1.9. Organization of the Thesis

This thesis contains five chapters. The first chapter deals with introduction and overview of the issue in the question. Thus background of the study is highlighted in a brief manner.

The second chapter is the review of related literatures written in the areas of environmental ethics and environmental justice. The concept of environmental ethics in general and environmental justice in particular is discussed. Traditional African environmental ethics as a form of ethics that can be taken as a model for other societies is addressed. Under this subsection, land ethics, animal ethics, forest preservation that were strongly attached to the life

of indigenous communities of Africa are discussed. To elaborate the discussion of the above raised points, experience from Ethiopia, my home country, are incorporated because the country shares a number of common attributes with the rest of African countries.

Chapter three provides theoretical analysis of the nexus between power, justice and environment in Africa. This section aims at the analysis of the facts that have been observed in Africa, and how Africans have become victims of environmental injustice.

In doing so, the impacts of contemporary global system and the historical background that the continent had passed through are discussed. This chapter particularly identifies the detrimental effect of colonialism, globalization, multinational corporations and capitalism on African environment.

The fourth chapter dwells on key and selected instances of environmental injustices in Africa which have been emanated from the kinds of nexus between power, justice and environment. The instances of environmental injustices comprising land grabbing, climate change & global warming, toxic waste dumping and overexploitation of natural resources are examined.

The last chapter presents summary and concluding remarks and provokes further research question.

Chapter Two

Environmental Ethics and Environmental Justice

2.1. Environmental Ethics

Environmental ethics is “the discipline that studies the moral relationship of human beings to the environment and also the value and moral status of the environment and its non-human content” (Estelle L. Weber, 2009:99). This is the definition that one gives for the term as an independent discipline that deals with the moral relations between humans and environment on the one hand and environment and its non-human members on the other. Holmes Rolston III further defines;

Environmental ethics is theory and practice about appropriate concern values and duties that man has towards the natural world. By classical accounts, ethics is people relating to people in justice and love. Environmental ethics starts with human concerns for a quality environment. Others hold that, beyond inter-human concerns, values are at stake when humans relate to animals, plants, species and ecosystems. According to their vision, humans ought to find nature sometimes morally considerable in itself, and this turns ethics in new directions. (Rolston, 2003:517)

As far as humans are the only self-reflective and deliberative moral agents, ethics is for people. Being moral agents, humans apply environmental ethics to the environment. Humans are not the only valuable things rather their environment too is valuable. As environmental quality is necessary for quality of human life, humans need to treat their environment ethically. In natural ecology where resources like soil, air, water, forest, and climate are the matter of life and death, inclusive environmental ethics is decisively important to be applied. Inclusive; in a sense that it should include the poor as well as the rich, women as well as men, future generations as well as the present.

Environmental ethics has two approaches as anthropocentric and non-anthropocentric. The anthropocentric (human centered) environmental ethics is an approach to environment that places human interests above those of any other species. Non-anthropocentric environmental ethics on the other hand considers all natures as equally valuable. A human centered environmental ethic has to go beyond this limit because much of the environmental damages and destructions are harmful to non-human creatures. Therefore, the first step to go out of the circle

of human interests is to include the rights of other species into consideration (Rolston 2003; King-tak Ip 2009).

The two approaches emerged based on the values of things that are of either instrumental or intrinsic. Instrumental value is a value that can be used as a means to some other ends. Rather than being valuable in itself it serves as a means to other end. Intrinsic value is a value of things which is an end in itself. It is pursued as an end regardless of whether it is also useful as means to other ends. Thus the question here is whether nature has intrinsic value in addition to its instrumental value. As far as the value of nature is concerned, the assumption is that, the moral superiority of human in relation to other species on earth is something to be questioned. The claim is why we might not assign intrinsic value to the natural environment and its non-human content.

For instance the argument from biocentric ethics gives intrinsic value to all creatures in nature. For example, philosopher Holmes Rolston III argues that species are intrinsically valuable and are usually more valuable than individual specimens, since the loss of a species is a loss of genetic possibilities (Rolston 1994). Thus, the deliberate destruction of a species would show disrespect for the very biological processes which make possible the emergence of individual living things. Because the disappearance of animals, birds, and plants from the earth raises public concern as the life of humans is impossible in isolation from them.

A rationale that includes their intrinsic and ecosystemic value in addition to their value as a means to other end is far reaching. That is why environmental ethics has given a new dimension to the conservation of natural resources. Unless the relations between human beings and environment is based on morality, the value that human kind places on conserving, protecting and efficiently using these natural resources will be under question.

Environmental ethics believes in the ethical relationship between human beings and the natural environment. Human beings are not separate from others. They are part of the society and so are the other living beings. When we talk about the philosophical principle that guides our life, we often ignore the fact that even plants and animals are a part of our lives (Leopold 1966; Jamieson 2001). They are an integral part of the environment and hence have a right to be considered as

part of the human life. On these lines, it is clear that they should also be associated with our guiding principles as well as our moral and ethical values.

People are cutting down forests for making their homes. They are continuing with an excessive consumption of natural resources. Their excessive use is resulting in many environmental problems. These forms of problems may take deforestation, land degradation, depletion of ozone layer and the like. As far as it is risking the life of our future generations, it is not ethical. This is the issue environmental ethics should deal with.

Thus human beings are disturbing the balance of nature. That is to mean we are not doing justice to the environment. The harm we, as human beings, are causing to the nature, is coming back to us by resulting in a polluted environment. The result of injustice we did to the environment is hindering us. The depletion of natural resources is endangering both the present and future generations.

Although environmental ethics teaches that all the life forms on Earth have the right to live, we are depriving these life forms of the right to live. In disturbing the balance of nature we stand against the true ethical and moral values.

2.2. Traditional African Environmental Ethics

2.2.1. Land Ethics

The concept of land ethics is developed by Aldo Leopold. In his last essay in *A Sand County Almanac*, Aldo Leopold made the case for the evolution of an ethical relationship or, for the extension of ethics to the land community-soils, waters, plants and animals as well as people.

Leopold's concept of land ethics begins with the way he argues for the fundamental changes that human beings relate to nature. He argues that we humans must stop viewing water, plants, animals and soil as mere resources to be exploited. That land is a community is the basic concept of ecology, but that land is to be loved and respected is an extension of ethics. "The land ethic simply enlarges the boundaries of the community to include soils, waters, plants, and animals or collectively: the land" (Leopold, 1949[1977]: 866).

With regards to land and natural resources there is a considerably difference between the culture of traditional African societies and that of other societies (C. K. Omari 1990). As cultural and

socioeconomic relationships and organizational developments are obviously different, the differences in treating environment can be traced back to these elements.

Africans have a very much concern with the value attached to land. The distribution and access to land within a society, as well as the right to use land for an individual in a community was of a great concern in African culture. Thus such differences in cultural attitude towards land influence human-to-land relations and the ethical issues that emanate from it (Omari 1990; Jean-Pierre KB 2013).

However, with the arrival of new economic system, the traditional concepts and attitudes towards natural resources failed to function properly as before. For instance concerning the ownership right, C.K.Omari argued that land ownership is not something that individual person can claim as private property. Rather, land is a communal property of social group. “In traditional African societies land ownership rights resided with the larger social group, either the clan, kinship group or family” (Omari, 1990:167).

Land was considered a communal property belonging to both the living and the dead, and each individual had obligation for its care and administration. Everybody is responsible for the protection and conservation of land. There was a great respect for nature and natural places in traditional African society especially in connection to religions. So, it was a taboo to cut trees and destruct them in areas of Shrines and initiation rite centers. Especial attention was given to some kinds of trees and animals, so that they were preserved over a long period of time.

Much pieces of land in traditional Africa remained uncultivated until recent time as it was covered by dense forests and the population was also sparse. The understanding of the society was also so high that they put land equivalent to their life. Everybody was equally responsible as they believed that both the benefit and burden of conservation of land was similar.

Not only land but also a friendly tradition toward the entire system of nature is the dominant theme in African traditional society. In traditional Africa there were no such greedy and egoistic attitude towards land and its natural resources.

But today all things are changed and one cannot find genuine land ethics as before. In previous time people were not conquerors of land but they used to be a community and plain members of it.

With regards to this, Aldo Leopold summarizes the land ethic in the maxim, “A thing is right when it tends to preserve the integrity, stability, and beauty of the biotic community. It is wrong when it tends otherwise” (Leopold, 1966: 204-205). As far as the land ethic enlarges the boundaries of the community to include soils, waters, plants and animals, (or collectively the land), the preservation and conservation of all these constitute this land ethic (Leopold 1949, 1977).

Conservation in this sense is a state of harmonious relation between men and land. When men and land with its natural resources interact in a manner that treats one and benefit the other, there would be common understanding from the side of man that one needs the other for its existence.

But nowadays, a lot of threats to land and its natural resources are posed largely by humans. These threats are to humans and non-humans placing the whole communities of the earth in state of fear.

Especially these deteriorations of traditional land ethics in Africa emanated from different angles. Among others, the arrival of new form of economy and a variety of religions changed completely by replacing the indigenous attitudes.

In line with this, C.K.Omari argued as follows “the introductions of money economy with its capitalist mode of production, the introduction of religions like Christianity and Islam, and the introduction of state control of natural resources have destroyed the indigenous belief systems to the extent of altering production relations” (Omari, 1990: 172).

According to Omari, the impact of changes in economic system and new imported values through education and religion totally changed the attitude of people towards natural resources. Many people are attracted by the benefits they acquire through exploitation of resources.

Value systems were all changed to the motives of individuals to accumulate wealth based on their individual interests. Indigenous belief systems were no more at their original places that

everything is changed with the arrival of capitalism, Christianity and Islam. These things were pointed out as if they were the causes of our present ecological crisis.

Ethical decisions also have made a kind of shift from the issue of how the community would benefit to the concern how states would restore natural resources and their exploitation. So, more priority is given to the advantage that state can get from the restoration than a benefit that community can acquire through it.

Changes in religion and politics also affected means of production, production and distribution of resources and considerably changed the attitudes of African communities away from traditional communal ownership of land. The present value system and practices is not congruent with the idea of sustainable development. If sustainable development is taken in the strict sense, there must be changes in programs which enable community to use land for them and a mutual benefit of land itself. Though it is ideal all traditional religions, Christian and Islamic belief systems take a care and responsibility for land.

2.2.2. Animal Ethics

The traditional African world view on animal ethics was as such authentic and can be taken as model for the others. Even though in modern times there is a view against the utilitarian view, Africans preserve animals for various reasons. Animals have economic values as they are sources of food, social prestige, especially if we take some specific ethnic group. They use animals as a source of power in the production of crops for subsistence. This is common in peasant farmers as they plough land by oxen.

The African people are highly dependent on animals for their existence. They believe that the role of animals for the health of environment is very important. Animals are crucial to keep the ecological balance. However, this does not mean that these people do value animals as things that have instrumental value alone. Apart from its economic value, wild life has, from time immemorial, been a valuable natural resource in Africa, (with several other traditional beneficial uses to society). This does not in any way mean that wildlife can only exist with reference to its uses to human kind. Indeed it has a right to exist in itself without such reference. Because there are animals which people do not eat them for various reasons either culturally or religiously.

But they do not kill or destroy them because they have no extrinsic values. Many ethnic groups, however, had totem animals. These are animals that are believed to be sacred naturally. Accordingly, they were conserved carefully over a long time and remain unharmed. Occasionally, they could only be utilized for prayers or medicinal purposes. Generally, there were traditional customs, rules, taboos, beliefs and practices of the various ethnic groups relating to wildlife (ODA 1996).

But they also treat very well both tame and wild animals. Apart from domestic animals, people respect and treat wild animals in a good way. These communities hunted wild animals for food and other uses such as clothing, bedding and cultural purposes. For instance when a man goes for hunting, he does not kill a pregnant animal that is about to give birth and animals that feed their young from breast thinking that it is unethical. At a moment of mating for breeding also killing is immoral. Naturally however there are certain animals (like snakes) for which in any circumstance people cannot be graceful to.

With the advent of imperialism, things changed dramatically when the colonial governments imposed stiff laws on wild life utilization, mainly on hunting and wildlife products. In this respect, Takirambudde (1988) has observed that colonialism in Africa created a new legal order to replace the traditional structures and ideology. This eventually changed totally the attitude that the traditional communities of Africa have had towards animals.

In view of the value they get from animals in terms of money, people had radically changed their attitudes towards these animals, forgetting the past harmonious relationships. Another factor that has relegated traditional African care for wildlife to the backyard is the modern way of life that has introduced foreign ideologies, conservation practices, lifestyles and religions of various kinds.

Here and there we can see that the animal ethics of traditional Africa has completely reshaped in a way it is compatible with Western ideologies. In that sense it loses its fundamental concept of the world view that treats animals as an entity that has equal right with itself. Consequently the past history remains slogan and challenges of the loss of biodiversity took place. People used to have the highest respect for animals those merit them most. So the treatment and reverence they had for all animals could not be said equal in strict sense of speaking.

Generally, traditional African people did not overexploit animals. And animals that are very few in number were not allowed to hunting. These animals are those endangered because of climate change or those which are about to extinct.

In sub Saharan Africa there are some ethnic groups that can be taken as the model for the others in this regard. The Oromo ethnic group preserves animal for various reasons. Like other societies of Africa, they value animals for social and economic purposes. From my experience, I know that day to day life of this people strongly linked to the value of animals. Because of their love and respect for animals, they do not arbitrarily kill or slaughter. Animals which are few in number are not often allowed to be killed or slaughtered at home or through hunting. Even those which are many in number are selected based on their age. Those which are older rather than the younger are subject to hunting. The younger ones are taken care for reproductive purpose. Especially any activity against animal that may lead to the total extinction of its species is strictly forbidden (Kelbessa 2009).

But from this perspective, there are scholars who argue against the peoples' use of animals for different purposes. For instance in connection to animal rights Tom Regan argued, "The fundamental wrong is the system that allows us to view animals as our resources, here for us-to be eaten, or surgically manipulated, or exploited for sport or money" (Peter Singer, 1985:13). What makes things to go in the wrong direction is reaching a consensus to exploit non-human animals as things that are created to serve humans. Therefore, it is easier to predict the impact of utilizing animals only for nutritional uses, medicinal values and socio-cultural uses. Considering them as ends in themselves is also equally important.

In line with this Peter Singer argued, in need of an expansion of moral horizons that includes moral principle of equality for other species is important (Regan 1989). Practices that were previously regarded as values and norms come to be seen as something wrong because of justifiable prejudice. If claim for the equality of all animals, there should be a kind of understanding that human and non-human animals are all equal. And if wrong claim goes, in way that it brings inequality, that claim should be treated immediately in order not to bring further devastation.

2.2.3. Forest Preservation

The African understanding of forest cannot be separated from the African cosmological view of reality. The forest is not preserved only for its wood and timber provision, but also because its value for the promotion of all life forms and the sustainability of ecosystems. In traditional times, African people lived and dwelled in the midst of the forest. Forest just like a mother earth, was seen as a source of life. This was also seen in certain cases as a kind of revering a number of trees in relation to traditional religion. “The forests, certain kinds of trees, animals and sources of water were preserved in the name of religion” (Omari, 1990:169). Among forests there are certain specific trees which are thought to have spiritual worth and some animals are preserved in similar case.

We can find this in the indigenous Oromo world view. Some trees are considered as sacred and kept well over a time. According to Kelbessa (2005:12), “in relation to our concern for the ecotheological nature of the Oromo worldview, we need to understand that the Oromo recognize some trees as sacred trees based on what are essentially spiritual values.” I myself witness this fact as an individual who was born and raised up in this particular community. Until the recent past, the Oromo community in my birth place, Wollega, used to revere Abdaarii or Qoloo trees, which are believed to be once under which their ancestors used to perform religious rituals.

For instance a number of trees for Irrecha in Oromo people which includes Hoomii, Abbayyii, and Ulumaayii were preserved well over a long time because people think them that they are chosen trees by God. Cutting them is seen as against the will of God and may bring disappearance of rain for a long time as a penalty. Accordingly, in traditional African societies, because of religious taboos and restrictions forest were preserved which may take the role of afforestation now a days.

However, it does not mean that religions are the only reason to preserve forests in traditional Africa. For instance in some areas where population is sparsely distributed in regions like central Africa, forests were kept regardless of religious taboos and restrictions. In any circumstance however there has been an ethics of forest preservation in traditional Africa thought today that authentic ethics had deteriorated for different factors. In line with this, Omari (1990) pointed out that, the impact of changes in economic system and new imported values through education and religion totally changed the attitude of people towards natural resources. Many people are

attracted by the benefits they acquire through exploitation of resources. Value systems were all changed to a motive of individuals to accumulate wealth based on their individual interests.

2.3. Environmental Justice

The meaning of justice in the context of environment has some different connotation from the very definition of the term in other contexts. Schlosberg defined environmental justice by tracing back its emergence as a concept. The term environmental justice emerged as a concept in the United States in the early 1980s. The term has two distinct uses. The first and more common usage describes a social movement in the United States whose focus is on the fair distribution of environmental benefits and burdens. Second, it is an interdisciplinary body of social science literature that includes (but is not limited to) theories of the environment, theories of justice, environmental law and governance, environmental policy and planning, development, sustainability, and political ecology (Schlosberg 2007).

Thus the idea of justice in case of environmental justice goes beyond the actual definition of the term in a normal sense. It includes all dimensions of justice through the incorporation of variables such as participation, capability, distribution and recognition (Young 2000; Shrader-Frechette 2002; Schlosberg 2007). Therefore, it is possible to see from the contemporary theories of justice stand point that the real definition of justice is broader than the definition given to it in terms of distribution.

When we are about to discuss justice in full sense of the term, our understanding of our own intuitions and theories of fore mentioned variables i.e. participation, capability and recognition in addition to distribution is important. How they function, both in groups and in individuals should be included to that stand point.

US Environmental Protection Agency once defined the term in a way that it should include all people regardless of any difference that may exist. It defines as the

fair treatment and meaningful involvement of all people regardless of race, color, national origin or income with respect to the development, implementation and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations and policies. Fair treatment means that no group of people, including racial, ethnic or socio economic groups should bear a disproportionate share of the negative environmental consequences

resulting from industrial, municipal and commercial operations or the execution of federal, state, local and tribal programs and policies. (EPA, 1998:2)

This definition puts fairness as a requirement for the justice to be there in the participation of people both in goods and bads of environment. One should not be excluded from decision making with regards to environmental benefits and burdens because of who he/she is. All have equal right and responsibility for the environment. Thus fair and meaningful participation in environmental decision-making is crucially important to keep the balance of justice in environment. Another definition of environmental justice is the one that Environmental Justice Networking Forum defined. The South African Environmental Justice Networking Forum quarterly newsletter defines environmental justice by capturing some philosophical tenets of human and democratic rights, which is so central to environmental justice movements and literatures according to McDonald. Here is the definition;

Environmental justice is about social transformation directed towards meeting basic human needs and enhancing our quality of life-economic quality, health care, housing, human rights, environmental protection, and democracy. In linking environmental and social justice issues the environmental justice approach seeks to challenge the abuse of power which results in poor people having to suffer the effects of environmental damage caused by the greed of others. This includes workers and communities exposed to dangerous chemical pollution, and rural communities without firewood, grazing and water. In recognizing that environmental damage has the greatest impact upon poor people, EJNF seeks to ensure the right of those most affected to participate at all levels of environmental decision-making. (David A. McDonald, 2002:4)

It is impossible to talk about environmental justice separated from human rights protection. Because environmental justice includes fulfilling basic human needs along the protection of basic human and democratic rights. Therefore environmental justice lacks full sense of definition if these fundamental components which can give the actual meaning of the concept are not incorporated. On the other hand, the term environmental justice alludes to yet another aspect of issue. According to David E. Newton, however, environmental justice refers to policies and practices by which existing environmental inequities can be corrected and prevented in the future. It focuses on research programs that attempt to detect the existence of environmental racism and environmental discrimination; that uncover the underlying reasons that hold such practices in place; and that promote the enforcement of existing laws and regulations, the

adoption of new rules and regulations, and the changes in philosophies and attitudes needed to eliminate environmental racism and environmental inequities from society (David E. Newton 2009).

Hence, the idea of environmental justice achieves a sense of its real connotation by incorporating the environmental racism and discrimination that they have a lot of things to do with environmental justice. In line with this, Filomina Chioma Steady (2009) stresses on the protection for the place where we live. Above all, environmental justice demands the right to the enjoyment and protection of where we live, work, and play.

The safety of life in relation to clean air and water, a place free from pollution of different varieties are among concerns of environmental justice to address. The right to enjoy and accesses to these well protected environments is for all human beings without any form of discrimination that may emanate from racial background, religious affiliation, color and the like. However, in case of environmental justice from the perspective of the distributive justice, it deals with the recognition that the low income and minority groups bear disproportionate environmental costs. The perception is that it is unjust to have such unequal distribution. For instance, “Glen S. John uses the environmental justice paradigm to analyze these environmental inequities in poor communities and communities of color in the United States and other parts of the world. Along this they discuss some of the successes and continuing struggles of environmental justice activists in challenging polluting industries and persuading the government to provide adequate environmental protection in communities under siege by environmental and health risks” (Steady, 2009:5).

The idea of environmental justice is clearly understandable from the angle of distributive dimension of justice for most people. However it does not mean that this is the only definition of the concept. As far as there are different dimensions of justice, the definition of the concept will be easier if all the dimensions are incorporated. Yet environmental justice encompasses the core concepts like participation and recognition more than a mere concern about the unequal distribution of environmental goods and bads.

2.3.1 Dimensions of Justice

It is commonly agreed that ‘what the justice of environmental justice?’ has been paid a little attention in a recently grown idea of environmental justice. Because, according to some thinkers the definition of the word should be understood in a way that conforms to the issue of environment. According to Schlosberg (2004:517), “most understandings of environmental justice refers to the issue of equity, or the distribution of environmental ills and benefits.” But defining environmental justice as equity is incomplete, as activists, communities, and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) call for much more than just distribution (Schlosberg 2004).

However, he considers this definition as not inclusive of all fundamental elements. So to make the definition inclusive of all elements of justice, he tries to add other concepts with an emphasis to include the concepts of participation and recognition.

The justice demanded by global environmental justice is really threefold: equity in the distribution of environmental risk, recognition of the diversity of the participants and experiences in affected communities, and participation in the political processes which create and manage environmental policy (ibid.).

Initially as stated earlier, environmental justice aims at addressing issues of inequity in the distribution of environmental benefits and burdens among communities of color and the poor. The question was the question of distribution alone. Some scholars also base their definition of justice in relation to distribution. Among others, John Rawls’s theory of justice is one that focuses on the distribution of goods and services as a standard of evaluation to refer to the institutions responsible for the distribution as just or unjust. His work ‘justice as fairness’ was one of the leading theory of justice in contemporary political philosophy. Therefore, it seems conventional to refer to his conception of justice when the issue of justice is raised.

Schlosberg (2007:1) argues that Rawls’s theory focuses on a conception of justice defined in terms of the distribution of goods in the society and the best principles by which to distribute these goods. Schlosberg (2007:12) further states that from the outset, Rawls defined that justice is a standard where by the distributive aspects of basic structure of society are to be assessed.

It was all these that seemed to be as key inadequacies in the liberal justice theory. Because its sole focus was on the processes of fair distribution of goods and benefits. Rawls on his behalf

tried to develop a right theory of justice through what he calls the veil of ignorance to a place where we do not know our own strengths and weaknesses (or our own place) in the grand social scheme of things. That is to mean, people do not have awareness about their identity, social position, religious and political views, and their individual values. It is possible for all to have equal political rights as well as share economic resources equally. No one is inferior and no one is superior.

According to Schlosberg, “Rawls represents the focal point of liberal justice theory fair distributions away from any substantive agreement on what we each believe as good - pictures of the good life” (Schlosberg, 2004:518). The point here is for most people the present justice theory even until the time of Rawls failed to deliver the component elements of justice. A theory of justice that we have seen within a political theory is concerned only with describing justice as fairness, impartiality and how to distribute benefits and burdens fairly. Respect and recognition are overlooked even though they are key terms to the concept.

But this does not mean that distributive justice is not essential in the search for environmental justice as fair and equitable distribution of societal technological and environmental risks and impacts is required. However, it is to show that participation and recognition are also equally essential. Many scholars, Iris Young (1990), Schlosberg (2007), and Shrader-Frechete (2002) therefore tried to briefly discuss the component elements of justice. Participation and recognition are important in addressing the problems of environmental justice in order to improve the principles and practices of distributive justice.

According to Young, “while theories of distributive justice offer models and procedures by which distribution may be improved, none of them thoroughly examine the social, cultural, symbolic, and institutional conditions underlying poor distributions in the first place” (Schlosberg, 2004:518). Young is so critical in that she focuses those elements that are so determining factors for social and institutional relations.

Accordingly, reducing social justice to distribution alone is so a mistake. This means for Young, injustice is committed not only when there is inequitable distribution. In strict sense of the word, there are reasons why some people get more benefits than others. Lack of recognition within a group may bring this unjust distribution (Young 1990).

The concept of recognition is focused by a number of scholars, Nancy Fraser (1997, 1998, 2000, and 2001), Shrader-Frechete (2002), and Schlosberg (2007) as they changed their attitude from the traditional approach of justice. The sole emphasis on distribution without an examination of the underlying causes of maldistribution is challenged. It is because lack of recognition manifests itself in various forms of discrimination like degradation and devaluation of one's culture.

Much of injustice in a community is not aroused because of inequitable distribution of goods and services. As there are a number of people that their voices are denied to be heard and have no role to implement the decisions made by others, protests are common in the quest of justice. Iris Young claims that these protests are not mainly about the justice of material distribution but about the justice of decision-making power and procedures (Shrader-Frechete 2002).

With regards to this, in the 1992 National People of Color Environmental Leadership Summit which was held on October 24-27, 1991, in Washington DC, recognized this fact. When they adopted 17 principles of environmental justice, they explicitly demanded participative justice in addition to other environmental rights. Their seventh principle says the following; "Environmental Justice demands the right to participate as equal partners at every level of decision making, including needs assessment, planning, implementation, enforcement and evaluation."¹ So the important things that are included in the principle are not just only about distributive perspective of justice rather the whole dimensions of justice are touched to bring environmental justice in actual sense. To realize justice for the people of color those are oppressed over 500 years because of colonialism, it is a must to include almost all dimensions of justice to keep the balance of justice which is crucially important in a present society.

The participatory dimension of environmental justice turns attention to the fact that people of color and the poor (domestically) and nations and people of the unindustrialized South (globally) have little representation in the environmental movement and in other arenas that bear on how environmental benefits and burdens are assigned. (Jamieson, 2001:427-428)

¹ Delegates to the First National People of Color Environmental Leadership Summit held on October 24-27, 1991, in Washington DC, drafted and adopted 17 principles of Environmental Justice. Since then, the Principles have served as a defining document for the growing grassroots movement for environmental justice.

Thus, an opportunity of democratic participation in the environmental movement which develops peoples' representation and participation in policy making at local, national and international levels can be actualized. In this manner, there will be universal decision making power over the location of environmental burdens and benefits in the society.

2.3.2 The Environmental Justice Movement (EJM)

It is obvious that the environmental problems pose a threat to all humans. But not all humans are equally affected by the problem. While some are affected seriously, the other portion of a certain community may be affected less. What is amazing is that sometimes the groups of people who do not contribute to the problem either totally or partially affected by the negative consequences of environmental problem. They are also those that earn a little or nothing from the benefits that generates the problem (Jamieson, 2008:10; Pellow, 2002:1).

So when first people understand that there was environmental discrimination with regards to the distribution of environmental benefits and burdens in USA in 1980s, groups and scholars started to merge social justice with environmental issues (Kaswan 1997; Kibert 2001). The EJM first emerged as a social movement in 1980s to deal with the injustices of environment for the people of color in USA. During that time the people of color were facing the problem of toxic waste dumping.

And the official EJM came from the community action group formed to protest against hazardous waste facility from being built in the middle- class of African American neighborhood (Bullard 1990, 1994, 2000; Kibert 2001). So as the issue of environmental justice came under the national attention in 1982, there were studies indicating distribution of numerous environmental waste disposals in many areas. All these are some preconditions for the establishment of EJM.

However, it is widely agreed that the movement took root at Warren County, North Carolina, in the community of Afton (Jamieson, 2001: 429). The Warren County protest served as a turning point for the environmental justice to stand against environmental racism by public mobilization. Among others it incited the 1983 United States General Accounting Office (US-GAO) study of hazardous waste landfill Siting, which found a strong correlation between Sitings of hazardous waste landfills and race and socio-economic status (US-GAO 1983). The protests also led the Commission for Racial Justice to produce Toxic Waste and Race in 1987, the first national study

to correlate waste facility sites and demographic characteristics. Race was found to be the most potent variable in predicting where these facilities were located-more powerful than poverty, land values and home ownership (Bullard 2004).

From its very definition, environmental racism refers to “any policy, practice or directive that differentially affects or disadvantages (whether intended or unintended) individuals, groups or communities based on race or color. It combines with public policies and industry practices to provide benefits for corporations while shifting costs to people of color” (Bullard, 2004:iii). Thus such practices of excluding some group of community in the decision making process that at the end of the day affects with the costs of environmental burdens is the manifestation of environmental racism. Particularly with its benefits allocation to the North and shifting burdens to the South, geographically on the one hand, and Whites and people of color, racially on the other hand, the implication of environmental racism is far reaching.

In addition, one of the founders of environmental justice movement defines environmental racism as follows;

Environmental racism is discrimination in environmental policy making. It is racial discrimination in the official sanctioning of the life-threatening presence of poisons and pollutants in communities of colour. And it is racial discrimination in the history of excluding people of colour from the main stream of environmental groups, decision making boards, and regulatory bodies. (Chavis, 1993:3)

It is because of their national origin that the African-American communities are selected to be the place of waste dumping site which clearly shows environmental racism. Thus addressing environmental racism which had many impacts was a precondition for EJM. The presence of group discrimination in environmental decision making, the subsequent negative implication it has for the environment and also for the well-being of the poor and people of color was the other reason for the emergence of the EJM. It also forms the initial concern of the movement.

In relation to this again, Bullard wrote in 1990 “Dumping in Dixie: Race, Class, and Environmental Quality” which chronicled the coming together of two important social movements: social justice and environmental movement into environmental justice movement (Bullard 2001).

This same region gave birth to the modern civil rights movement in United States that originated the concept of EJM. The 1991 First National People of Color Environmental Leadership Summit was probably the most important single event in the movement's history. As the summit broadened its scope beyond anti-toxics and started to focus on public health, worker safety, land use, transportation, housing, resource allocation and community empowerment it started to attract special attention (Charles Lee 1992). Delegates come from different states exchanged information and shared relevant action strategies and redefined environmental justice movement to develop common plans in addressing environmental problems affecting people of color in United States and across the world. Thus the EJM's foundation has a lot to do with this summit in many perspectives.

2.4 Issues of Environmental Ethics and Environmental Justice

Environmental ethics and justice deal with a number of environmental related problems since their foundation. They try to address problems that are created either by nature or humans in the course of time. Especially the idea that ecological balance is being degraded from time to time is something that is worrying. Among others the contemporary environmental problems we are facing are the main topics of environmental ethics and justice.

As science and technology advances, there has been deterioration in ecological balance over the years. The economic perspectives that one may follow and the religious and world views are also among the causes of environmental problems (Jamieson 2008). Population growth has also its own role in bringing a number of environmental problems. Air pollution, ozone layer depletion, global warming & climate change, and exploitations of natural resources are common environmental problems affecting every corner of the world today.

Some people deny the seriousness of environmental problems, not because they believe that we are making progress in addressing them, but because they believe that the changes that we have set in motion will have limited or even positive impacts (Ibid.). But in relation to the rapid growing of EJM and its remarkable successes, the important question is whether all people are equally affected with these environmental problems (Newton 2009).

Parallel to the causes of environmental problems, the communities those cause only impose the large amount of negative externality upon the minority of low income and people of color. The

large portion of world's population is under the threat of this inequity and discrimination of environmental burdens over the years (Bullard 2004; Faber 2008; Shrader-Frechette 2002). In the context of Africa, the concerns of environmental ethics and justice are along the environmental injustices the continent is facing because of the legacy of colonialism and global system of the day. Specifically, the environmental crises in the continent are an issue that needs critical concern.

Environmental crisis is a conjunction of some natural disaster such as earthquakes, volcanic eruption and storms, together with man's activity of exploration and utilization of natural resources through the ingenuity of science and technology, which have impacted negatively on the environment and human well-being. (P.A. Ojomo, 2011:105)

With regards to the anthropogenic causes, the population growth of the continent and huge resource exploitation are major factors bringing environmental crisis. With the increment of population, the demand of natural resources increase which indirectly affects the wellbeing of the natural environment. Densely populated areas are highly subject to land degradation, deforestation and overexploitation in general.

Recently, natural disasters of various types are also affecting negatively the environment of Africa. Frequent volcanic eruptions, periodic earthquakes and storms are instances of natural disasters contributing to the environmental crisis in Africa today.

Chapter Three

Theoretical Analysis of the Nexus between Power, Justice and Environment in Africa

Introduction

This chapter is a theoretical analysis of the nexus between power, justice and environment in Africa. Accordingly, the impacts of contemporary global system and the historical background that the continent had passed through are discussed below. First, the detrimental effect of colonialism in its classical and internal forms is analyzed. The second section discusses impacts of globalization processes in general and multinational corporations in particular on the issues of environmental degradation in Africa. The third subsection dwells on the implication of the forces of capitalism on the environmental justice (injustice) in the continent. Towards the end of this chapter, the issue of civil war, instability and conflict arising from resource sharing internally and the interests of global North externally are revealed as environmental crisis in Africa.

3.1. Colonialism: External and Internal

There were different factors that contributed to the under development of Africa and its present challenges. The same fact holds true with regards to environmental problems and injustices that the continent is facing today. Among others, colonialism, both externally when first Europeans came to Africa in need of raw materials for their fast growing industry, and later internally when there is a domination of one society over the other, the two being indigenous society.

The colonization of Africa by European powers was necessitated by several factors. Notable, among the factors was the emergence of the industrial revolution which brought about a rapid change in the socio-economic transformation and technology of the European countries. (Stephen Ocheni and Basil C. Nwankwo, 2012:47)

The industrial revolution that took place in Europe and the capacity of agricultural sector to feed this fast growing industry were unequal and this developed the need for other raw materials. To satisfy the demand for raw materials required in the industries, the European powers started to go outside their own country to look for additional raw materials.

With industrial revolution and decline in agricultural production, the problem of how to provide urban population with food was a serious challenge. The need for market was also another factor that created great ambition in colonizing Africa. It was also the interest of colonialists to take a direct control of the African economy and political administration. This was important for the reorganization of the economy and market in a way they could suit and integrate into the world market and international economy.

The pre-colonial African economy which was based on barter system had to be replaced by money economy to make international division of labor that assigned a compulsory role of production of agricultural raw materials which serves as input for European industry till today. As Ocheni and Nwankwo (2012:51) explored, “The major impact of colonialism in African is that it brought about the under-development of African territories in many different ways.”

Even though some people argue in favor of colonialism for the introduction of western education and civilization, I argue that the impacts of it are much more than the developments it made. Since the education and civilization introduced have not been rooted in African culture, they failed to foster a meaningful development within African environment. On the contrary, they are responsible for the present under-development of the continent in socio-economic, cultural and political aspects.

Moreover, colonial education was essentially aimed at training individual Africans who could help the colonizers in exploiting abundant African natural resources, which in turn led to African environmental degradation in many forms.

Saying this much about colonialism as an introduction because it is impossible to address all the impacts of colonialism in relation to current poverty and under development, in what follows I am going to discuss the environmental injustice that colonialism brought to Africa. For that matter I am going to discuss some case studies that are already carried out by researchers concerning the problems that are created by both classical and internal colonialism.

As Francis O. Adeola (2001) pointed out, colonialism as a process of economic and sociopolitical domination and exploitation of nations by other powerful nations has a long standing in human history. He identified both classical colonialism on the one hand and internal

colonialism- a condition in which both the dominant group and subordinate one co-exist as a native society on the other.

Concerning the external colonialism, Blauner (cited in Adeola 2001), identified some basic elements of colonization process as a phenomenon of forced and involuntary entry of the colonizing power to implement a policy that destroys and transforms indigenous culture in a way that conforms to their own including its values, orientations, beliefs, tradition, ways of life, and modes of subsistence. Not only this, but also the members of the subordinate or colonized group are typically governed or ruled by representatives of the dominant power; and the colonized have the experience of being controlled and manipulated by outsiders who employ either a supremacist or a paternalistic ideology to maintain the system of dominant-subordinate relations.

Despite many scholars argue against the concept of internal colonialism on the ground that there are both oppressed and oppressor, the issue has long age in human history. As Steady (2009: 152) explored, “The concept of internal colonialism was first used by Marxists, such as V. I. Lenin and A. Gramsci, to describe political and economic disparities between regions within a particular society.” Thus, it characterizes the uneven and ununiformed state development on basis of region, ethnic group and extending the gap between core and periphery relations in which resources are tapped and withdrawn from the periphery to develop and sustain the core.

In many African countries and other countries of the world, it is easy to observe inequality of development within the same country because the power transfers and locates resources from periphery to develop the center. Justice does not operate in a way that citizens expect and wish. In the absence of justice, injustice functions using power as sword for taking action on those who cry for fairness and equality.

The impact of internal colonialism is deep rooted in socio-economic and political relationship of the society to the existing world systems. The world system currently operating has a great role in intensifying internal colonialism in African continent (Steady 2009; Carmin and Agyeman 2011). The world is becoming one village because of globalization. To accomplish the mission of making the world one village, there are institutions which support this system. These institutions are in the hands of powerful Wests. In the name of these institutions, the Wests are practicing new form of colonialism on Africa and other continents.

In addition to this, the legacy of classical colonialism persists in many African countries which strengthened the internal colonialism. Today internal colonialism is manifesting itself more in the areas of resource exploitation, material allocation, power distribution and prestige among ethno-national groups, than ever before. That way the core can exploit the resources of the periphery and control the economic and political power of it (Adeola 2001).

A modified version of internal colonialism is however inclusive of relation between states, multinational corporations (MNCs), the dominant and minority ethnic groups in relation to development and underdevelopment. “The origin of internal colonialism in a country such as Nigeria involved the skillful, strategic pursuit of political dominance by the numerical majority following the independence in the 1960s” (Adeola, 2001:44). Adeola used the terms ‘core’ and ‘peripheral indigenous tribes’ to describe the dominant and minority ethnic groups respectively.

As far as the case of Nigeria is concerned, one school of thought suggests that the contemporary problems in the Niger Delta are deeply rooted in classical colonialism, internal colonialism, and neocolonialism, which are incongruent with the fundamental principles of environmental justice (Steady 2009). The problems that the people of Niger Delta are facing are of many types. Among others, chronic and crude environmental injustice, poverty, underdevelopment, social and ecological insecurity are serious problems challenging the life of the community residing there. The oil bearing communities (OBCs) of Nigeria are subject to a number of environmental problems instead of getting much benefit from their own resource endowment. Instead, the struggles for scarce land, the claim for fair returns of investment, and the struggle for environmental and human rights are some of the instances of violent conflicts in the region (Obi 1999; Steady 2009).

The clash between oil-bearing communities (OBCs), the multinational oil companies (MNOCs) and the federal government of Nigeria (FGN) on the issues of oil mineral rights, political marginalization, and ecological injustice gave rise to intense conflicts which exacerbates human and ecological insecurity. On the other hand, it also brought about a serious threat to national security as well. The frequent war in the region over the control of oil wealth and the alignment of MNCs to the interest of their own is responsible for the death of millions of people. Still many others are waiting for death because of their precious nature’s gift. Instead of improving the standard of living and material well-being of most citizens of the OBCs in Nigeria, the

opportunity of these community turns to be suffering a lot by the exploitation of their resources by state power holders internally and MNCs externally(Steady 2009; Carmin and Agyeman 2011).

They cannot defend their right of ownership because of their powerlessness. Especially as the region is now relatively changed to strategic geopolitical and economic prominence at the national and international levels, the power that is invested to control the region is increased. Consequently the fate of the community decreases over the time to have self-determination right on their life and property as well.

More than 90% of oil fields that Nigeria exported located to OBCs region, however the region is the most hindered area ecologically and the community of the region are the most vulnerable group as well. Despite its position within Oil and Petroleum Exporting countries (OPEC) and among the top ten major oil exporting countries in the world, Nigeria remains the most impoverished among OPEC members and high-ranking Oil Producing nations (OPNs) (EIA 2006; WB 2007, and UNDP 2006). Thus the country in general and the region in particular is not benefiting from their oil and other natural resources fairly, rather they are living in the highest poverty rate, lowest per capita income, and shortest life expectancy compared to other major oil exporting countries. The reason behind is the impact of neocolonialism and the selfish dictators leading the country.

When many people are still starving, few corrupt individuals save hefty capital gained from communal resources by putting justice aside. This is deep rooted problem challenging communities of developing regions in general and Niger Delta in particular as well. As Steady (2009:142) mentioned;

While Nigeria has received billions of dollars from crude oil-most of which has vanished into the national and international economies or private accounts without benefiting most Nigerians, very little oil revenues have trickled down to the areas of extraction in OBCs of Niger Delta. Furthermore, the indigenous cultures, including their customs and traditions, have been destroyed

Indigenous people of the Niger Delta region, like elsewhere in Africa, are losing their sacred traditional land ethics, forest preservation, animal ethics and water management (Obioha 2010). Their agricultural lands are destructed, no accesses to clean water, forests are deforested, a

number of totemic animals are lost, and fishes which were used to be subsistence food are killed because of polluted water, majority population were displaced. So, the inequity with regards to the distribution of environmental benefits and burdens in many oil producing African countries remained a detrimental for the local communities over the years. But the injustice is not something that is derived from the nearby companies alone; state leaders are also equally responsible as well.

In reference to this, Carmin and Agyeman (2011) have shown that, there is a suggestion that oil related injustices are of two folds. On one side, the imprudence of governments internally resulted in underdevelopment of the regions of oil bearing communities. Sometimes, state leaders even fail to provide basic necessities for the impacted communities as a result of oil possession. On the other side, however, multinational corporations of the advanced nations of the world negatively affected the innocent people of Africa. Their priority is only consumption of fossil fuels by disregarding the well fare of African communities of oil bearing.

Much of these injustices are done to Africans though only few of them are disclosed. Imprudent and selfish governments are exploiting their people more than the MNCs are doing. In the first place these governments themselves are responsible for allowing irresponsible and unaccountable companies to enter and exploit resources in unmanaged manner. They do not care about the fate of coming generation and the present also. They only do care about their own wellbeing and to some extent about their family. Had they have been prudent and accountable; they would have allowed these MNCs to carry out environmental impacts needs assessment before they begun to operate. But they rather give priority for individual benefits in wrong ways even today. To strengthen this argument, Ocheni and Nwankwo (2012:53) claimed that, “The severe impoverishment of most Africans by their petty bourgeois leaders and marginalization as well as oppression of the masses by those who have access to state power are offshoot of colonialism or colonial hang-over among African states”. Thus the legacy of colonialism manifests itself in a way that African leaders exploit their citizens in unjust manner.

Majority of conflicts in Africa emanated from the need to get access to state power, as holding political power in Africa means a lot. Power sometimes makes decision leaving aside justice in its all aspects. The ideas of participation, recognition and distribution have little to do with the dictators of Africa. Power gave a say to very few members of ruling class while majority of the

people are excluded, no recognition is given to the mass, and environmental benefits are reserved for the powerful few while the burdens are for the poor mass. As Ben Naanen (1995:49) explained;

The political power gained by the numerical majority ethnic groups in Nigeria (including the Hausa-Fulani, Yoruba, and Igbo), has been used hitherto to appropriate and transfer resources from the periphery to develop the core areas especially in the North, while creating immiseration and increased inequality among the subordinated resource-dependent ethnic communities in the periphery.

It is not something easy to look at the injustices that are taking place in many African countries. The ethnic groups from which individuals holding state power come give little attention to justice to govern rationally the diverse population the continent has. According to Mohammed Salih (1999), in Africa the competition among different groups to control the state power is highly influenced by the need to control resources both for economic and livelihood purposes. As soon as they came to power their first task is transferring resources from one corner to the other. The other immediate task they take may be making their local area an industrial zone; so that many of their relatives get employed there and start to lead urban life. If not all, inequality, oppression, marginalization, unjust appropriation of natural resources, lack of equity and adequate compensation for ecological despoliation and loss of livelihood, cultural genocide, lack of basic infrastructure, and lack of economic development continues throughout that regime.

The dominated group did not remain silent, struggles in different forms goes along, which on other hand is the major tackle to development in the continent. Peaceful power transmission from one regime to the other is not common. Therefore, there is frequent war to hold political power. The war leads to serious crisis. Death of many people and loss of huge amount of resources are among the crisis which contributed most to the existing absolute poverty in the continent.

3.2. Globalization

Globalization means different things to different people. Some people may say it is simply the movement of people, language, ideas, and products around the world. Its definition may be this or that but what I want is to show the role and impact of globalization on Africa from the point of view of environmental justice. According to Alhaji Ahmadu Ibrahim (2013: 86), “globalization broadly refers to the expansion of global linkages, the organization of social life on a global scale, and the growth of a global consciousness, hence to the consolidation of world society.”

Globalization is striving to make the world a one village community in all aspects of life. So one cannot isolate itself and live independently because one way or the other the impact of globalization is inevitable. From the intention of bringing world people together, there are loser and gainer among the people (Najam et al. 2007). Africa is one of the victims of it. My aim turns out to be the impact of globalization on environment. Globalization helped accentuate the major environmental damages we are experiencing today, even though it is only indirectly responsible.

As far as the age of globalization is concerned, it has witnessed the triumph of a distinctly hard-nosed brand of American capitalism in the world economy. This has been made easy by the neoliberal agenda for global free trade which ends the interference of government regulation. It removes government restrictions through business practices former public services interred into privatization system. Thus despite it created new opportunities for many but not for all, it has also placed pressure on global environment by reducing social welfare and environmental protection (Najam et al. 2007; Faber 2008).

Globalization represents the emergence of a truly integrated international system of capitalist production and distribution under the hegemony of the world power, United States of America. The easy movement of goods and services across national borders characterizes globalization. Not only goods and services but also technology, natural resources, labor forces, and energy are all integrated in the circuit of global capital. The way structures of transnational corporations, banks, and institutions, that are controlled by the American interests, are organized in the current world reflects this truth. In this respect, Faber describes, the term “globalization” is often used as a cover word by U.S. policymakers to describe the imposition of neoliberal capitalist development models all around the world (Ibid.). Therefore, this act of world’s power in exploiting the world’s resources in a large amount and at the same time exporting the environmental burdens in an amount that is not proportional to the benefits gained by developing countries is one way how power describes itself in global world. Especially Africa is among the manifestations of the impacts of globalization.

Moreover, multilateral institutions such as the World Bank, International Monetary Fund and World Trade Organization played a key role in organizing a new architecture of global economic governance in addressing the interest of USA. So long as contemporary globalization is highly information based (Majekodunmi and Adejuwon 2012), it maintains its regime by the core’s

technological monopoly, domination, and control of global financial markets, monopolistic access to the planet's natural resources. The new innovation and improvements in modern media and communication monopolies, and monopolies over weapons of mass destruction speeds the exploitation and degradation of resources at worldwide level. Thus, globalization seems to have produced a new hierarchy in the world system, more unequal than ever before and further subordinating the peripheries and creating conditions of violent resistance (Steady 2009).

As I mentioned earlier, globalization has reinforced a world system in which few are dominating the whole world through different means. Through technological domination which is also at same time political domination; those who hold power make a decision about the entire activities of our planet. The media and communication monopoly is also playing a key role in the process of globalization.

This can be manifested through different dimensions. The global broadcasting corporations facilitate their coverage to achieve the intended goal of their respective nations' interests as much as they can. For instance one can easily recognize that BBC on its 'Focus on Africa' most of the time presents focusing on its former colonial territories in Africa. Among others, compared to Ethiopia their interest is in favor of Kenya.

The way they disclose information to the public is not something neutral totally rather it is purposive in its nature. By no means had Western Medias report environmental injustices resulted from their technological products in developing countries. Even they are not interested in disclosing any human rights abuse emanated from natural resources exploitation elsewhere. The repression of minority or majority groups by states and MNCs are less reported. Because of the dichotomy that is created among nations as center-periphery, continuous violent resistance is common now days than ever before.

The dichotomy is not only limited within a state, but also at global level, there are global North and South. The global south sometimes named as Third World. The global north is known for its political domination through technological advancement and imposing a number of environmental injustices which includes notably human rights abuse. Detention, torture, repression and other forms of human rights violations are common in the Third World by the powerful global North and their alliance within Third World nations.

Among the recent cases of environmental injustice and human rights violations in the Third World are: the murder of Wilson Pinheiro and Francisco “Chico” Mendes in the Amazon rain forest, the massacre of Father Nery Lito Satur and several others in the Philippines, and the public hanging of Ken Saro-Wiwa and eight other members of the Movement for the Survival of the Ogoni People (MOSOP) in November 1995 in Nigeria. (Adeola, 2001: 40)

Environmental and civil rights transgression is common even now days in many African states. With the opening of their economies to western investors, African political systems are becoming more closed and a number of human rights organizations (Amnesty International 2009; HRW 2011) are critiquing African governments. To the extreme, there are cases where a systemic genocide of minority groups is taking place in many African countries to appropriate natural resources by government agents. The current civil wars in across the continent of Africa justify this truth, if present day South Sudan, Nigeria and Democratic Republic of Congo are taken into account.

3.3. Impacts of Multinational Corporations (MNCs)

The adverse impacts of multinational oil companies on oil-producing countries located in sub-Saharan Africa is far reaching. It directly affects the environment and by extension the local population; as a result, many Africans are victims of environmental injustices resulted from MNCs. The dependency of the poor nations on the politically and economically strong nations and their multinational corporations results in overexploitation of natural resources and thus damage the livelihoods of the poor (Adeola 2000, 2001). The dependency of the poor, as he further claims, is perpetuated through unequal exchange and external controls that maintain the statuesque. Moreover, the activities of multinational corporations (MNCs) in different Third World countries add to environmental injustice and human rights violations in those countries. In addition to colonialism and globalization with its new world system it created, as Shrader-Frechette (2002) explained, the ability of developed nations and their corporations continued to exploit indigenous people.

Environmental degradation by oil industries operating in Africa eliminates peoples’ sources of income. When it seems a way forward for nation to attract investors, it however marginalizes some community groups especially in areas where the activities of MNCs carried out. The destruction of Ogoni agricultural and fishing lands in Nigeria by Shell oil is an instance of the

adverse impact of Oil Company to the indigenous community in Niger Delta. “The company has come under heavy criticism from environmental groups because it provided oil revenues to the Nigerian military government but not to the Ogoni tribe whose land and people have been destroyed by oil drilling” (Shrader-Frechette, 2002:118). Shell Oil is responsible for the death of thousands of Ogoni people, making many homeless because of explosions and oil pollution.

At its extreme case the flaring natural gas which took place within Ogoni homes has caused destruction of plants and animals, pollution of air, water, and soil, acid rain which as a result endangered the life of this people. “Gas flaring in the process of oil exploration in the Niger delta has contributed more greenhouse gases than all of sub-Sahara Africa combined” (Friends of the Earth 2004 cited in Oruonye). In addition to direct health impacts on adjacent communities, gas flaring in Nigeria has also contributed to global greenhouse gas emissions. This in turn resulted in various forms of environmental problems, notably climate change, increasing risks of diseases caused by pollution, and food insecurity. The residents of the region have been facing roaring noise and intense heat from the flares. It is obvious that the particles from the flares could fill the air and because of these livelihoods are suffering. Local communities are suffering from respiratory diseases more than ever.

In Nigeria, the oil politics of the multinational corporations in partnership with the political elite have left “ecological footprints” that imperil her environment; this has also plunged Nigeria’s natural world and leadership into disquiet. (Uzoechi Nwagbara, 2013:199)

MNCs are also a reason for the large amount of toxic dumping on developing countries mainly through their companies to the host countries. The factors that contributed to the prevalence of toxic waste dumping include; absence of well formulated strong environmental policy, the powerlessness of the states to implement national environmental policy if any and the influence of multinational companies not to implement as it will be against their interest.

As states remain weaker in formulating and implementing the policy, MNCs can do whatever that interests them. Among others, toxic waste dumping by MNCs is quite prevalent because of weak or non-existing national environmental policy. According to Adeola (2000:691), the toxic waste trade in Africa could be explained from the unequal economic interaction between the

world's poor and rich countries which has led to the dependence of the poor on the economically and politically strong nations. He writes (2000:691): “[b]ecause poor nations are passive or negligible actors in global environmental policy decisions, and represent the path of least resistance, environmental burdens are continuously directed to them.” The major actors in global environmental policy use power in making environmental laws ineffective. The standards in developing countries; bribery and corruption, and poverty or desperation to accept pollution for cash are also some detrimental factors that are bringing long-term adverse environmental and public health consequences to Africa (Adeola 2001).

Many national environmental policies in Africa are paper value. They are powerless in taking action against the polluter. Much of these policies are wrongly implemented by corrupt and irresponsible individuals. There is absence of paying fair compensations for the affected community, because these multinational companies prefer to pay a little amount for individuals who are not accountable and not transparent to their people who elected them. Obviously, dictators rely on the strength of their military forces so that much of the revenues go into the hands of military officials and individuals. Within a state itself however the impacts of MNCs on environment is not equally distributed. Depending on differences in ethnic group, race, center-periphery environmental inequalities are common in relation to current activities of MNCs.

Recently, there are certain actions that were taken by Amnesty International in the Niger Delta region regarding the ecological tragedy by oil MNCs. In response to the human and environmental rights implications of oil MNCs operating in the oil-rich Niger Delta, in 2009 amnesty programme was initiated to halt the outright descent into violence in the Niger Delta and to, ostensibly, resolve the region's socio-economic needs (Benjamin Maiangwa and Daniel E. Agbibo 2013). Amnesty international intervened in order to fundamentally reduce the escalation of violent conflicts that took place between resistance groups on one side and Nigerian state and MNCs on the other. Unfortunately, however, Amnesty is unable to address the problem because of different factors emanated from the interests of MNCs and Nigerian political economy.

The recent heightened criminality in the Niger Delta suggests that the fragile peace established by the 2009 amnesty is now at risk, and the region thus seems to be sliding back into outright instability. At the same time, the inhabitants of the

Niger Delta are continuing to voice their concerns regarding the issues that stem from the environmental damage perpetrated by oil MNCs. It is most likely that their discontent will continue to brew, especially if efforts by Shell and the Nigerian government to clean up the degraded Niger Delta ecosystem are further delayed. (Maiangwa and Agbiboa, 2013:76)

A hope was made when the resistance groups and Nigerian government made a deal on the environmental issues raised by Oil companies in Niger Delta region. Immediately, however, in its May 2011 report, Human Rights Watch stated that despite the Amnesty programme, some criminal groups and militants operating in the Niger Delta have carried out ‘kidnappings, bombings and attacks on oil facilities’ (HRW 2011). The militants’ argument seems reasonable on one way in that Shell failed to address the ecological problems it promised. We understand this from its blame by Amnesty International that the company is following a compensatory strategy that is neither transparent nor fair. The compensations made are subject to corruption so that they strengthen the power of the greedy dictators to continue exploiting Oil bearing communities without paying them appropriate compensations.

The case of Niger Delta of Nigeria is not the only region in Africa that their ecology is eliminated and degraded by multinational oil companies. The US oil company Chevron (now Chevron-Texaco), also made the same injustice in areas it invested in Africa. The activities by the company reveals outright how much the geographical and human landscape of oil bearing countries in Africa are affected by oil extraction.

Like in the case of Niger Delta of Nigeria, environmental issues have rarely been considered in oil exploration activities in Sudan. It seems as if environmental impacts needs assessment had not took place there, which led to very negative impacts on the environment. The most significant of these impacts are construction of access roads for very heavy equipment, seismic survey lines and drilling sites. The damage to the environment is mainly physical, comprising deforestation and devegetation, erosion and watercourse siltation, and disrupted drainage patterns. Extensive damage of this type has been observed north of the Heglig facility in Southern Kordofan (UNEP 2007). The areas targeted for oil exploration in South Sudan are vulnerable to various environmental damages as the area is characterized by several months flood resulted from well forested and soft soils found there. In as much as the oil company and the negative impacts it brought is of various kinds in the country, displacement through bombing

and burnings are among major abuses of human rights. As Oruonye (2012:158) explored, “Oil exploration in Sudan also resulted in displacement of innocent civilians from the areas of Talisman’s operation to create a no man’s land around the oil wells. Displacement is effected by bombings and burnings of communities”. Thus innocent civilians often mistreated by cruel, inhuman action for the sake MNCs interest.

The war between the Government of Sudan (GOS) and Sudan People’s Liberation Movement (SPLM) lasted long time mainly because with the independence of oil located areas of the south, MNCs operating in the region need to formulate a new form of agreement to exploit the oil. Therefore, intentionally these companies delayed the independence of the South Sudan (Patey 2006; Shankleman 2011; Grawert and Andra 2013). After its independence in 2011, also the civil war continued despite the SPLM holds power in the south. As a result of the war, many people were made refugees to neighboring countries where they were suffering from hunger, diseases, and a number of human rights abuses. Its impact is a fear for the security of the horn region even today. Human Rights Watch in its report of 2003, indicated that the displacement of a number of a people from their resident places because of war on oil and oil development in Sudan. Much of these problems were emanated from the absence of carrying out environmental impact needs assessment, regarding the adverse impacts on wildlife according to Ecologists and environmental activists.

Ecologists criticized the oil industry for not conducting a careful study of environmental impact, blaming local oil planners for failing to consider the effect of the pipeline on access of wildlife to water, in particular. They further stated that the refinery in Jaili, on the Nile River in northern Sudan, would contaminate the river if over spills occurred. They warned that alleged uncontrolled dumping of oil waste by the refinery, under construction by China National Petroleum Company (CNPC), constituted a pollution threat. The Malaysian firm hired to supervise the work did not have local expertise necessary to avert such problems, the environmentalists charged. (HRW, 2003:378)

It is commonly understood that, the other power that is emerging in the world with its MNCs that intensify the environmental crisis in Africa is China. The marked presence of Chinese multinational corporations on the global stage is changing the landscape of international business and politics on the one hand and it increases the competition for capturing key resources and market share across Africa on the other. Many construction projects in Africa like rail, road and

telecom are under taking by Chinese companies. During their construction of these projects in Africa, they do care a little about the environmental management.

The environmental impacts challenging the people of Sudan led the Communities of Melut County to have a Memo of Protest on the Petroleum activities in Sudan, Maluth, on March 2010. Among the memo they adopted, the second memo reads as follows regarding the impacts of oil companies on the ecology resulting from continuous drilling:

The Companies are still continuing the drilling and refinery which causes astonishment reflecting total greediness without considering the negative effects that will emerge from this works especially on the future of the area on the geological part of it. Based on the CPA² provisions, we request the immediate stopping the drilling process, we are afraid of its effects on the future of the next generation. (ECOS and PAX, 2014:107)³

Even though different agreements carried out between the people of South Sudan and the companies found there with regard to environmental protection, the companies failed to implement the agreements because of their selfishness. Irresponsibility and lacking sense of humanity made them to continuously exploit and extract the oil without giving due attention to the future of the local community.

3.4. Capitalism and Its Impacts on African Environment

The impacts of capitalism on African environment cannot be discussed in separation from the development of colonialism, new global system and huge multinational companies operating across the continents. Capitalism as one form of economic system negatively affected the African indigenous environmental ethics, as I have already discussed in chapter two, with the introduction of money economy and the destruction of indigenous environmental ethics. “The shift from the preservation of Nature to capitalism in the wake of frontier global capitalism is fundamentally ensconced in different modes of humanity’s relation to earth” (Nwagbara,

² CPA-Comprehensive Peace Agreement, is a wealth sharing Protocol signed between the Government of Sudan (GoS) and Sudan People’s Liberation Movement/Army (SPLM/A), in 2005.

³This was taken from the Memo that was written by the Communities of Melut County and addressed to President Kiir. The Memo was signed by the Paramount Chief of Dinka Melut, a representative of native administration, the speaker of the local legislative, a representative of the SPLM Secretariat, a Women representative and a Youth representative.

2013:199). With the ever increasing practices of capitalism in a global state, the degree of oppression and dominance characterized by the movement of resources from the periphery to the center as well as destruction of the natural world of the periphery nations is being witnessed than ever before.

As far as collective life style turned into capitalism in many African states with colonialism, the indigenous attitude of people regarding their environment is diverted to earn and run with lately introduced money economy than giving due attention for their surrounding environment. As it is the case anywhere, not all people are polluted by the process of capitalist structuring. Faber (2008:8), argued that:

Not all citizens are polluted equal in this process of capital restructuring. Instead, it is poor people of color and the white working class, especially the most politically oppressed segments of America's "underclass" (or subaltern peoples), that are being selectively victimized to the greatest extent by corporate environmental abuses.

Thus it shows that the people of color everywhere and particularly in Africa are affected badly by the environmental abuses of different kind because of capitalist global system. Capitalism affected Africa from the vantage point that traditionally the society of the continent used to follow collective way of life. "...the growth of capitalism in Africa with the excessive economic activities of multinational companies have exploited natural resources and destroyed the environment" (Polycarp A. Ikuenobe, 2014:17). With the arrival of free market economy; where production and distribution and industry are privately owned and operated for a private profit, it could be impossible to imagine people cares for the future generations this much. Faber (ibid.) further claims that "Defined in terms of North versus South, corporate-led globalization is magnifying externally and internally based environmental injustices to the advantage of the United States." In many developing nations the former free access to natural resources is now restricted by the transformation of commonly held properties into the hands of private capitalist investors. Peoples of the global South who draw their livelihood directly from the land, water, forests, coastal mangroves, and other ecosystems are becoming displaced in order to supply cheap raw materials for the dominant classes and foreign capital (Adeola 2000, 2001; Faber 2008). The unjust aspects of capitalist destruction of the environment if examined well, shows

easily that the African population is experiencing negative impacts of environmental hazards because of commercial hazard site imposed up on marginalized communities.

According to Schlosberg (2007), Environmental justice recognizes that distributional patterns of hazards created by industrialization disproportionately affect marginalized communities.

A number of researches reveal that the global capitalist system developed a system of value that measures everything in terms of money value. Along with this it brought the commercialization of the environment between community and corporations. In that way the corporations site environmental burdens to the area of poor community located at the periphery by giving them little money in return. Therefore, indigenous communities in Africa often bear burdens of industrial hazards as a result of their poverty, location and functioning, while government and corporations' officials benefit from the companies that produce these toxic wastes.

3.5. Civil war

Recently civil war and terrorism in Africa have become the worrying agendas of the continent. The reasons behind these catastrophes are differences in interests and ideologies that are emerging due to new global system from economic, political and social perspectives. The conflicts arise because of resource sharing accounts a big percentage of conflicts in the continent. Disagreements within a society on the environmental entitlement and sharing of uncertain environmental risks and burdens, is part of the conflict.

Thus the impacts of civil war on humanitarian situation on the one hand and environmental degradation on the other hand is enormous. The ongoing civil wars like in the case of South Sudan have severely undermined the humanitarian and socio-economic situation in South Sudan and neighboring countries. The civil war made many people refugees. The continuity of the crisis forced people to seek refuge in the neighboring countries like Ethiopia, Uganda, Sudan, Democratic republic of Congo, and Kenya.

According to UNHCR (2014), since fighting erupted in Juba in December 2013, seven out of South Sudan's ten states have been affected by the violence, which has left an estimated thousands of people dead and over one million displaced and sought refuge in neighboring countries.

The reality however, lies in the need for scarce and limited resources. So oppressing one group for the scarce resource actually available in the area of that group is common in the continent. Obviously there are conflicts between native population and multinational corporations across the continent. This case is very harsh in the areas with oil and where multinational corporations are operating. The nexus between oil and civil war in many African states strongly witnesses the case. Like I mentioned before, the current situation in South Sudan is revealing the failing state building because of the continuity of the war resulting from the resource exploitation in a way that intensifies the civil war.

Under the rule of the Government of Sudan in Khartoum, there had been a nexus between oil and the civil war in south Sudan. The government used the war to provide free access to oil companies for exploration. This was accompanied by displacement and large scale killing and, as a war legacy, caused entrenched hostilities and distrust, and led Southern Sudanese to sabotage the Asian-dominated oil companies operating in Southern Sudan. After the return of the displaced people during the interim period after the CPA, land conflicts ensued. (Grawert and Andra, 2013:5)

The civil wars that are taking place in many African states are contributing to environmental degradation in terms of killings, displacement of people, pollution by military weapons, and economic crisis that comes through budget allowed for the war instead of investing on development projects. If one takes into account the total deaths because of civil war, in African states where civil war has been going on, the impact is impossible to imagine as simple as far as it destroys the productive labor who are the hope of the continent's economic resource. The civil war in Democratic Republic of Congo destroyed the life of many people. This destruction of many peoples' life is risky to the continent in general and to the country in particular.

According to Anke Hoeffler (2008), recent surveys suggest that the war in the DRC has claimed a total of 3.9 million lives, making it the world's deadliest war since World War II. The majorities are young men killed during war and women and children are also vulnerable to disease. Men were at far higher risk of being killed, separations and disappearances were also common, mostly affecting men. The economic devastation has impacts on neighboring countries most of the time.

Displacement of native people because of violent conflicts also made Africa which is a home to twelve percent of World's population to have the highest percentage of world's refugee population. The present violent conflict in Darfur began in earnest in February 2003, resulting in an estimated 190,000 refugees who fled to Chad and about 1 million internally displaced persons (IDPs) (Depoortere et al 2004). The displaced people live either in refugee camps where they suffer from several problems emanating from pollution, hunger, diseases, and even death. The UNHCR rates situations with crude mortality rates above 1 death per 10,000 persons per day as an emergency situation (ibid.). The occurrence of continuous disputes makes the environment so harsh that it is inhospitable to human life so far. The way power is related to justice in calming down the war over the years in the region indicates lacking the applicability of justice.

Chapter Four

Environmental Injustices in Africa

Introduction

In previous chapters, I tried to discuss the African traditional environmental ethics and how they have been affected by capitalism, globalization, multinational corporations and colonialism. This chapter, however, discusses environmental injustices in Africa. The chapter presents environmental crises in Africa are mostly created as a result of developed North's. These injustices, I argue, are intended to exploit African resources by use of power. Environmental problems that the majority of African indigenous communities have today, come from the abuses of the Western countries on the resources of these communities.

Though Africa hardly contributes to the environmental problems, the community of the continent has been affected much. As many scholars (Shrader-Frechette 2002; Faber 2008; Newton 2009) noted, not all nations or people of the world suffer equally from the dangers of environmental crisis. There are occasions when some nations of the world who contributed much to the problem are affected less, and those who contributed less or none to the problem may be affected more. The same fact holds true concerning societies as well, because not all parts of society are affected equally by the dangers of environmental problems.

Because of power and lack of strong justice system operating in the continent, the impacts of environmental problems, disproportionately affected different communities. The communities, from which state power holders come, are less subject to the problem while the ruled are desperately affected with the injustices of environment. Environmental problems are posing a serious threat to the security and development in Africa today more than ever before. These problems are of various forms but I focus on the major ones including climate change and global warming, land grabbing, exploitation of natural resources and toxic waste dumping as instances of major environmental problems that indigenous communities of Africa are facing.

In the subsequent discussion, these environmental problems are elaborated along with the nexus between power, justice and environment.

4.1. Land grabbing

Land grabbing is a new phenomenon enacted on the planet without much consideration and analysis of the long term impacts of it. It is a debatable issue of large-scale land acquisitions; the buying or leasing of large pieces of land in developing countries, by domestic and transnational companies, governments, and individuals. Land grabbing primarily refers to a large-scale land acquisitions (Cotula et al. 2009; Hall 2011; Anseeuw et al. 2012; Thaler 2013).

Large-scale land acquisitions either through purchases, leases or other ways are emerging as a global phenomenon in recent years. There is a hot debate regarding the effects of large international investors buying or leasing land in poor African countries. Many countries in sub-Saharan Africa are heavily affected by large-scale land acquisitions as many of the governments across these countries are implementing the policy that encourages investors to lease land for commercial agricultural purposes considering it as an opportunity for transformation of agricultural sector (Von Braun and Meinzen-Dick 2009; Moreda 2013).

Despite the contemporary global systems are more influenced by the global North, the case of land grabbing is not limited to the advanced Western countries. Most Asian countries are involving in the large scale land investment for their growing economy lately. Among others, countries like India, Saudi Arabia, South Korea and China are investing on the land of Africa in hefty amount. Thus, Western developed countries are not the only to be blamed for the land grabbing challenging African environment.

Now days, the acquisition of huge plots of agricultural land in sub-Saharan Africa by foreign investors has been increasing at alarming rate. There are different factors that motivated foreign investors to put their eyes on developing countries in general, and sub Saharan Africa in particular. In this regard, the availability of plenty of land in an area where assumed to be conducive for crop productions that can be exported, made Africa a targeted continent for land acquisitions. The investors are attracted by Africa's cheap labor and fertile land as well. According to Rahmato, (2011:2), "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."

A critical evaluation and analysis of the impacts of this investment as conducted by many scholars however shows that the welfare situations of the people in the continent are affected negatively in many ways. “--there are negative impacts in terms of threat to domestic food security, dispossession and displacement of poor rural population, environmental degradation and depletion of water resources, loss of policy space because of obligations entailed by international investment contracts and legal agreements” (Anh-Nga Tran-Nguyen, 2010:3).

Despite enough production of food for people through mechanized commercial farming, multinational corporations have brought a number of environmental problems. For instance, unlike traditional African peasant farmers, these corporations use fertilizers, insecticides, fungicides, and herbicides, which have polluted ground water, rivers, and lakes (Ikuenobe 2014). Thus, it is evident that for the local people of Africa, the current large land investment projects imply more risks than their benefits. Thousands of indigenous communities are forced to be displaced from their fathers’ land; leaving their century’s farm land to multi-national companies and domestic investors. Displaced farmers and those unable to find jobs in the vicinity of the land given to investment projects migrate to other rural areas or the cities. For those who are forced to remain there, only jobs that are seasonal, of low wages and poor working conditions are available (Anseeuw et al 2012; Moreda 2013).

Not only their displacement, but also there is increasing food insecurity problem because these multinational companies produce and export food and biofuel crops to the investors’ home countries on a large scale. Local foods prices are increasingly rising from time to time. Many of indigenous communities are unable to afford the crops that are produced as they are at export standard. No attention is given for internal consumption of the mass. Instead the ultimate goal of these crops of export standard is to secure food safety of the investors’ home countries (Oakland Institute 2011; Anseeuw et al. 2012).

The large-scale land acquisition of Africa by foreign investors is not common to all African countries. Some few countries are heavily affected than others, as the majority of reported acquisitions are concentrated in a few countries.

A large number of countries (84) are reported to be targeted by foreign investors, but just 11 of them concentrate 70% of the reported targeted surface. Among

those 11 countries, 7 are African, namely Sudan, Ethiopia, Mozambique, Tanzania, Madagascar, Zambia and DR Congo. (Anseeuw et al., 2012: vii)

It is apparent that the targets of investors are on poor countries as they are poorly integrated into world economy and have no strong land institutions. Because of their poverty, their influence in world systems is very limited. On the other hand, these countries have no strong land tenure security (Anseeuw et al. 2012; Cotula et al. 2009; Oakland Institute 2011). In as much as they have no well-founded land policy (Anh-Nga Tran-Nguyen, 2010) that can sustainably be implemented, the lands of these countries are subject to foreign large scale land acquisitions.

Land grabs causes not only uprooting people from their permanent residence, but also it plays a great role in creating conflicts among Africans. When a fertile land owned by certain ethnic group is taken from by the other which is a majority (or ruling class) internally and by foreign investors externally, conflict is inevitable. The civil war among many African countries indicates this reality. Food and water insecurity stemming from land grabs can destabilize African nations and create international conflict between countries (Bujra 2002; Cotula et al. 2009; Anseeuw et al. 2012). The situation of land grabs brings instability among African nations and creates international conflicts between countries. Because food and water insecurity which stems from land grabs, exacerbates the condition especially in some of the Horn countries.

Egypt provides a perfect example of how food and water insecurity stemming from land grabs can destabilize African nations and create international conflict between countries. Egypt's revolution was exacerbated by food insecurity caused by the rising price of wheat. Food insecurity could get much worse for Egypt soon because foreign investors are pushing Ethiopia to build a massive dam upriver along the Nile that could drastically decrease the water Egypt will have available for irrigation. (Oakland Institute, News Embargoed Until 12:01 AM Edt. Dec. 6, 2011:4)

In what follows I briefly discuss the case of large-scale land deals in Ethiopia and its adverse impacts on peasants' livelihoods and the natural environment. In recent years, Ethiopia opened her door to foreign investors with the assumption that the country possessed plentiful land and water resources. The government was actively promoting that land transfers to investors would be made under favorable conditions.

Among areas given to investors in a large amount, Gambella Region in the extreme west of the country and Bako Tibee woreda in western Oromia were sites that can be taken as examples. The two areas witness large-scale forcible displacement of villagers. In these two sites, an Indian floricultural and agro-business conglomerate Karuturi Global Ltd, is investing heavily. According to Mahaprashasta (2012:52); “the company has leased 10,000 hectares in Bako and 100,000 ha in Gambella, and has an option for 200,000 ha of additional land in Gambella.”

In Africa, the land considered as idle or uninhabited is in fact used by local communities for agricultural purposes, including fallow cycles and pastoralism. This land belongs to local communities by customary law, but in the absence of well-defined land rights, the government claims ownership of such land (Tran-Nguyen 2010). In present day Ethiopia, all land is state property, private ownership is not allowed. Only use rights in which the users cannot sell, mortgage or exchange in any way is functioning. Beyond allowing only use right, there are conditions that make holders lose the land if they are absent from farms and the land remain idle for three or more consecutive years (Rahmato 2011). More specifically as Rahmato (2011:6) pointed out, “the government has the right to remove holders from the land if it decides that the land is needed for ‘public purposes’ or if it considers that the land will be more valuable if utilized by investors, cooperative societies and other public or private entities.”

Thus, the government continues relocating the population from their ancestral lands to small villages to accommodate investors. Once the communities dispossessed their land, they came across many challenges. The land in the new villages is often dry and poor in quality because the fertile land is most of the time given to the investors (Mahaprashasta 2012). In addition to the challenges of adjusting themselves to the new location, the impact of forcible transfers has been far greater.

Forcible evictions have become the norm in the past decade in Africa in the face of demanding agro-business market. The Ethiopian example becomes one of the sharpest pointers to the phenomenon of agro-imperialism, which is ever-expanding in Africa and in which governments are, time and again, colluding with multinational companies and international donor agencies against the interests of the citizens of their own countries. (Mahaprashasta, 2012:54)

The state used power to displace indigenous people from their land in order to attract foreign investors. In this line, as Dessalegn Rahmato (2011:26) pointed out that “the state has used its

hegemonic authority over the land to dispossess smallholders and their communities without consulting them, without their consent.” Indigenous people are not invited to discuss the benefits they will get and burdens they incur from land investment. There has been lack of participative justice to make decisions on matters that affect them.

Moreover, lack of transparency and accountability in land deals is common. This situation marginalizes the local community and put them into situation even worse than before displacement. The displaced people also suffers from a violation of human rights; erosion of their cultural identities, loss of property rights, and food insecurity crisis. The idea of justice has little to do with compensation issues in the relocated communities. The vast majority of people did not get fair compensation payments (Laura German et al. 2011; ADF 2012; Richards 2013).

4.2. Toxic Waste Importation

When first emerged, the environmental justice movements of 1980s in the USA, they were believed to be anti-toxic movements. Toxic wastes were dumped in the areas where colored and non-white people live. It was race based in its nature. Consequently, the black communities were disproportionately affected by the environmental health threats resulted from toxic waste dumping. According to Robert Bullard (1990) and David Pellow (2002), the movement was developed as social struggles against the fact that the poor and communities of color have been disproportionately burdened with toxic dumping and other environmental pollutions.

On accounts and reports released by specialized international agencies such as the United Nations Environmental Program (UNEP) (2007), Greenpeace (1994) and other international environmentalist organizations, Africa has been used extensively by foreign companies and their partners as a dumping ground to dispose large quantities of highly toxic waste from the industrialized countries. Consequently, most of African countries are suffering from the toxic dumps that are imported from industrialized nations of the world. Empirical evidence compiled by the NGOs indicates that annually, millions of tons of hazardous wastes are channeled by MNCs based in core advanced industrial countries to underdeveloped nations of Africa, Asia, Latin America, and Caribbean (Greenpeace 1994; Asante-Duah et al. 1992; Frey 1994-95; Uva and Bloom 1989; Hilz 1992).

As an unfortunate aspect of globalization, the relative ease of transnational movements of industrial products and hazardous materials brought about problems of inequitable distribution of environmental hazards between developed countries and developing. The patterns of distribution of hazardous wastes, toxics especially some banned chemicals like DDT, polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), herbicides, and asbestos indicates that the advanced industrial states of the North export to the underdeveloped societies of the South (Adeola 2001; Greenpeace 1994, 2001).

Much of these hazardous wastes come from USA and EC countries. Many underdeveloped countries of the South are used as a reservoir of garbage, toxic wastes, DDT, and hazardous products generated in advanced industrial nations (Adeola 2001; Hilz 1992; Greenpeace 1994; Weir and Shapiro 1981; Scherr 1987). Thus, Multinational corporations based in advanced countries distribute millions of tons of hazardous wastes to all the corners of underdeveloped countries of the world.

Africa being one of the underdeveloped continents of the world, fell victim to some of the major transshipments of toxic wastes. The case is an indication of waste colonialism. In many places of the continent, there are separated areas for the disposal of hazardous substances. The accurate analysis of the means and activities of the exporting toxic wastes imply that the developing countries of Africa are so powerless and voiceless in the global system because of their level of economy.

There is no strong and active environmental awareness with Africans to stand against the dumping of waste disposal. But the industrialized countries of the world which have power, at the same time who are with strong and active environmental awareness look away for the hazardous waste of their industrial process. As a result, they illegally and forcefully bring to Africa their industrial wastes. The report by Green Peace International (2010) shows that the movements of these wastes from one part of the world to another involves different stakeholders who greedily engaged in the activity to acquire individual benefit. They bring together the exporter and importer.

Accordingly, systematic dumping of hazardous wastes to the regions of poor Third World countries is carried out by many multinational corporations (MNCs) through export. Although

the role of MNCs as the culprit seems glaring, the underlying problems of toxic wastes dumping, especially in Africa, are emerged from within. Some of which include; government corruption, bribery, inefficiency, and abuse of power by military and public officials at the expense of the poor innocent people (Adeola 2001).

However, it is commonly understood that with the importation of these toxic wastes into a given community, the safety and security of the community gets disturbed. Besides, the intended use they have on protecting agricultural products by killing pests at modest costs, some of the most popular pesticides proved to be toxic not only to pests but also to harmless or beneficial animals and humans. Therefore, it is easy to observe the environmental injustices of undue imposition of toxic wastes by powerful global North on the life of global South from the angle of associated adverse health effects on innocent people (Pellow 2007).

Another toxic dumping importation is that of E-wastes. E-waste also known as ‘Waste of Electrical and Electronic Equipment (WEEE)’ or ‘Electronic Waste’ is defined in various ways by different researchers. Davis & Heart (2007), Christine Terada (2012) defined e-waste as old, end-of-life or discarded appliances which contain electrically powered components. Toxic electronic or ‘e’-waste is the case when millions of tons e-wastes produced around the world each year has been dumped on the land of poor people and countries.

Electronic materials from the smallest to the largest which are used extensively in Europe and elsewhere in developed nations are coming to Africa in the name of aid and technical support of development. Wastes of electronic materials like computers, cell phones, radios, TVs, cameras and the like are imported to Africa in huge amount. A number of used electronic devices headed for the dump to Third World countries usually. “E-waste-trashed electronic hardware, from personal computers and monitors to mobile phones, DVD players, and television sets-is, like the electronics industry, growing at an explosive rate” (Jennifer Gabrys, 2011:2).

Western educational, government institutions and NGOs dispose used computers to Africans as an aid to support and facilitate school education. For example, “Computer Aid International (CAI) ship older computers to schools in South Africa, Uganda, Kenya, and Nigeria with the intention of bridging the digital divide and providing access to this technology for some of the world’s poorest children”(Pellow, 2007:200). However, immediately after their arrival, they

failed to give service either because of incompatible software configuration or already failed machines that need maintenance. Thus, after a while these secondhand computers changed to something useless and added to waste.

Computers and other electronics goods in the industrialized global North are discarded, and exported often by ship to urban areas and rural villages across Asia, Africa, and Latin America, where residents and workers disassemble them for sale in new manufacturing processes or where they are simply dumped as e-wastes (Pellow 2007). The western African countries are mostly affected by the E-wastes exported from European countries. According to Environmental Investigation Agency (EIA) (2011:2), “much of Europe’s e-waste ends up in West Africa, especially Nigeria and Ghana.” Though different conventions made the trade of hazardous e-waste illegal in sub-Saharan African countries the e-waste trade continues to flow into this region of the continent. According to Terada (2012:166), “it is estimated that 500 containers of second-hand electronics are imported to Nigeria every month from Europe, with each container holding 500 computers. About three-quarters of these imported products are junk that cannot be reused and are dumped in landfills.” In as much as individuals in the area participate in the breaking down of the electronic goods to earn subsistence wage, they are faced with significant environmental and health impacts. Because of the harmful nature of chemicals found in e-wastes, the potential health consequences for those involved in this kind of work are of many types; reproductive and developmental problems, damaged immune, nervous and blood systems, kidney damage and impaired brain development in children (Pellow 2007; EIA 2011; Carmin & Agyeman 2011). More specifically, Terada (2012:166) indicated that “children-often young boys-make their way through slicks of oily water to scavenge for any valuable components and earn around US \$2 a day by collecting components. The children burn cables and wires to recover reusable metals like copper wire; in the process, toxic chemicals and metals are released into the surrounding atmosphere.”

Another country most affected by e-waste dumping in West Africa is Ghana. There is a dump site in a place called Agbogbloshie, where the nearby communities are suffering from many environmental hazards.

Agbogbloshie dump site in Ghana’s capital, Accra, is a computer graveyard. But PCs are not given a decent, safe burial-they are dumped on this expanding, toxic treasure trove. Many of the

well-known brands are there: Compaq, Dell, Gateway, Philips, Canon, Hewlett Packard. (Carmin & Agyeman, 2011:1).

Most of Ghana's e-waste is imported from developed countries, disguised as secondhand electronic goods which are, however, often dysfunctional. As it is the case in Nigeria, in Ghana also the impacts of these e-wastes are numerous. Because of poverty and absence of strong e-waste management in countries where e-waste is illegally dumped, young children involved in labor work of electronic goods in unsafe manner; using only rudimentary tools and with no protective equipment (Karin Lundgren 2012; EIA 2011).

The impacts of these electronic wastes are numerous. They cause environmental pollution, make soil unproductive; destroy natural cleanness of environment. As a result, people cannot have easy access to clean natural surroundings. Instead, they suffer from ecological hazards that electronic wastes brought.

4.3 Climate Change and Global Warming

Climate change refers to “a change in the state of the climate that can be identified (e.g., by using statistical tests) by changes in the mean and/or the variability of its properties, and that persists for an extended period, typically decades or longer” (IPCC-WGIIAR5, 2014:4). Africa is one of the most vulnerable regions in the world to climate change. The impact of climate change on Africa is likely to be severe because of adverse direct effects, high agricultural dependence, and limited capacity to adapt. At the root of climate change is a global warming caused by anthropogenic actions like the emissions of carbon dioxide, methane and other greenhouse gases. Here and there it is possible to experience the impacts of climate change in every sectors and life of individuals. Climate change is already a reality in Africa. There are prolonged and intensified droughts in eastern Africa; unprecedented floods in western Africa; depletion of rain forests in equatorial Africa; and an increase in ocean acidity around Africa's southern coast (Besada and Sewankambo 2009).

The problems of climate change and global warming pose a hefty threat to the life and well-being of the people of the world in general and more particularly to the people of the poor Third World countries. Therefore, climate change issues in the global North differ from the prevailing climate change concerns of sub-Saharan Africa. For the world's richest

industrialized countries who contributed most to the global warming; the priority is to avoid climate change crisis through managed way. However, Africa and other developing regions in the global South that have relatively low carbon emissions due to their lack of development are suffering from the face of current and future climate change challenges (Faber 2008; Besada and Sewankambo 2009).

The issue here is if the claim that rich nations of the world contribute most to the climate change, then what obligation should they have for the developing countries? Many developing countries, for example, argue that the developed world should bear most of the cost of greenhouse gas mitigation efforts simply because they are rich. But this emanates not from the point that they are principally responsible to deal with the problem, rather they are so rich and they have to make it regardless of their self-interest (Eric A. Posner and David Weisbach 2010).

Climate change from perspective of justice needs some explanation on how one sees the idea of climate change and spatial justice. In as much as the concept of spatial justice explores the means to understand that there is actually inequalities of climate change between and within countries, it also helps to know the views and claims and views of governments and activists. Spatial justice is defined as the equitable allocation of socially valued resources such as the jobs, political power, income, social services, and environmental goods in space, and the presence of equal opportunities to make use of these resources over time (Soja 2009; Marcuse 2009; Carmin and Agyeman 2011). Traditionally, justice refers to the appropriate division of social advantages between people over time (Rawls 1971). But as I discussed in chapter two, justice is not only about fair and unfair distribution, rather it includes other variables like recognition and participation. It also incorporates issues of identity with groups and individuals as well.

The claims that rich countries should bear the burden of reducing emissions are often used to support policies that change what type of emissions reductions are required in relation to its time, space and mechanisms to follow. Spatial injustices occur at a variety of scales. At the global scale, the capitalist model of growth and profit maximization, and the related goal of protecting capital and lower labor costs, often is viewed as being at the root of injustices that emerge between countries.

Climate injustice traditionally refers to the inequities that exist between countries and regions in their climate responsibility, vulnerability, and mitigation. It also refers to the weaker ability of poor nations to negotiate effectively in global climate conferences (Roberts and Parks 2007a). Developing countries are politically weak due to their economic dependence vis-à-vis richer nations. More often than not, developing countries are unable to have meaningful participation and constructive input in global policy dialogues (Adger et al. 2006; Roberts and Parks 2007a).

In what follows, I briefly present the Copenhagen climate change summit which was held from December 7-18, 2009 in Denmark; in relation to the bifurcation of finance negotiation. While the summit did not achieve all the expected political and policy objectives, the major outcome of the summit was the Copenhagen Accord (Jackson and McGoldrick 2010). This political document was delivered at the end of two weeks of tense and often confusing negotiations. Its exact legal status-and hence its implications-remain the subject of debate and it leaves unanswered many of the difficult questions that have bedeviled climate negotiations for much of the past two years (Kenber et al. 2010). As finance is one of the most urgent issues that needs to be addressed in order to achieve a comprehensive post-Kyoto climate agreement, the 'Copenhagen Accord' gives some clear promises and numbers for both short-and long-term financial support by wealthier countries for developing countries, especially the most vulnerable, to deal with climate change (Schalatek et al. 2010).

The call for financial support for climate adaptation and mitigation was agreed upon by the heads of states of Africa. In line with this, John Vidal (2009:1) pointed out that "the head of the African group of nations at the UN climate change conference in Copenhagen has proposed a finance deal where rich countries would pay for schemes to help poor states adapt to climate change and develop their economies using clean technology". But there were differences in the amount of money to be financed for that purpose. While the G77 group of 130 countries, backed by the least developed countries and small island states, has long proposed that \$400bn (£356bn) a year, or 1% of rich countries' GDP, the proposal from the Ethiopian prime minister, Meles Zenawi, of \$50bn (£44bn) a year for poor countries by 2015 and \$100bn (£89bn) by 2020, is far less than which many developing nations had been calling for, but is roughly in line with a proposal in June by the UK prime minister, Gordon Brown, and an offer agreed by the EU in October (Vidal 2009; Hoste and Anderson 2011). However, the Copenhagen Accord pledges

US\$10 billion per year from 2010-2012 with the promise to increase to US\$100 billion per year starting in 2020 (Schalatek et al. 2010). However, as the Accord is a nonbinding political agreement, there are fears of how the commitments are going to be certain. The questions of how to fulfill the agreement need to be answered. But if translated into a framework for a legally binding agreement, the Accord could provide a reasonable framework on which to build more ambitious global action (Schalatek et al. 2010; Jackson and McGoldrick 2010).

The proposal of Prime Minister Meles Zenawi apart from many developing nations as a delegate of Chairperson of the Conference of African Heads of State and Government on Climate Change (CAHOSCC) is subject to different reasons according to Africa Policy Brief (Hoste and Anderson 2011). Among others, the influence of USA made the Primer to accept the Copenhagen Accord.

Prime Minister Zenawi was put under pressure by the US to defend the Copenhagen Accord at the AU. According to disclosed US diplomatic cables there was a meeting between the US and Ethiopia on 31 January 2010 in Addis Ababa where Zenawi said he would defend the Copenhagen Accord at the AU. But he expressed his disappointment that despite President Obama's personal assurance to him that funding committed in Copenhagen would be made available, he had received word from contacts at the UN that the US was not supportive of Ethiopia's proposal for a panel to monitor financial pledges regarding climate change. (Hoste and Anderson, 2011:2)

This exactly shows that the climate injustice with all forms of environmental injustices Africans are facing is because of the power that is playing a crucial role in developing countries. This implies that there is an exclusion of global South in decision making because of powerlessness and poverty as well. As a solution, one way to adequately tackle climate injustice in the nations of global South must be confronted “in an integral way with the problems of poverty and exclusion in the South and over-consumption of fuel dependence in the North” (Pettit, 2004:105).

4.4 Over Exploitation of Natural Resources

Over exploitation of natural resources is one of the environmental injustices Africa is suffering from today. Developed nations are running out of natural resources as they used to utilize it so far. Besides long time consumption of their resources, they are also too egoistic so that they are

conscious of their resources to preserve for the coming generation. In the midst of this, they continuously import hefty amount of Africa's natural resources in the form of raw materials.

Especially the over exploitation of African minerals are taking place at alarming rate by different multinational corporations (MNCs). In paradox to plenty Africa's natural resources, many states are at poor standard of life. There are different factors that made Africa to attract attention for its abundant natural resources recently. Among them the pandemic deadly HIV/AIDS brought a devastating toll in the continent, periodic outrageous civil war across the continent, and the religious fundamentalists who inhumanely bombed the USA embassies in certain parts of the continent (Makwerere and Chipaike 2012).

In these sorts of situation, Africa once again started to experience a similar phenomenon it historically experienced in the 19th century through colonialism. The scramble for Africa's resources through new form of colonialism by outside countries and their multinational corporations (MNCs) keen to fuel their industrialization projects and provide raw materials for the same.

Unlike the first scramble, the latter one uses different soft tactics of investment, infrastructure development, provision of economic and humanitarian development aid. This new form of scramble brought strong tension between the two active participants, namely USA and China. The exploitation of various strategic resources in Africa, by these two powers is ongoing through various ways. While previous scramble was the desire by the west to keep their hands on raw materials for their industries, the new one is however the competition between USA and China for the same objective.

The USA uses the War on Terror, humanitarian aids, the dogma of democracy and capitalism, international peacekeepers and neoliberal economics to hide its quest for hegemony. Its empire hegemony is mostly empowered by oil, military supremacy and international finance. So it uses its military power to control the oil resource areas everywhere. They interfere into the political affairs of states to get the profit they need (Frynas and Paulo 2007; Makwerere and Chipaike 2012).

Africa's natural resource in general and its oil in particular became under the threat of the competition between USA and China, both of which are the competing powers of the world. The

need for resources, especially oil, for their growing economy and the search for markets for their cheaper products have dictated that the Chinese become pro-active in Africa (Makwerere and Chipaike 2012). This again on the other hand strengthened the tension between the two states over the exploitation of African resources.

The two competing powers follow different strategies to exploit abundant African natural resources. USA came up with the Africa Growth and Opportunity Act (AGOA) in 2000; a preferential trade arrangement that benefits selected products from eligible African countries by providing their duty free entry into the American market, the Africa Command (AFRICOM), Millennium Challenge Account (MCA) among many other similar initiatives to extend a conducive environment for further exploitation in stable and secured continent. The China Africa Development Fund is the anchor of this resource exploitation drive coupled with massive investments in infrastructure development by private corporations (ibid).

On the other hand, the over exploitation of natural resources is among the key economic factors that are fuelling conflicts in Africa today. Because natural resources has been playing a significant role in conflicts that have plagued a number of African countries. The revenues gained from the exploitation, is used for sustaining armies as well as personal enrichment in addition to building political support.

Many of the current conflicts in Africa are on natural resource exploitation. But the interference of external powers through their multinational corporations (MNCs) exacerbated the conflict further. For instance the ongoing civil war in South Sudan is on its crude oil exploitation. The same fact holds true for the Niger Delta region of Nigeria. As there are competing multinational companies on the extraction of oil in these states, one promotes instability and war to defeat transnational threats in order to advance its own national interests and promote regional security, stability, and prosperity.

One such example is the case of Shell oil exploiting the native Ogoni tribe in Nigeria. It has been destroying Ogoni's agricultural and fishing lands. The government of Nigeria also continues to exploit its people with the oil company that only rushes for its own interest. The company supports the regime to extend their long life exploitation. "The company has come under heavy criticism from environmental groups because it provided oil revenues to the Nigerian military

government but not to the Ogoni tribe whose land and people have been destroyed by its oil drilling”(Shrader-Frechette, 2002:118). This case is not limited to the Nigeria. Most dictator governments across the continent of Africa brutally exploit their fellow citizens in collaboration with MNCs. Their main goal is only to extend their regime in a way that favors few violating the rights of the mass.

Chapter Five

Summary and conclusion

The thesis analyzed the nexus between power, justice and environment in Africa. The central argument of the study is that African environment has been deteriorating due to the implication of power on environmental justice. In present African continent, environmental problems are increasing at alarming rate. Many of these problems are created as a result of the justice system that has been biased towards world's powerful nations. On the theoretical grounds, the nexus between power, justice and environment has not been rightly emphasized especially in the context of Africa.

Environmental ethics, as discussed in chapter two, is the theory that examines the moral relations that human beings have established with the environment and its nonhuman contents. As a theory and practice it explores the values that man ascribes to the natural environment and the duties that this man has towards the whole natural world. In so far as environment is the source of valuable things that sustain human life, due attention should be given to it by humans. Humans cannot live alone on earth without preserving the life of other creatures. They have a moral responsibility to take care of the life of nonhuman contents as well.

Land and other natural resources have been kept wisely by different societies of the world. The traditional African societies had their own environmental ethics that could serve as a model for the other societies. The life of many people in the continent is based on agriculture. The basic resource of these agricultural activities is land. African life is entirely dependent on the value attached to land. The distribution and access to land within a society, as well as the right to use land for an individual in a community has been of a great concern in African culture.

Despite the presence of such a genuine and authentic traditional environmental ethics in Africa, the arrival of the new economic system, the traditional concepts and attitudes towards natural resources made it not to function properly as before. Centuries lived natural environment preservation has begun deteriorating with the advent of the new socio-economic and political systems. Most of the indigenous communities of the continent have adopted the life style of other society introduced through colonialism; be it religion, culture, norm or values attached to their day to day lives. Because of this, they have given up the good knowledge and practice they had for the preservation of natural resources. People started to value money and other benefits more

than preservation and conservation of environment and its natural habitats. This resulted in environmental crisis of many sorts. Over exploitation of natural resources, environmental degradation and loss of biodiversity are common challenges we are facing across the continent.

Environmental problems and injustices are endangering the life, wellbeing and integrity of humans. Environmental justice is needed in the midst of such situation of environmental problems created and still increasing at alarming rate. The idea of justice in the environmental justice goes beyond the actual definition of the term in a normal sense. As I have shown, it includes dimensions of justice through the incorporation of variables such as participation, capability, distribution, recognition and the like. It is possible to see from the contemporary theories of justice stand point that the real definition of justice is broader than the definition given to it in terms of distribution alone. Equal distribution of environmental risk, recognition of the diversity of the participants and experiences in affected communities, and participation in political processes which create and manage environmental policy are among dimensions from which global environmental justice is demanded. Peoples' capability to attain the desired environmental rights is also equally important in addition to these elements of justice in the full sense of speaking.

However, a kind of environmental injustice would occur when these elements fail to function together properly. Thus, it is common that in many places environmental justice is not applied. Globally and locally many people are affected by environmental injustices that threat their lives. To this cause, the environmental movement in USA advocated justice. Preconditions those led to the emergence of such movement is that not all people were equally affected by the dangers of environmental problems at that time. Even in most cases, a group of people who hardly contribute to the problem affected more. Therefore, the aim of environmental justice movement (EJM) was to challenge these sorts of environmental injustices based on color, national origin, and economic class. The reason behind is, people of color and minority groups are subject to the problem more than others most of the time.

Environmental problems that are created either by nature or by any human actions are issues of environmental justice and environmental ethics. Environmental ethics and environmental justice pay attention to the current environmental problems like ozone layer depletion, climate change and global warming, over exploitation of natural resources, disturbed ecological balance, and

environmental degradation. These are contentious issues in the context of Africa today, as devastating occasions are happening.

In the third chapter, I related three important concepts; power, justice and environment in Africa from theoretical perspective. Based on these theoretical perspectives, the study argues, the environment of Africa has been treated in an unjust way by powerful advanced countries of the West. Although the era of colonialism in Africa is already over, its adverse impacts still exist. The internal colonialism and a new scramble for Africa are forms of imperialism that are exploiting the natural resources of Africa extensively. Much of the colonial imposition up on the environment of Africa during colonial period continued functioning in the form of legacy. Socio-economic and political transformation developed through colonialism has a far reaching consequence on the wellbeing of the life forms of the continent's environment.

Globalization as a world system that runs by multilateral institutions such as the World Bank, International Monetary Fund and World Trade Organization played a key role in organizing a new architecture of global economic system across the world. I claimed that its main objective is to fulfill the interests of few developed nations of the West. As far as it is guided by those nations who funded these multilateral institutions, it pays little attention to the environmental protection of Third World countries.

The impacts of multinational corporations especially in oil bearing regions of Africa are not simple. As I tried to show, the adverse impacts oil companies from advanced nations up on the indigenous communities of Africa has been posing threat on their livelihoods. Only little attention is given to the wellbeing of poor people of Africa by the competing companies of the West for the exploitation of Africa's oil. As I argued, the corrupt and dictators of Africa also do the same injustice against their fellow citizens for the sake of individual benefits they receive. These irresponsible governments failed to formulate and implement strong environmental policy to remain loyal to the multinational companies operating in the continent. This in turn led to various inter and intra ethnic war in the continent. Death and displacement of many people are caused by civil war. Environmental injustices created by oil companies in alliance with African elite groups lasted long time and still continuing.

The presence of an environmental injustice mainly in the regions of oil bearing communities negatively impedes the enjoyment of the people's human rights. For instance the communities of Niger Delta of Nigeria have been challenged by periodic human rights violation. Gas flaring and oil drilling are still damaging the livelihoods of these communities. Therefore, active community participation in decision making and policy formulation is important to access environmental justice in the continent in general and oil bearing communities in particular.

Capitalism as one form of economic system also negatively affected the African indigenous environmental ethics. As I discussed it in chapter two, in this chapter also I strongly argued that, with the introduction of money economy indigenous environmental ethics failed to operate in authentic manner. The ever increasing practices of capitalism in a global state, devastates the degree of oppression and dominance characterized by the movement of resources from the periphery to the center as well as destruction of the natural world of the periphery nations. Capitalist nations have to avoid overexploitation of African natural resources in lieu of their long time consumed resources. Money is not a fair compensation for the polluted poor people of color and working class of whites. This mistake may be remedied by giving an opportunity for Africans participate in decisions and environmental policy making.

The adverse impacts of present global systems cause many civil wars in the continent of Africa. The ongoing civil wars in many parts of the continent have severely undermined the humanitarian and socio-economic situations in the countries where civil war is taking place and neighboring countries. Death of many people and the challenges that displaced people are encountering in refugee camps is beyond estimate. The interference of Western states to extend the African dictators regime for their political and economic interests while innocent people are dying of hunger, disease and pollution.

In the fourth chapter, I have shown how certain instances of environmental injustice are created from theoretical perspective of power, justice and environment relationship in Africa. I have done this by looking at four different instances of environmental injustice and how they negatively affect the wellbeing of African environment. These forms of environmental injustices are not the only environmental problems challenging the continent but I selected them as the major among the many. Land grabbing is a challenge to many people of Africa since it uproots them from their fathers' land. Historically, foreign investors have been attracted to the Third

World by the availability of plenty of land and lack of strong regulations. Toxic waste importation, climate change & global warming, and overexploitation of natural resources are instances of current environmental injustices resulted from asymmetrical relationship between power, justice and environment in Africa.

In conclusion, the current environmental problems Africans are facing are resulted from the incompatible relation between power, justice and environment. The continent comes under the threat of various environmental injustices as a result of power abuse by the developed nations and corruptive petty bourgeoisie of the continent. The continent underwent the problems because of its under-development in which the justice fails to function properly on the condition that there is limited capacity, participation and recognition of the local people.

The solution to this environmental destabilization needs the obligation of all people in Africa. Africans and non-Africans equally need to act in a way that preserves future human generation, sentient beings, and African ecosystem in particular and nature in general. I argue that justified environmental ethics which is based on African experiences and merges environmental theories from the West should be applied in a condition that centers on conformed relation between power, justice and environment. My argument is based on the belief that traditional African environmental ethics, which is based on a kind of culture that conserves nature, is an important input and good experience that best preserves nature if merged with environmental theories of the West. The good thing could be achieved if theories of environmental ethics in its fullest sense and traditional African environmental ethics best applied. That good thing is environmental justice that the present day Africa is pursuing.

Moreover, to achieve environmental justice in Africa, the same environmental standards applicable in core industrialized countries should be extended across the continent without bias. These environmental standards have to base themselves in African tradition at the first and work in a way free from any sort of abuses. Similar strong environmental laws and regulations should come and apply with core nations in Africa as well. Power, justice and environment should have a symmetrical relationship to keep the quality of African environment. As indicated by Adeola (2001, 54), the issues of equitable distribution of resources, power, and opportunities among the core and periphery, as well as socio-political integration are important challenges to be confronted at both the domestic and world system levels if environmental justice is to be

achieved. As a way out, fair and adequate reparation for the victims of environmental injustice, due to extractive and exploitative powerful advanced nations should be available.

Although compatible and consistent relationship between power, justice and environment is needed to access sound environmental justice in the continent of Africa, this not achieved yet. Thus it remains a problem to be resolved and important question to be answered. To foster global environmental justice that contemporary Africa needs, this thesis suggests that stronger justice system free from abuse of power is crucially important.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adeola, Francis O. (2000) Cross- National Environmental Injustice and Human Rights Issues. A Review of Evidence in the Developing World. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 43(4), 686-706.
- 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*, 8(1), 39-59.
- Adger, N., Jouni, P., Saleemul, H., and Mace, J. M. (eds.) (2006) Fairness in Adaptation to Climate Change. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- African Development Forum (ADF) (2012) Land and Africa's Development Future: Governing the Risks and Opportunities of Large-scale Land based Investments. ECA/ADF/8/3, Issues paper 2. Addis Ababa: AU/ADB/ECA.
- Amnesty International (2009) Nigeria: Petroleum, Pollution and Poverty in the Niger Delta. London: Amnesty International.
- Anseeuw, W.; Boche, M.; Breu, T.; Giger, M.; Lay, J.; Messerli, P. and K. Nolte (2012) Transnational Land Deals for Agriculture in the Global South. Analytical Report based on the Land Matrix Database. Bern/Montpellier/Hamburg: CDE/CIRAD/GIGA.
- Attfield, R. (2003) Environmental Ethics: An Overview for the Twenty-First Century. Cambridge: The Polity Press.
- Besada, H & K.N. Sewankambo. (eds.) (2009) Climate Change in Africa: Adaptation, Mitigation and Governance Challenges. Waterloo: The Centre for International Governance Innovation (CIGI).
- Bujra, A. (2002) African Conflicts: Their Causes and Their Political and Social Environment. Addis Ababa: Development Policy Management Forum (DPMF).
- Bullard, R. and Johnson, S. G. (2000) Environmental Justice: Grass Roots Activism and Its Implication on Public Policy Decision Making. *Journal of Social Issues*, 56(3): 555-578.

- Bullard, R. D. and Wright, Beverly (eds.) (2009) Race, Place, And Environmental Justice After Hurricane Katrina: Struggles To Reclaim, Rebuild, And Revitalize New Orleans And The Gulf Coast. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Bullard, R. D. (1990) Dumping in Dixie: Race, Class, and Environmental Quality. 3rd ed. Boulder, CO: West view Press.
- _____. (1999) “Environmental Justice Challenges at Home and Abroad”, in Low, Nicholas (ed.). Global Ethics and Environment. London and New York: Routledge, pp. 33-44.
- _____. (2004) Environment and Morality: Confronting Environmental Racism in the United States. Geneva: UNRISD.
- Bunnin, N. and Tsui-James, E.P. (eds.). (2003) The Blackwell Companion to Philosophy, 2nd ed. Oxford Blackwell Publishing.
- Callicott, J. B. (2003) “A Critique of and an Alternative to the Wilderness Idea”, in Light, Andrew and Rolston, Holmes III. (eds.). Environmental Ethics: An Anthology. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, pp.437-443.
- Carmin, J. and Agyeman, J. (eds.). (2011) Environmental Inequalities: Beyond Borders. Local Perspectives on Global Injustices. Cambridge, MA and London: The MIT Press.
- Cotula, L, S. Vermeulen, R. Leonard and J. Keely (2009) Land Grab or Development Opportunity? Agricultural Investment and International Land Deals in Africa. London: IIED, FAO and IFAD.
- Davis, G. & Heart, S. (2007) Electronic waste: The local government perspective in Queensland, Australia. *Journal of Resources, Conservation and Recycling*, 52(8-9), 1031-1039.
- Depoortere, E. et al. (2004) Violence and mortality in west Darfur, Sudan: epidemiological evidence from four surveys. *Lancet*, 364(9442), 1315-1320.

- Environmental Investigation Agency (EIA) (2011) System Failure: the UK's harmful trade in electronic waste. London: EIA/EarthSight.
- ECOS and PAX (2014) Scrutiny of South Sudan's Oil Industry. The Netherlands. European Coalition on Oil in Sudan (ECOS).
- Faber, D. (2008) Capitalizing On Environmental Injustice: The Polluter-Industrial Complex In The Age Of Globalization. USA: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Fraser, N. (1997). Justice Interrupt us: Critical Reflections on the Post socialist Condition. New York: Routledge.
- Frynas, J. and Paulo, M. (2007) A New Scramble For African Oil? Historical, Political, and Business Perspectives. *African Affairs*, 106(423), 229-251. doi:10.1093/afraf/adl042. Oxford University Press.
- Gabrys, J. (2011) Digital Rubbish: a natural history of electronics. USA: University of Michigan press.
- German, L., Schoneveld, G. and Mwangi, E. (2011). Processes of Large-Scale Land Acquisition by Investors: Case Studies from Sub-Saharan Africa. *Paper presented at the International Conference on Global Land Grabbing 6-8 April 2011*.
- Grawert, E. and Andrä, C. (2013) Oil Investment and Conflict in Upper Nile State, South Sudan. Bonn International Center for Conversion, Brief 48.
- Greenpeace (1994) The Database of Known Hazardous Waste Exports from OECD to Non-OECD Countries, 1989-1994. Washington, DC: Greenpeace.
- Greenpeace (2001) POPs in Africa, Hazardous Waste Trade 1980-2000: Obsolete Pesticide Stockpiles. Washington, DC: Greenpeace.
- Hall, R. (2011) Land grabbing in Southern Africa: the many faces of the investor rush. *Review of African Political Economy*, 38(128), 193-214.
- Hilz, C. (1992) The International Toxic Waste Trade. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.

- Hoeffler, A. (2008) Dealing with the Consequences of Violent Conflicts in Africa: Background Paper for the African Development Bank Report. Oxford: Centre for the Study of African Economies.
- Hoste, J.C and Anderson, A. (2011) African dynamics at the climate change negotiations. African Policy Brief number3. Brussels: EGMONT, Royal Institute for International Relations.
- Human Rights Watch (HRW) (2003) Sudan, Oil, and Human Rights. New York.
- Human Rights Watch (HRW) (2011) Nigeria: President Should Make Rights a Priority. Online: www.hrw.org/en/news/2011/05/28/nigeria-president-should-make-rights-priority (15 June 2013).
- Ibrahim, A. (2013) The Impact of Globalization on Africa. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 3(15), 85-93.
- Ikuenobe, P. (2014) Traditional African Environmental Ethics and Colonial Legacy. *International Journal of Philosophy and Theology*, 2(4), 1-21.
- Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change Working Group II Assessment Report 5 (2014). 'Climate Change: Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability', Summary for Policymakers. Approved SPM – Copyedit Pending. 31 March.
- Ip, K. (ed.) (2009) Environmental Ethics: intercultural Perspectives. Amsterdam-New York: Rodopi B.V.
- Jackson, E. and McGoldrick, W. (2010) Global climate policy post-Copenhagen: Progress and prospects. *Discussion paper. The Climate Institute*.
- Jamieson, D. (1994) 'Global Environmental Justice' In Robin Attfield and Andrew Belsey (eds.). Philosophy and the Natural Environment, (pp. 199-210). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jamieson, D. (2008) Ethics and the Environment: An Introduction. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Jamieson, D. (ed.) (2001) A Companion to Environmental Philosophy. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers
- Kelbessa, W. (2002) "Indigenous and Modern Environmental Ethics: Towards Partnership" in Presbey, Gail et al (eds.). Thought and Practice in African Philosophy: Selected Papers of the Sixth Annual Conference of International Society for African Philosophy and Studies. Nairobi: Konrad Adenauer Foundation, pp.47-61.
- _____ (2005) "The Rehabilitation of Indigenous Environmental Ethics in Africa." Diogenes 207:17-34
- _____ (2005) The Utility of Ethical Dialogue for Marginalized Voices in Africa. Discussion paper. Available at: www.policy-powertools.org/related/docs/workineh-kelbessa-final3.pdf
- _____ (2009) "Africa, Sub-Saharan", in Callicott, J. Baird and Frodeman, Robert (eds.). Encyclopedia of Environmental Ethics and Philosophy. Vol. I. Detroit, Michigan: Macmillan Reference USA. A part of Gale, Cengage Learning, pp.10-18.
- _____ (2011) Indigenous and Modern Environmental Ethics: A Study of the Indigenous Oromo Environmental Ethic and Modern Issues of Environment and Development: Ethiopian Philosophical Studies. I. Washington, D.C.: The Council for Research in Values and Philosophy.
- Kenber, M et al. (2010) The Copenhagen Climate Summit: A Climate Group Assessment. Copenhagen: The Climate Group.
- Lee, Charles. (1992) Proceedings: The First National People of Color Environmental Leadership Summit. United Church of Christ Commission for Racial Justice, New York.
- Leopold, Aldo. [1949] (1966) A Sand County Almanac With Other Essays on Conservation From Round River. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lundgren, Karin (2012) The global impact of e-waste: Addressing the challenge. Geneva: SafeWork and SECTOR/ILO.

- Mahaprashasta, A. (2012) 'Ethiopia Witnesses Large-Scale Forcible Displacement of Villagers in What Has Become the Norm in the Past Decade in Africa', *Frontline* Volume 29 - Issue 05: March 23, 2012. Available from: the publishers of THE HINDU or http://www.oaklandinstitute.org/sites/oaklandinstitute.org/files/Recolonizing%20Africa_Frontline.
- Maiangwa, B. and Agbiboa D. E. (2013) Oil Multinational Corporations, Environmental Irresponsibility and Turbulent Peace in the Niger Delta. *In Africa Spectrum*, 48(2), 71-83
- Majekodunmi, A. and Adejuwon, K. (2012) Globalization and African Political Economy: The Nigerian Experience. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 2(8), 189-205.
- Makwerere, D. and Chipaike, R. (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), 311-319.
- Marcuse, P. (2009) Spatial justice: Derivative but causal of social injustice. *Spatial Justice* 1:49-57.
- McDonald, D.A. (ed.) (2002) Environmental Justice in South Africa. Athens: Ohio University Press.
- Moreda, Tsegaye (2013) Postponed Local Concerns? Implications of Land Acquisitions for Indigenous Local Communities in Benishangul-Gumuz Regional State, Ethiopia. The Land Deal Politics Initiative.
- Munnik, V. (2007) "Solidarity for Environmental Justice in Southern Africa." A Report for groundwork. Available from <http://www.groundwork.org.za/publications/solidarityforEJinSA.pdf>
- Naanen, B. (1995) Oil-producing minorities and the restructuring of Nigerian federalism: The case of the Ogoni people. *Journal of Commonwealth and Comparative Politics*, 33(1), 46-78.

- Najam, A. et al. (2007) Environment and Globalization: Five Propositions. Winnipeg, Manitoba: International Institute for Sustainable Development.
- Newton, David E. (2009) Environmental Justice: A Reference Handbook. 2nd ed. USA: ABC-CLIO, LLC.
- Nwagbara, U. (2013) Nature in the Balance: The Commodification of the Environment in Niyi Osundare's The Eye of the Earth. *Nordic Journal of African Studies*, 22(3), 196-212.
- Obi, C. (1999) Globalization and Environmental Conflict in Africa. *African journal of political science*, 4(1), 40-62.
- Obioha, U. (2010) Globalization and the future of African culture. *Philosophical papers and Reviews* 2(1), 1-8.
- Ocheni, S. and Nwankwo, B. (2012) Analysis of Colonialism and Its Impact in Africa. *Cross-Cultural Communication*, 8(3), 46-54.
- Odera Oruka, Henry. (ed.). (1994) Philosophy, Humanity and Ecology: Philosophy of Nature and Environmental Ethics. Nairobi: ACTS Press.
- Oakland Institute (2011) 'Understanding Land Investment Deals in Africa. Country Report: Ethiopia'. Oakland, CA: The Oakland Institute.
- Oakland Institute (2013) Unheard Voices: The Human Rights Impact of Land Investments on Indigenous Communities in Gambella. Oakland, CA: The Oakland Institute.
- Ojomo, P.A. (2011) Environmental Ethics: An African Understanding. *The Journal of Pan African Studies*, 4(3), 101-113.
- Omari, C. K. 1990. "Traditional African Land Ethics", in Ethics of Environment and Development: Global Challenge, International Response, ed. J. Ronald Engel and Joan Gibb Engel. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, pp. 167-175.
- Oruonye, E. D. (2012) Multinational Oil Corporations In Sub Sahara Africa: An Assessment Of The Impacts Of Globalization. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science* 2(4), 152-161.

- Overseas Development Administration (ODA) (1996). Africa wildlife policy consultation. Final report of the consultation. London: ODA.
- Patey, L. (2006) Understanding Multinational Corporations in War-torn Societies: Sudan in Focus. Copenhagen: DIIS Brief.
- Pettit, J. (2004) Climate justice: A new social movement for atmospheric rights. *IDS Bulletin*, 35(3), 102-106.
- Pellow, D. and Robert, B. (eds.) (2005) Power, Justice and the Environment: A Critical Reappraisal of the Environmental Justice Movement. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Pellow, D. (2000) Environmental inequality formation: Toward a theory of environmental injustice. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 43 (4), 581-601.
- Posner, E. and Weisbach, D. (2010) Climate Change Justice. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Rahmato, D. (2011) Land to Investors: Large-Scale Land Transfers in Ethiopia, FSS Policy Debates Series No. 1. Addis Ababa: Forum for Social Studies.
- Rawls, J. (1971) A Theory of Justice. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Regan, T. (1984) The Case for Animal Rights: from In Defense of Animals, ed. Peter Singer, Black well publishers.
- Richards, M. (2013) Social and Environmental Impacts of Agricultural Large-Scale Land Acquisitions in Africa-With a Focus on West and Central Africa. Washington, DC: Rights and Resources Initiative.
- Roberts, T. and Parks, B. (2007a) A Climate of Injustice: Global Inequality, North-South Politics, and Climate Policy. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Rolston, Holmes III (1992) 'The Challenges of Environmental Ethics' in David E. Cooper and Joy A. Palmer (eds.) The Environment In Question: Ethics And Global Issues (pp. 134 - 144). Routledge, London and New York.

- _____ (1988) Environmental Ethics: Duties to and Values in the Natural World. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- _____ (1989) Philosophy Gone Wild: Environmental Ethics. Buffalo: Prometheus Books.
- _____ (1994) Conserving Natural Value. New York: Columbia University Press.
- _____ (2003) "Environmental Ethics", in Bunnin, N. and Tsui-James, E.P. (eds.) The Blackwell Companion to Philosophy, 2nd ed. Oxford Blackwell Publishing, pp. 517-530
- _____ (2012) A New Environmental Ethics: The Next Millennium for Life on Earth. New York and London: Routledge.
- Salih, Mohammed (1999) Environmental Politics and Liberation in Contemporary Africa. London: Kluwer academic publishers.
- Schalatek, L. Bird, N. and Brown, J. (2010) Where's the Money? The Status of Climate Finance Post-Copenhagen. Climate Finance Policy Brief No.1. North America: Heinrich Boell Foundation and Overseas Development Institute (ODI).
- Scherr, S. J (1987) 'Hazardous exports: U.S. and international policy developments'. In Charles S. Pearson (ed.), Multinational Corporations, Environment, and the Third World, 129-148. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Schlosberg, D (1997) 'Challenging Pluralism: Environmental Justice and the Evolution of Pluralist Practice'. In Roger S. Gottlieb (ed.) the Ecological Community. Great Britain: Routledge.
- Scholsberg, D. (2002) Environmental Justice and the New Pluralism. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Scholsberg, D. (2004) Reconceiving environmental justice: Global movements and political theories. *Environmental Politics*, 13(3):517-540.
- Schlosberg, D. (2007) Defining Environmental Justice: Theories, Movements, and Nature. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Schlosberg, D. (2013) 'Theorizing Environmental Justice: The Expanding Sphere of a Discourse', *Environmental Politics*, 22(1), 37-55.
- Shankleman, J. (2011) Oil and State Building in South Sudan: New Country, Old Industry. Washington, D.C.: United States Institute of Peace.
- Shrader-Frechette, K. (2002) Environmental Justice: Creating Equality, Reclaiming Democracy. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Singer, P. (ed.). (1985) In Defense of Animals. New York: Basil Blackwell.
- Singer, P. (2002) One World: the Ethics of Globalization. Second Ed. New Haven & London: Yale University Press.
- Soja, E. (2009) The city and spatial justice. *Spatial Justice 1*: 31-38.
- Steady, F. C. (ed.) (2009) Environmental Justice in the New Millennium: Global Perspectives on Race, Ethnicity, and Human Rights. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Stiftung, F. (2013) African Perspectives on Social Justice. Kampala: Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung. Summary For Policymakers
- Takirambudde, P. N. (1988) The role of law in commercial and industrial expansion: The case of Botswana, Lesotho and Swaziland. Nairobi: English Press.
- Taylor, D. (2000) The Rise of the Environmental Justice Paradigm: Injustice Framing and the Social Construction of Environmental Discourses. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 43(4), 508-580.
- Terada, C. (2012) Recycling Electronic Wastes in Nigeria: Putting Environmental and Human Rights at Risk. *Northwestern Journal of International Human Rights*, 10(3), 154-172.
- Thaler, K. (2013) Large-Scale Land Acquisitions and Social Conflict in Africa. Conference paper for discussion at 'Food Sovereignty: A Critical Dialogue, International Conference September 14-15, 2013'.

- Tran-Nguyen, A. (2010) Global land grabbing: issues and solutions. Paper prepared for Pain pour le Prochain. BROT FUR ALLE.
- UNEP. (2007) Sudan: Post-Conflict Environmental Assessment. Nairobi, Kenya.
- US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). (1998) Guidance for Incorporating Environmental Justice in EPA's NEPA Compliance Analysis. Washington, DC: EPA.
- U.S. General Accounting Office. (1983) Siting of Hazardous Waste Landfills and their correlation with Racial and Economic Status of Surrounding Communities. Washington, D.C.: General Accounting Office.
- Vidal, J. (2009) 'Copenhagen: Head of African bloc calls on poorer nations to compromise over climate funding'. Copenhagen: Wednesday 16 December 2009 17.51 GMT, the Guardian. Available from: <http://www.theguardian.com/environment/2009/dec/16/meles-zenawi-copenhagen-climate-funding>.
- Von Braun, J. and R. Meinzen-Dick (2009) 'Land Grabbing by Foreign Investors in Developing Countries: Risks and Opportunities'. Washington, D.C.: IFPRI Policy Brief 13.
- Weber, E.L. (ed.) (2009) Environmental Ethics: Sustainability and Education. Oxford: Inter-Disciplinary Press.
- Weir, D. and M. Schapiro (1981) Circle of Poison: Pesticides and People in a Hungry World. San Francisco, CA: Institute of Food & Development Policy.
- WGII AR5 Phase I Report Launch (2014) Climate Change: Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability.
- Young, I. (1990) Justice and the Politics of Difference. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Young, I. (2000) Inclusion and Democracy. Oxford: Oxford University Press.