Villagization Model in Global Humanitarian Interventions: Meeting the Needs of the Vulnerable Population.

Ude Bassey Obeten; Brian Obue Eyang and Ajang Akima Ogar

Department of Social Work
Faculty of Social Sciences
University of Calabar, Calabar, Nigeria
Correspondence Author:udeobeten@yahoo.com; udeobeten@unical.edu.ng

Abstract
Development initiatives across the globe have expanded to include the adoption of Villagization or resettlement models which allows the affected populations in conflict and crisis to relocate while maintaining and promoting socioeconomic and cultural synthesis in managing humanitarian interventions in conflict-ridden areas at various levels of society's development. The strength of this modelis anchored on the wide admissibility and guaranteed optimal connectedness for rehabilitation, restoration and reintegration of the vulnerable population. Humanitarian interventions are a global phenomenon which has received wide acceptability in Africa, Asia, Europe, the Middle East and the United States, because of its articulate and systemic mechanism in policy design and implementation in mitigating vulnerability and assisting populations to raise their social and economic capital, through participation and partnership of the affected populations and intervention agencies. This paper adopted and relied on descriptive survey methodology to explore the contents and discourse, and concludes that with clear-cut objectives villagization is vital in addressing the needs of the vulnerable populations and broadening globalinterventions, enhancing the quality of life and standard of living of people and society;promotingsocial and economic recovery through the building of strong infrastructures and institutions in terms of education, health, agriculture, water and sanitation, food provision, safety and security, and addressing poverty gaps etc. The paper recommends that proper policy design, targeting options, implementation and framework for sustainability plan should be worked out to avoid delay in implementation, abandonment and misappropriations of budgeted funds. The vulnerable population should be involved in the processes, monitoring and evaluation of the projects; setting targets and checklist for effective intervention. Increase awareness, sensitization and information dissemination, capacity building of the vulnerable populations and implementers. Government and interventionist agencies should respect and observe the fundamental human rights, conventions and protocols as regards vulnerable populations.

Keywords: Villagization, Humanitarian, Intervention, Vulnerable populations.

Introduction
        The recent increase and emphasis on evidence-based policy in global humanitarian interventions must be applauded from several perspectives and models, especially as it shifts attention to accommodate effective policy-making processes that affect rural economies and social networks in meeting the needs of vulnerable populations and addressing humanitarian interventions. Meeting the needs of vulnerable populations and managing humanitarian crises demands comprehensive approaches that limit bureaucratic bottlenecks, and promote inclusion and participation. Participation that is capable of opening sustainable rural economy

and development (Lowe and Ward 2007), and building support networks for the vulnerable populations.

Therefore, from an economic and social point of view adopting the villagization model in advancing humanitarian intervention is a think-through broad-based policy-making agenda that ought to be more precisely developed and targeted specifically to address peculiar demands of humanitarian interventionsbe it forceful displacement, disease and epidemics, water and sanitation, environment, flooding, wars, drought, fire outbreak, family disorganisation etc (Abbute, 2004; 2000). At least part of this includes uncertain geography, society, economy, culture and religion.Thus, it sought an entirely new definition, based on an "underlying settlement classification" built up from the location of individual households, in an attempt to uncover the "needs of rural areas and communities". The villagization model promotes cultural and socioeconomic dynamics and application in managing humanitarian crises (Guyo 2012). It provides for transparent participation, targeting options, synergy, partnership and inclusiveness, especially of the end users and limits administrative and bureaucratic bottlenecks, service inducement and corruption in humanitarian intervention, and fiduciary management in line with democratic principles end emplaces fundamental human rights.

In recent times there has been considerable expansion in the efforts in humanitarian interventions with a departure from a local to a more global outlook (Ugala 2020). For decades,policies and programs targeting the social and economic development of the rural space and addressing vulnerability have dominated the local, national and regional discussion. International donor agencies like the World Bank, the World Health Organisation (WHO), International Red Cross Crescent, UNICEF, UNHCR, USAID, IFAD, Agric Development Bank, IMF etc, has consistently provided guides and platforms for engaging and managing humanitarian crisis and conflicts and has implemented programmes in different forms and dimensions around the world in a more appreciated way. The purposes of these programmes and infrastructural projects are usually related and push forward developmental objectives and political agenda that can engender spatial growth and development in the rural space.As mentioned earlier these humanitarian crises include forceful and internal displacements, war, drought, epidemics and pandemics, flooding, ethno-religious conflicts, man-made and natural disasters, insecurities and food shortages and insufficiencies, poor health and education funding etc. Humanitarian interventions are planned actions and initiatives targeted at meeting the needs of vulnerable populations in society according to the scale of population and locations (Uben, 2019).Though, most humanitarian interventions and programmes unfortunately have been implemented haphazardly and with unsuccessful outcomes.

Villagization can be described as "the concentration of the population in villages as opposed to scattered settlements" (Oxford Dictionaries 2016). Other scholars defined it as "the grouping of the population in centralised planned settlements" (Lorgen 1999). Thus, promoting the concentration of people in villages instead of continuing their lives in scattered and often temporary settlements. Villagization often changes the traditional ways of life to a certain extent, as most of the resettled people have not been used to living in larger communities as some often come from a nomadic or pastoral lifestyle. Villagization can thus, be considered as a resettlement policy, just like resettlement due to infrastructure projects, conflicts, insecurities, drought, etc (Olawepo 2008). As a resettlement programme, villagization can be classified under more cited phenomena like development-induced displacement and resettlement (DIDR). According to DeWet (2012), villagization programmes are usually implemented to render the rural population more legible and controllable and as a rationalist, technicist and modernizing approach to development (De Wet 2012, 396). The essence of villagization programmes is to change people's ability to

improve their current situation and livelihoods by modern means. Hence, it has a close relationship with modernization theory (De Wet 2012, 397; Abbute 2004).

Villagization may be used as a tactic by a government, agency or military power to facilitate control over a previously scattered rural population believed to harbour disloyal or rebel elements. For Example, the Indian removal to reservations by the U.S. government, General Order No. 11 (1863) in the American Civil War, the Israeli concentration camps, and holocaust and Nazi war, the British New Villages programme to defeat communist insurgents during the Malayan Emergency, the U.S. "Strategic Hamlet Program" in the Vietnam War and the "protected villages" strategy adopted by Rhodesia, Mozambique, Uganda and Nigeria in combating modern insurgencies(De Wet 2012). Villagization or resettlement can be described as "the grouping of the population in centralized planned settlements".Villagization programs typically promote the concentration of people in villages and expand social institution coverage in terms of health, schools, water, Agric and sustainable rural space development etc. (Kloos 1999; Heart 2003: Messay 2009). These programs often change the traditional ways of life to a certain extent. As a resettlement programme, villagization also differs from the others, as it has the people in the programme as the targets for development. Contrary, most otherdevelopment-induced displacement and resettlement (DIDR) projects often want to develop infrastructure, large hospitals, schools, hydro dams, housing,roads etc. where the people that need to be resettled are a bi-product of the "real" developmental aim (De Wet 2009, 41). This also means that the resettled vulnerable population is the focus of the development policies and planning, which often creates better options and starting points for them, as for the ones being moved due to other and unrelated development policies.

Methodology

This paper attempts to articulate the adoption of global humanitarian intervention in meeting vulnerable populations through the villagization model and relied on descriptive survey methods to explore the content and discourse.

Overview of the Phenomenon

Humanitarian crises all over the world have impeded social and economic development and pressurised the social environment to the point of stretching the tensile strength of the affected individuals and communities beyond their coping mechanisms. Forceful displacement, natural and man-made disasters, wars and environmental degradation as well as health issues and pandemics has overbearing infractions on the vulnerability, emotional and psychological well-being of individuals in society in diverse ways, magnitude and proportion. To address these issues, several intervention models have been advanced whose inertia is quantitatively unproductive considering the prognosis of such interventions over time. Villagization is a necessary systemic means of pursuing spatial growth and development,which promotes adjustment adaptation, restoration and integration relying upon reciprocity and participation paradigms. Villagization gives credence to intervening in humanitarian crises using the home environment and village setting which at best fits or describes the environment of the victims. The lack of funds and resourcesimpedes the process of humanitarian involvement itself. In some quarters, villagization is being implemented with the use of force, thus violating human rights protocols and expelling people from their lands to make room for investors and humanitarian interventions especially, when there is a crisis. Additionally, government promises regardingthe development of socio-economic infrastructures and services to meet the needs of vulnerable populations are in most cases not provided, hence making it even more difficult for those in humanitarian needs. Contemporary critics of the villagization model noted that the policy often worsened the problems it sought to address.

Many research works have been done on forceful and internal displacement and resettlement, and many theoretical orientations have been developed on why the programmes turn out successful or not. Some research work has shown that the main reasons why large resettlement programmes like villagization have often failed are that the inputs to the programmes have been inadequate and haphazard in implementation. These lacking inputs are typically related to the lack of legal frameworks and policies, political will, funding, pre-settlement surveys, planning, consultation, careful implementation,poor targeting options, proper monitoring and evaluation, and feedback processes. Other scholars have put a larger focus on the often-involuntary aspect of resettlement schemes. They argue that the programmes fail to bear fruit due to a range of complexities that involuntary resettlements schemes raiseproblems that are much more difficult to deal with. Thispaper, therefore, aims at examining the process of implementation of villagization models in global humanitarian interventions in meeting the needs of vulnerable populations, the awareness and attitude of villagers towards it, the challenges it faced, its development indicators and finally its policy implications to suggest some possible recommendations.

Conceptualising Villagization Model and Global Humanitarian Intervention

The concept of villagization as a model of humanitarian intervention may seem trite and overlap with resettlement as many researchers used in literature, and has become a preferred option and strategy in restoring the life of vulnerable people globally with minimal shift in their preferred lifestyle. Its value as a framework and tool for policy and planning about conflict-induced displacement (CID), and disasters.For instance. according to Muel (2019; 2011) and Collin (2009), the government of Ethiopia, Columbia has implemented a villagization model whereby the pastoralist groups are supported to diversify from livestock to agricultural cultivation. The essence of this diversification is to support sustainable and support infrastructural upgrades and development opportunities, to provide basic socioeconomic infrastructure, food security and cultural transformation (Guyo 2012). According to explanations, Messay & Bekure (2011) use the conception of villagization or resettlement and internal displacement as if they were similar concepts joining them by conjunction, "or" while they have certain differences within some sort of similarity. In this conjunction, resettlement and villagization conceptually overlap while they have also differences. Although villagization is an aspect of resettlement, it involves the relocation of scattered dwellings and settling in mostly similar geographic and administrative units, thus promoting adaptation, adjustment and integration and a sense of warmth in addressing the challenges.

The major objective of villagization is the improvement of socioeconomic infrastructures: housing, health, food and sanitation, water, education, health and psychosocial support etc. In this regard, the capacity of re-settlers to readjust and adapt to new environments is less complex than that in resettlement. Theoretically, all forms of settlement readjustment, including villagization, inevitably involve resettlement, be it voluntarily or involuntarily, planned or spontaneous because it involves a comprehensive package in assisting and meeting the needs of the vulnerable populations thus transforming the living conditions of people experiencing difficult conditions and suffering. Piguet & Dechassa (2004) stated that resettlement is a planned or spontaneous redistribution of population. Asrat (2006) averred that resettlement, land settlement, colonization, or transmigration all refer to the phenomenon of population redistribution, either planned or spontaneous. Messay & Bekure (2011) although equating this with internal displacement, define resettlement by modifying from United Nations High Commission for Refugee (UNHCR)2004 definition, as a process that involves the fleeing of a person or a group of persons from their usual residence to new area forcibly or voluntarily as a result of conflict and crisis.

In all cases, the movement of individuals or groups of people and voluntarism in the definitions are the principles shared by resettlement and villagization. Although there is a paucity of literature on villagization, the existing ones defined it as the process of gathering scattered populations form of settlements into a predetermined centre or site either voluntarily or forcibly (Sandra, 1987; Mhando, 2011; Messay & Bekure, 2011). The definition of villagization involves establishing nucleated villages to deliver social, economic and administrative services intended to be implemented voluntarily for the interest and benefits of the vulnerable populations who are either exposed to humanitarian crises (Kloos 1990; Collins 2009). As such, the model approaches and conceptual frameworks to study both villagization and resettlement should inevitably overlap each other because the concepts involve human populations and socioeconomic and cultural perspectives that guarantee sustainable better life and even development.

Villagization models are mostly associated with policymakers of many developing countries, in Africa generally, though international organizations like WHO, World Bank, IFO, IMF, ILO, Red Cross Crescent, ADB etc most often adopt this approach in their interventions during humanitarian emergencies. Mhando (2011), for instance, tries to explain how rural development without villagization would be in jeopardy in Ujamma villages in Tanzania; also, the Uyanga Model village project in Cross River State, Nigeria introduced by Donald Duke in 1999-2007 was to serve budding hotspot for rural transformation. The adoption of villagization programme and centres are believed to act as a springboard for spatial growth and development geographically.

Another form of villagization is the Impoverishment Risks and Reconstruction (IRR) model, which is one of the most recent models adopted by several authors for analysing population relocation of any type, be it resettlement or villagization model (Cernea 2000), though it was later modified and used by other authors (Collins, 2009). The Impoverishment Risks and Reconstruction (IRR) modelis mostly based on the 'inadequate inputs' approach (DeWet, 2004). This approach, basically employingthe IRR model, recognizes that forced relocation/resettlement of people is usually accompanied by ecological, social, economic and cultural impoverishment and may be reconstructed through viable intervention policies. According to Collina (2009), the IRR model is criticized for its incompleteness and due to the inadequate supply of necessary resources in villages collected. The factors that affect this model are landlessness, homelessness, joblessness, policy inconsistency, ethnicity, prejudices, marginalization, food insecurity, loss of access to common property, increased morbidity and mortality, social disarticulation and poor governance structure (Collins, 2009; Malik 2019: Bernard 2020).

Collins (2009) stated that the IRR model is criticized for its incompleteness, using cases from Colombia, the model was tested to assess its value as a framework and tool for policy and planning about conflict-induced displacement (CID),and the inability to promote and generate collective results in the wellbeing of all the affected people (Malik 2019). Cernea's (2000) IRR model was originally developed to reduce impoverishment of risks that might emerge mainly during dam construction or urban renewal projects; however, it has been used as a prism for other resettlement interventions It is criticized for focusing on avoiding risk, ignoring the events leading to resettlement and the reasons for relocation, and over-emphasis on economics at the expense of human rights (Collins, 2009). However, although it is criticized for a highly generalized framework, this model is generally adaptable to local contexts and a basis for the analysis of resettlement studies especially during humanitarian emergencies. According to Muller (2019) and Sakamoto (2003), this approach of forcing people to live in villages as a result of environmental and human problems certainly disrupts the accumulated knowledge of the people and creates in them a sense of hopelessness and turning them mere labourers, and most often, leaving them in want.

Humanitarian Interventions

Humanitarian interventions have assumed a global character (Ugala 2020) and are planned interventions and action processes and initiatives targeted to provide relief to the vulnerable population in society. Usually, interventions of any kind are graded according to the scale, magnitude and location and conditionalities attached (Obeten and Isokon 2018). Most of the interventions are carried out in collaboration with and by multinational and international organizations like the WHO, IMF, ADB, UNICEF, Red Cross/Crescent, UNHCR, IFO, etc, with local assistance and support from both Federal, State and Local Government Authorities. The process of collectivizing people into such village schemes is mainlyfor intervention purposes and thus demands a comprehensive policy design and implementation modalities that will guarantee social, economic and cultural transformation.

Most often humanitarian interventions and the major principles of villagization lies in voluntarism, participatory, consultation of the community, preparation etc. but with a focus on infrastructure development, housing healthcare, access to food and water, education, farming facilities, sanitation and environment, safety and security, social economic institutions and walk-in facilities that offer emergency management services that forestall deaths, frustration and escalation of conflicts. Buttressing this fact Ogbonna (2003) argued that the intervention of resettlement in Ebonyi state helped to forestall more loss of lives and property. While intervening on the issues that affect the vulnerable population is to bear in mind the appropriate schemes, skills, vocations and livelihood options that can be beneficial to their early Adjustment, adaptation, restoration and reintegration as well as provide alternatives to link them to resource systems to reduces the pains of their wants and lack. These resources will help to boost their social, spiritual and economic recovery.

Construction of Resettlement and Housing Units

One of the preconditions for the successful implementation of the villagization model in global humanitarian intervention is the preparation of housing for the relocation of affected households and vulnerable populations. Humanitarian interventions are key in managing conflicts at all levels of human society, thus villagization is aimed ata radical transformation of rural space and life especially in providing affordable housing units, combatting drought, insurgencies and increasing agricultural productivity to engender food sufficiency; and connects the vulnerable to springboards and resource systems that enhance their standard of living (Obeten and Isokon 2018). Relocating displaced and dispersed communities into larger, planned villages, the state and government and non-governmental agencies could more easily supply modern services such as clean water and sanitation, health services, schools, roads, security and electricity. With government and non-governmental organizations assistance villages would also act as hubs for technological improvements in agriculture and other related products and expand their markets as well as that rejigs the socioeconomic and cultural environment of the society.(Ugala 2020; Ogbonna 2003; Collins 2009).

Economic and Social Welfare Institutions

Establishing economic and social welfare institutions is one of the major concerns of the villagization model in global humanitarian interventions. International and rescue originations and government provide facilities and infrastructures that engender economic, cultural and social activities. These institutions are constructed to meet the needs of the vulnerable people in new villages beforethe actual relocation of households and create wide chances for peace-building initiatives to reduce the tension, and fear and prevent the escalation actual in the areas (Buen 2020). Buen argued that humanitarian efforts must target the improvement and welfare of vulnerable populations, building their social capital and preventing the recurrence of conflicts or crises whether man-made or natural disasters. Therefore, the construction of several health posts, centres and clinics, water wells (both

shallow hand-pulled and medium hand-pumps), primary and secondary schools, Farming schemes, skills indentureship and vocational training centres, livestock health and sanitation, and other recreational facilities for both out and indoor games. The policy of resettlement creates avenues for enlarging employment nets and on-the-spot psychosocial counselling and support of vulnerable people. Other infrastructure includes roads, markets, surveillance and security. Careful allotment and distribution of farmland to landless households are the other preconditions during the implementation of the villagization model in global humanitarian interventions. The fear of disease outbreaks and epidemics especially communicable diseases makes it essential for the provision of public educators and inspectors, and health extension workers.

Villagization and Psychosocial Support Intervention

Forceful displacement occasioned by disasters, terrorism and conflicts puts vulnerable people in a state of confusion and hopelessness. The loss of human and material properties and resources has a significant effect on the emotional and mental state of individuals, groups and communities. Most people have a strong attachment to their ancestral land and culture regardless of circumstances and as such displacement and relocation would have an untoward effect on their health, and stress coping ability, and cognitive and testamentary capacity (Obeten 2021). Muller (2019), noted that the resettlement of victims has certain unpleasant situations and circumstances in sub-Saharan Africa. The impact and magnitude of displacement place a huge burden on the vulnerable individual and society in general, as some of the people suffer frustrations and are traumatised, and mentally sapped to the point of suffering post-traumatic disorders (PTDs) and syndromes which equally affect their wellbeing and health status.

Ogbonna (2003), observed that these frustrations and trauma can lead to mental disorders that may need psychiatry evaluations and treatment. Therefore, part of efforts in villagization and humanitarian intervention is to ensure psychosocial support and therapy are articulated in the policy and implementation design. These psychosocial supports include cognitive behaviour therapy (CBT), emotional and counselling support and a therapeutic team made up of social workers, psychiatrists, social psychologists, mental health nurses, pharmacists, laboratories, lawyers, spiritual workers, volunteers etc. Also setting up child-friendly spaces to support children's mental health through safe play. Providing dedicated phone lines and help desks. psychosocial support will make rehabilitation, restoration and reintegration swift and reduce unhealthy prognoses in the long run. These will give them a sense of safety, calmness, self-reliance and community efficacy, social connectedness as well as hope.

Implications for Villagization Model

Generally, in life, people are relatively affected and disadvantaged at one point or the other in different proportions and magnitudes. Vulnerability, therefore, is an abstract phenomenon that can manifest at any time. As succinctly put by scholars, Collins (2009); Mhando (2011); Cornea (2000); Abbute (2004) etc., the villagization model aims to ensure the sustainable supply of basic socioeconomic services such as education, health, water, sanitation, credit facilities, agricultural inputs, food sufficiency and sustainability and general security etc., and other infrastructures such as help desks telephone, electricity power, markets and road that facilitate rural space development and promotes participation and ownership of interventions. The villagization model provides a ground-breaking in-root mechanism for humanitarian interventions although there are still deficiencies in implementation. The provision of health facilities, schools, health, roads and markets agricultural extension inputs, workers and volunteersmakes the villagization model a positive mechanism in contributingto addressing the immediate needs of the vulnerable populations and as a catalyst to the socioeconomic development of the society. Summarily, carrying out

humanitarian interventions relying on the villagization model must be anchored on the fundamental human rights principles, integration support systems, multi-layered support networks and promoting identity formation and social relationships. Villagization is far-reaching socioeconomic and positive cultural implications in meeting the needs of vulnerable populations and therefore, must be pursued vigorously by government and development partners.

Challenges Affecting Humanitarian Interventions andVillagization Model

Statelessness and landlessness are crucial in identity formation and accessing interventions. The displacement of people has serious implications for their cultural, economic and social life and affects them in diverse ways, especially in cyclical poverty and food insecurity. This usually has a multiplier effect on society as criminality is on the increase. Trying to relocate or resettle them is oftentimes visited with resentment and foot-dragging. The attitude of vulnerable populations towards participation and the lack of volunteerism affect the scheme. Often this category of people feels being displaced put them in a right to support and therefore relaxes in finding and making alternatives for their survival. The poor policy design and lack of commitment from the implementing bodies negatively and adversely affect the overall progress of the villagization model in humanitarian interventions. Also, the people, volunteers and implementers may not have the capacity to mitigate midwife interventions. The inability and insincerity and lack of government and agencies in fulfilling the promises make it difficult to people to accept and buy into government efforts. In most cases, government officials, implanters and volunteers divert such marked projects funds and projects. Some of such programmes and projects are often not completed in record timeand are sometimes abandoned and making the assessment of services delayed or failed. Most projects fail because of misappropriation, embezzlement and corruption and while some fail because of hard-to-reach locations and inappropriate site selection.

Adopting the villagization model has long-time cultural consequences of the disintegration of the long existed and strong social networks, chains and interactions, and destruction of cultural institutions of the people and society. The social networks such as kinship in Patri- matrilocality and descents, social and cultural institutions such as cultural groups that serve as agents of social control, church and mosques together with their elements and cultural values will inevitably be affected leading the cultural identity failure and extinction and as well as cultural knowledge banks. The mutual communal benefit and collective ideology disappear among the kin groups as kinship relations might have been broken up and the chain of helping each other may stop until adjustments may take place. This has a tremendous implication in building strong support systems for vulnerable populations.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The essence of the villagization model in humanitarian interventions in meeting the needs of vulnerable populations is to boost the cultural, social and economic recovery as well as to build strong institutions in education, health, agriculture, water and sanitation, food provision, safety and security as well as to address poverty. The adoption of this model will engender rural space development and enhance the standard of living of vulnerable populations as well as address the environmental problems and consequences and sustainability. Vulnerable populations are susceptible to verities of challenges and complications which must be kept on the front burner in policy design and implementation. Humanitarian interventions must be codified in line with human rights principles and protocols, and best practices to reduce, victimization, exclusion, dependency and hopelessness among vulnerable populations.

The key takes on in adopting this model are inclusiveness and a sense of sincerity by all participating individuals and agencies. The appropriateness of this model is to be

underpinned by a participatory approach to enable sustainable improvements in their quality of life and improvement in humans and the ecosystem.Proper and detailed policy design, targeting options and implementation, and frameworksustainability plans should be worked out to avoid delay in implementation, abandonment and misappropriations of budgeted funds. The vulnerable population should be involved in the processes, monitoring and evaluation of the projects while setting targets and checklists for effective intervention. Humanitarian interventions shouldconcentrate on increasing awareness creation, sensitization and information dissemination as well build the capacity and skills of the vulnerable people, groups and communities and that of implementers as well as the trust of the vulnerable populations. Government and the intervening agencies must strive to respect and observe the fundamental human rights, conventions and protocols as regards vulnerable populations. Ensure appropriate facilities and infrastructures, education, health, water and sanitation, staffing, food safety and security are up and running, as well as reduce budgeting handcuffs and bureaucratic bottlenecks to the barest minimum.

References

Abbute, W. (2000). "Social Re-articulation after Resettlement: Observing the Beles Valley Scheme in Ethiopia." Cernea, M. and Mc Dowell, C. (eds) *Risks and Reconstruction: Experiences of Re-settlers and Refugees*. Washington, D.C: The World Bank.

Abbute, W. (2004). Impact of resettlement in Beles Valley, Metekel; Pankhurst, A and Piguet,F. (eds) *People, Space and the State: Migration, Resettlement and Displacement in Ethiopia*. Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University.

Asrat, T. (2006)."Resettlement and Food Security concerning the Ethiopian Experience: The Boreda Case". Catholic Church Community-Based Integrated Development Program, Southern Region of Ethiopia.

Bernard, A. (2020) "Villagization and Military Manoeuvring in the African Context." *Basic Journal of International Relations,* 3 (1), 30-44.

Buen, A. (2020). *Thoughts on Restoring Peace in Africa.* Lagos. Global Research work

Cernea, M. (2000). "Risks, Safeguards, and Reconstruction: A Model for Population Displacement and Resettlement."*Economics and Political Weekly*, (35) 41, 3659-3678.

Collins, N. D. (2009). "Forced Migration and Resettlement in the Pacific: Development of a Model in Addressing the Resettlement of Forced Migrants in the Pacific Islands Region from Analysis of the Banaban and Bikinian Cases." Unpublished MA Thesis, University of Canterbury.

De Wet, C. (2004). Why Do Things So Often Go Wrong in Resettlement Projects? Alula Pankhurst and F. Piguet (eds). *People, Space and State: Migration, Resettlement and Displacement in Ethiopia. Proceedings of the Workshop held by the Ethiopian Society of Sociologists, Social Workers and Anthropologists.* Ethiopia: Addis Ababa University, 50-70.

Ethiopian Society of Sociologists (2003).*Social Workers and Anthropologists.* Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University, 50-70.

Guyu, F. (2012) "Voluntary Villagization Scheme for Transforming Semi-pastoral Communities in Benishanguimz Region, North-western Ethiopia: Challenges and Local Development Indicators." *Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa*, 14 (5), 241-274.

Hart, K. (2003). "Decentralized development in the European Union." *Progress in Development Studies*, 3 (1), 59 - 64.

Kloos, H. (1990). "Health Aspects of Resettlement in Ethiopia."*Soc. Sci. Med*. 30, 643 – 656.

Lowe, P.and Ward N. (2007). "Sustainable rural economies: some lessons from the English Experience." *Sustainable Development*, Vol.15 (5), 307-317.

Lorgen, C. (1999). The Experience of Villagization: Lessons from Ethiopia, Mozambique and Tanzania. London: OXFAM GB, January 1999. Available at:http://mokoro.co.uk/wp-ontent/uploads/villagisation_experiences_eth_moz_tanz.pdf. Accessed on 23/6/23.

Malik, M. M. (2019). *Lessons from Villagization in Ethiopia.* Accra: Lun Educational Services.

Messay, M. (2009). "Challenges and Opportunities of Voluntary Resettlement Scheme in Ethiopia: A Case from Jiru Gamachu Resettlement Village, Nano District, Central Ethiopia."*Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa (JSDA)*, 11. (3), 83 – 102.

Mhando, L. (2011). "Tanzania and the Geopolitics of Rural Development: The Return of Neo-liberalism."*Journal of Emerging Knowledge on Emerging Markets*, Vol. 3 [2011], Art. 26; An ICA Institute Publication, Pennsylvania State University, USA. Retrievedfromhttp://digitalcommons.kennesaw.edu/jekem/vol3/iss1/26. Accessed 23/6/23.

Muel, J. (2019) "Reflections on Global Humanitarian Intervention: Comparative Analysis." *Immigration Review*,1 (9), 20-28

Muller, A. (2019). "Politics of Impendence and Domination: The Villagization Model." *Journal of Public Administration and Management,* 2 (3), 79 - 80.

Obeten, U. B (2001). *Social Work Practice and Criminal Justice System in Nigeria: An Introduction.* Calabar: University of Calabar Press.

Obeten, U. B and Isokon, B. E (2018), "Assessment of Conditional Cash Transfer Scheme and Poverty Alleviation among Rural Poor in Cross River State, Nigeria." *Advances in Social Science Research Journal,* 5 (8), 206-222.

Ogbonna, A. B. (2003) "Peace Building in Eastern States, Nigeria." *International Journal of Peace and Conflict Resolutions*,2(2), 42-48.

Olawepo, R. (2008). "Resettlement and Dynamics of Rural Change in Jebba Lake Basin."*Journal of Social Science*, 6, No.2, 15-30. Department of Geography, University of Ilorin, Nigeria.

Sakamoto, K. (2003). "Social Development, Culture, and Participation: Toward Theorizing Endogenous Development in Tanzania." Unpublished PhD Thesis, Graduate School of Asia-Pacific Studies (GSAPS), Waseda University.

Sandra, S. (1987). "Resettlement and Villagization- Tools of Militarization in SW Ethiopia."*Cultural Survival Quarterly*; 11. (4), 38-48.

Uben, U. U. (2019). *Humanity Rights and International Law.* Kampala: Creative Education Group.

Ugala, P. (2020), *Humanity in Conflict.* Lagos: Johel Publishers Limited.