

**A CRITICAL ASSESSMENT OF THE IMPACT OF
INVOLUNTARY RESETTLEMENT ON THE LIVES OF
BASOTHO PEOPLE: THE CASE STUDY OF LESOTHO
HIGHLANDS WATER PROJECT, LESOTHO**

Bakoena Augustine Sephula

209511160

Submitted in fulfilment for the Degree of Master of Social Science (Public Policy) in the Faculty of Humanities, Development and Social Sciences at the University of KwaZulu – Natal, Howard College Campus, Durban

November 2011

Supervisor:

Ms Claudelle Crick Dunn

Staff number: 17231

DECLARATION

I, Bakoena Augustine Sephula, declare that this Research Project, unless specifically indicated to the contrary, is my own original work. It has not been submitted before, for any degree or examination at any other University.

.....

B. A. Sephula

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to extend my gratitude to Ms Claudelle Crick Dunn, who doubled her efforts as my supervisor. Without the contributions she made, this project would not have been possible. I also wish to thank my friends, particularly Mabileli Ntsapi and T'seliso Mokoko for their encouragement.

Finally, I wish to thank my family (particularly my grandmother, mother and sisters); my sons Raymond and Reginald. My greatest debt is to my wife, Clementine. I could not have finished this work without her forbearance, support and most importantly, her belief in me.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Declaration	(i)
Acknowledgement	(ii)
Table of contents	(iii)
List of abbreviations and acronyms	(v)
Abstract	(vi)

CHAPTER ONE - Introduction

1.1 Background and outline of the study	1
1.2 Statement of problem	2
1.3 Significance of the study	3
1.4 Key questions to be asked	3
1.5 Research Objectives	4
1.6 Broader issues to be investigated	5
1.7 Research methodology and methods	
1.7.1 Selection of the study	5
1.7.2 Data collection techniques and data analysis	5
1.7.3 Sampling strategy	6
1.7.4 The ethical standards of the University	7
1.7.5 Limitations of the study	7
1.7.6 Conceptualisation of terms	8
1.7.7 Conclusion	8
1.8 Chapter Outline	9

CHAPTER TWO - Literature Review

2.1 Introduction	10
2.2 Economic significance of Lesotho Highlands Water Project	12
2.3 The socio-economic and environmental effects of resettlement	14
2.4 Leadership and administrative capacity	17
2.5 Theoretical framework	19
2.6 Conclusion	22

CHAPTER THREE – Results and Data Analysis

3.1 Introduction	23
3.2 An overview of research findings	23
3.2.1 Policy and Legislation guiding the resettlement programme	24
3.3 Positive and negative socio-economic impacts associated with LHWP	26
3.3.1 Food security	30
3.3.1.1 Access to livestock	31
3.3.2 Housing and living conditions	31
3.3.3 Health status	32
3.3.3.1 Health services	33
3.3.4 Social fabric	34
3.3.4.1 Social stress	35
3.4 Environmental impact	37
3.5 Perceptions of the respondents regarding their public participation	39
3.6 Policy implementation in LHWP resettlement programme	44
3.7 Coping strategies	48
3.7.1 Government support	49
3.7.2 The process of adaptation	52
3.7.2.1 Attitudes to adaptation	53
3.7.2.2 Individual coping mechanisms versus group coping mechanisms	54
3.7.3 Restoring food security	55
3.7.4 Rebuilding housing	55
3.7.5 Constraints to adaptation	56
3.8 Conclusion	56

CHAPTER FOUR – Conclusion and Recommendations

4.1 Introduction	58
4.2 Conclusions	59
4.3 Recommendations	60
Bibliography	63

Index of Appendices

Appendix A Interview guide for LHDA	68
Appendix B Checklist of questions for TRC	70
Appendix C Interview questions for Ombudsman office	71
Appendix D Interview questions for resettles	72

List of Abbreviations and Acronyms

CE:	Chief Executive
CLCs:	Community Liaison Committees
GDP:	Gross Domestic Product
GoL:	Government of Lesotho
IFIs:	International Financial Institutions
IMF:	International Monetary Fund
LCN:	Lesotho Council of Non-governmental Organizations
LHDA:	Lesotho Highlands Development Authority
LHLDC:	Lesotho Housing and Land Development Corporation
LHWC:	Lesotho Highlands Water Commission
LHWP:	Lesotho Highlands Water Project
MNCs:	Multinational Corporations
M&E:	Monitoring and Evaluation
MW:	Mega Watts
NGOs:	Non-Governmental Organisations
PoE:	Panel of Experts
PIO:	Principal Investigation Officer

Sq km:	Square Kilometre
TRC:	Transformation Resource Centre
UNDP:	United Nations Development Programme
WASA:	Water and Sewage Authority
WCD	World Commission on Dams

Abstract

The aim of this research project is to explore the socio-economic and environmental effects experienced by the relocated population at Lesotho Highlands Water Project (LHWP). Large dams are constructed for irrigation, generation of hydroelectricity, consumption and so forth. In the case of Lesotho, the LHWP was constructed with the purpose of selling water to South Africa to earn royalties and generate hydroelectricity. Despite the fact that a number of factors are advanced to justify the construction of large dams, phenomenal experience has shown that the consequences emanating from their construction are sometimes irreversible and painful, for instance resettlement. This research study therefore sought to investigate the socio-economic and environmental impacts experienced by the affected community emanating from LHWP resettlement programme at Ha Thetsane and Ha Makhalanyane; whether the standard of living of resettles as measured in terms of access to services has improved or not; the extent of their participation in the resettlement programme; their perception on their standard of living; the extent to which the people have adapted to their forced removal from their homelands; investigate the compensation process; and make tailored recommendations concerning the environmental impacts of involuntary resettlement on the lives of the Basotho people.

Qualitative approach was used to collect both primary and secondary data. Literature review was undertaken to provide background information to the problem statement, the methodology design, the theories and other factors used to justify the construction of large dams. The existing literature led to a deeper understanding of the impacts of larger dams, reaction towards construction of large dams and Lesotho's experience regarding the construction of large dams. Interviews were also conducted. The data collected were written into descriptive analysis form. The resettlement programme at Ha Thetsane and Ha Makhalanyane has resulted in both positive and negative impacts.

The study has concluded that there is a need to engage all the stakeholders affected by involuntary resettlement through a transparent public participation process; consider more sustainable means of livelihoods; furnish resettles with information on the options to enable them to make informed decisions; fulfil promises in order to build trust with the resettles.

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background and outline of research problem:

Southern African Information portal (2005) portrays that, Lesotho is a small, mountainous country, poorly endowed with natural resources, except for water. Since the 1950's, there has been developed a strategy to export Lesotho's water to neighbouring country South Africa. The manifestation of these plans has resulted in massive construction of dams and royalties from water sales as well as from hydroelectric power. The project had promised the development of the rural areas of Lesotho and compensation for those who have been displaced and otherwise affected by the dams. In many countries, large dams are constructed for irrigation purposes and for hydro-electric schemes to generate energy of the growing industries and the urban population. These are meant to improve people's standard of living and to develop the national economy.

According to Wolfowitz (2007), the Bank-financed Lesotho Highlands Water Project is a massive, multi-billion dollar water transfer and hydropower operation implemented by the governments of Lesotho and South Africa. The African Development Bank points out that considering the continent's significant resources – and the decades of resource exploitation – resource abundance has not translated into improved livelihoods and increased welfare. This is largely attributable to Africa's poor management of its natural resources – a recurring theme in recent debates on the natural resource curse associated with many resource-rich countries (African Development Report, 2007: xv).

In the case of LHWP, the significant realised benefits of the project accrue to both Lesotho and Republic of South Africa from the implementation of this project. South African Information Portal (2005) indicates that benefits to Lesotho are numerous, particularly when placed in the context of Lesotho as a small developing country with limited natural resources, and without a fully diversified economy and a strong manufacturing base. Project benefits may be classified under four categories: income from export of surplus of water; self-sufficiency in electric power generation (including capacity to export power); economic development; and ancillary development.

The aim of this research is to examine and assess the impact of involuntary resettlement in Lesotho Highlands Water Project on the displaced Basotho population. However, in order to achieve this objective, the researcher will also be investigating how the LHWP resettlement

policy was implemented, and the role played by the affected community members and government/LHDA officials in the LHWP policy decision-making process.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

In 1986, the Kingdom of Lesotho entered into agreement with the Republic of South Africa through the Lesotho Highlands Water Project Treaty, to construct the LHWP Phase I, of which the cost was more than R15 billion (LHDA, 1999). The LHWP is a result of a feasibility study that explored the possibility of diverting the waters of the Senqu River System for export from Lesotho to South Africa. The findings of the study culminated in the signing of the treaty on the LHWP by the two governments in 1986. The LHWP comprises five dams, water transfer tunnels and a hydroelectric power plant, the first of its kind in Lesotho. The resettlement programme at Ha Thetsane and Ha Makhalanyane was part of the Lesotho Highlands Water Project (LHWP) resettlement programme for Phase IB. The main objective of the Phase IB resettlement programme was specifically to assist the displaced people in their efforts to improve or restore their living standards in terms of income generation capacities and to gain access to valued resources and social benefits such as health, education, water (LHDA, 2002b).

According to Hope (2004), while the Lesotho Highlands Water Project (LHWP) increased the fortunes of the nation's elite, the majority of Lesotho's citizens were not able to cash in on the LHWP. In total, approximately 1.5 percent of Lesotho's citizenry is directly affected by the project. Research findings by Hoover (2001) have concluded that the LHWP weakened local economies and severely strained social fabric of nearby villages. Despite a long-term compensation programme, huge amounts of resources devoted to "rural development", and many good intentions, the welfare of affected people has been compromised – perhaps irrevocably (Hoover,2001). This being the case, the researcher's hypothesis is that centralised decision making of top officials is, among other things, a contributing factor to the involuntary resettlement. The previous research (Lenka, 2006: 1450) has found that the proceeds for the project which were expected to be used to better the lives of the people were diverted to private use; and thus causing an increase in the poverty level of the people, pandemic diseases, as well as government's inability to put in place the needed infrastructures.

For this reason, the researcher sought to inquire about the effects that are being encountered by the relocated population; and the extent to which local community consultation and participation was put into practice. Thus, while participation is frequently limited to policymaking, there exists a great desire among citizens to effect the outcome of governmental decision making because such outcomes affect them vitally and personally (Grindle, 1980: 17). According to Public Policy Commission (2008: 32), participation in policy making requires that ordinary people be consulted and involved in all spheres of government programmes, from

design through to implementation and evaluation, so that their needs will be properly articulated and addressed.

In implementing the LHWP, the LHDA had to ensure that as far as is reasonably possible, the standard of living and the income of the people resettled by the construction of an approved scheme shall not be reduced from the one existing prior to the resettlement of such persons (GoL, 1986b). Therefore, the aim of the research was to assess the socio-economic and environmental impact of involuntary resettlement on the population residing at Ha Thetsane and Ha Makhalanyaane.

1.3 Significance of the study

The outcome of this study is to contribute to an understanding of policy implementation process; and the significance of public participation for effective policy implementation. Again, this study seeks to identify the challenges associated with the administering of large scale development projects, which might potentially retrogress or hinder economic development in Lesotho. The research findings will also contribute to changes in the people (staff) who work in public and private sphere, in the sense that once the staff/officials are knowledgeable of the devastating effects of involuntary resettlement, that enlightenment can be very useful in changing their mindsets, motives and attitudes in their decision making process.

By using a public policy theoretical approach to the study, the researcher makes the argument that the approach used to implement this policy excluded the participation of the local community. As a result, the researcher would like to propose that both top-down and bottom-up approaches would provide useful insights into the policy implementation process, and there is a need to evolve new models which incorporate the strengths of both perspectives for public participation.

1.4 Key questions to be asked

1. What are the socio-economic effects experienced by the people of Lesotho, with regard to their forced removal from their homelands?

This question will:

- enquire the understanding of people's background
- interrogate their employment status
- look into their financial support systems
- make enquiries on their vulnerability/exposure to poverty and pandemic diseases

2. How has the environmental degradation of the Basotho homelands impacted on the lives of the Basotho people?

This question will:

- investigate out to what extent environmental degradation has been caused
- enquire how ecological problems have brought about poverty
- identify the people's general feeling about the scheme and relocation
- look to identify the people's understanding of that water policy
- look to probe for recommendations from individuals about that policy

3. How, and to what extent have the people of Lesotho adapted to their forced removal from their homelands?

This question will:

- investigate their coping strategies and mechanisms, and
- enquire about their different attitudes to adaptation

4. To what extent has compensation, in respect of forced removals, impacted upon the lives of the affected people of Lesotho?

This question will:

- look to find the total amount each individual receives each month
- investigate the sufficiency of the compensation per recipient
- identify some uniformity and discrepancies across all recipients

1.5 Research problems and objectives:

Research Objectives:

- i) To investigate the socio-economic and environmental effects experienced by the people of Lesotho, with regard to their forced removal from their homelands
- ii) To investigate the extent to which the affected community participated in the resettlement programme
- iii) To explore the extent to which the people of Lesotho have adapted to their forced removal from their homelands
- iv) To investigate the compensation process and its targeted results

- v) To make tailored recommendations in respect of the environmental impacts of involuntary resettlement on the lives of the Basotho people.

1.6 Broader issues to be investigated

1.6.1 To investigate the factors that make individuals more vulnerable to poverty and pandemic diseases by investigating the experiences of the relocated people in relation to the LHWP.

1.6.2 To investigate how elite power has been exercised with regard to the relocation of the Basotho people homelands in the decision making process during the policy implementation and make tailored recommendations to modify Water Scheme Policy in regard to resettlement.

This objective will highlight public participation aspect, where target groups themselves will be making policy recommendations, through providing advice with respect to strategies on consultation and needs assessment. The latter will then play an integral part in policy development because the information shared is what the policy makers need to know.

1.7 Research methodology and methods

1.7.1 Selection of the case study

The overall objective of this study was to investigate the impact of involuntary resettlement in the Lesotho Highlands Water Project on displaced Basotho population, particularly those people who have been resettled to Ha Thetsane and Ha Makhalanyane.

1.7.2 Data collection techniques and data analysis

This was an empirical study using primary data as well as secondary data. This study was primarily qualitative in nature. Semi-structured interviews with open-ended questions were utilised as the instrument with which to conduct fieldwork activity. Data was collected from secondary sources, such as relevant textbooks, journals (e.g. survey reports, Lesotho National Environmental Policy, World Bank reports). Semi-structured interviews were used extensively in this study, with different levels of administration, interest groups and the affected communities. Additionally, note-taking was employed. Thereafter, data collected was analysed through documentary review and descriptive analysis.

Qualitative research is a field of inquiry that crosscuts disciplines and subject matters. It aims to gather an in-depth understanding of human behaviour and the reasons that govern such behaviour. This is particularly the case of understanding how and why certain outcomes were achieved. It facilitates the easy acquisition of the needed information and clear understanding of the intricacies and linkages involving resettlement, power, and development in an endeavour to realise their interrelatedness and the overall impact. This has been a critical tool for socio-

politico-economic impact analysis of involuntary resettlement on economic development. This qualitative research has been determined as the most appropriate approach for the research, as it was the perceptions of the respondents that were investigated (Babbie and Mouton: 2004). This research employed both exploratory and explanatory approaches, because the researcher needed to understand how and why certain outcomes were achieved – the impact of a programme on relocated population. Qualitative research explores the perceptions of the affected people in order to give a descriptive explanation on the overall impact of a particular phenomenon, which is in this case the involuntary resettlement in LHWP. This research attempted to build a model or way of understanding the socio-economic impact of involuntary resettlement.

1.7.3 Sampling strategy

In this research, simple random sampling was used to select a sample of the affected community. This random method would give each household unit in Ha Thetsane and Ha Makhalanyane an equal chance of being selected into the sample. The total number of households resettled was 48 – which is 25 households at Ha Thetsane and 23 households at Ha Makhalanyane. However, only 44 participants (households) were ready to respond to the interviews. From that total, at Ha Thetsane, four households had rented out their houses and the owners lived elsewhere and were therefore not included in the sample. The street consisted of rows of built houses. The researcher used simple random sampling to select households in each row of houses. A total of 40 community participants (one from each household) were interviewed.

In order to select the research participants within the Lesotho government administration and specialists who have been involved in the LHWP, purposive sampling was employed on the basis of the researcher's knowledge of the population, its elements, and the nature of research aim. These sampling techniques were prompt and efficient means of gathering information, because subjects were selected based on their convenient accessibility to the researcher. For instance, the research population consisted of all the community which had been affected by the Lesotho Highlands Water Project during the involuntary resettlement. This community consisted of Basotho people who resided in rural areas. They had been living in the same area and now relocated to different villages. According to Grinnell and Williams (1990: 127), a sample of 30 is sufficient to perform basic statistical and even non-statistical procedures. There were various categories of respondents, namely:

1st category: two officials who are working in Lesotho Highlands Development Authority (LHDA) and have been abbreviated as LHDa1 and LHDa2.

2nd category: the Lesotho local NGO official - Transformation Resource Centre (TRC) who is the Head of Water for Justice and Environmental Project addressing any endeavour undertaken by the government concerning the Lesotho citizens.

3rd category: one official from the office of Ombudsman – Principal Investigation Officer (PIO) whose task is to investigate the public complaints tabled by the affected community.

4th category: 44 community members (Respondents). In the fourth category, the researcher selected 22 relocated community members residing at the urban area of Ha Thetsane and 22 community members residing at Ha Makhalanyaane rural area, so that the sample will be representative of the larger research population. This enabled the researcher to compare similarities and differences in their behavioural responses.

1.7.4 The Ethical standards of the University

The ethical standards of the University of KwaZulu-Natal were adhered to, in the manner that, the affected people who indicated that they wished to participate in the study were made aware that they were guaranteed anonymity since information would be recorded in such a way as to protect their identity. They were also made aware that their participation was being conducted purely on a voluntary basis, and that they could withdraw at any point. Prior to the interview taking place, an informed consent form was verbalised in Sotho for the respondents' understanding due to the reason that many of the respondents could hardly read and write. The permission was obtained verbally from the participants.

1.7.5 Limitations of the study

- Most of the research participants were illiterate; and most of them spoke Sotho. They could not speak and understand English, hence the researcher was obliged to ask the questions, and clarify the wording in the spoken dialect for a common understanding. The researcher translated the questions from English to Sotho and recorded responses in Sotho. The responses were then translated back to English to facilitate the process of transcription.
- Key informants who had been working for the implementing agency during the implementation of the resettlement programme at Ha Thetsane and Ha Makhalanyaane were no longer working for the LHDA. The researcher chose to interview the officials/participants who currently work in the section of resettlement programme, and they seemed to have some information even though they were not there during the implementation stage. The researcher attempted to locate and gain access to the key people who actually participated in the resettlement programme but in vain, they could not be located.
- Lack of cooperation between the LHDA and the affected people at Ha Thetsane and Ha Makhalanyaane had resulted in the latter being suspicious of anyone who wants to work

with them. Findings later revealed that this suspicion was caused by the fact that the relocated people felt that LHDA had not kept the promises they had made to them. They expressed their desire not to cooperate with the LHDA until their grievances had been addressed. Community members were of the opinion that the researcher was doing the interview on behalf of LHDA. This challenge was addressed by clarifying the purpose of the interviews, and the researcher's role in the interview.

1.7.6 Conceptualisation of terms: Relocation/Resettlement

Before going any further, the researcher would like to show how some officials understood the concept of resettlement or relocation.

During the interview, Principal Investigation Officer (*PIO*) posited that resettlement refers to two types, as defined below:

Relocation is the removal of the people from their original area which is rural to another area which is still rural, but not very far from the area of abode. This means that it does not bring about greater changes in those people's lifestyles.

Resettlement is the removal of the people from their original place which is rural to another place in the lowlands, for example, in town, whereby the lives of the people change very much as compared to when they were in the rural area.

Conversely, the official from Transformation Resource Centre (*TRC*) asserted that resettlement means mass movement of people from one geographical area to another area. It means movement of the habits, psychology, values, culture and belief patterns of a particular community.

Involuntary resettlement, relocation and forced removal in this document are used synonymously to mean people who are compelled to vacate their places of abode as a result of external factors (beyond their households), such as the construction of large dams. Therefore, resettled population or resettles refers to people who originated from the Mohale catchment area and who were resettled at Ha Thetsane and Ha Makhalanyaane so as make way for the construction of the LHWP Phase 1B.

1.7.7 Conclusion

This paper sought to investigate the socio-economic and environmental impact of the involuntary resettlement of Basotho population, in Lesotho Highlands Water Project. The researcher chose to adopt/utilise public policy implementation as a theoretical model to conduct this research study. The chapter had introduced the problem statement and methodological design of the research study. Having gone through the above issues, the following chapter will

discuss the socio-economic and environmental impact of involuntary resettlement; economic significance of the LHWP; leadership and administrative capacity; as well as theoretical framework.

1.8 Chapter Outline

The research study will be organised in the following manner:

Chapter One

Chapter one is the introduction of the research proposal. It comprises the background, the problem statement, significance of the study, hypothesis, research methodology which outlines and justifies the research design that has been selected as the most appropriate to answer the research question, organisation of methodology to address purpose and objectives, methodological considerations, research design, population and sample, data collection, data verification and data summary and analysis, ethical considerations and limitations of the study.

Chapter Two

Chapter two comprises the organisation of literature in relation to the problem, presentation of literature and highlights of aspects to be used in the study. It provides a theoretical framework from which to answer the research question.

Chapter Three

Chapter three is the research findings and discussions. This is the presentation and analysis of findings. The findings will be linked to the literature and some conclusions will be drawn.

Chapter Four

Chapter four provides a conclusion that ties all the major findings and the literature together and some recommendations are made.

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

To start with Ha Mohale is a rural community. The Mohale basin is the term applied to the area most directly affected by the Mohale Dam and its reservoir. It includes the dam itself, the area inundated at full supply level, and the slopes of the Senqunyane Valley in the vicinity of the reservoir where the affected residents grazed their livestock. The catchment of the Mohale Basin is 938 sq km in size (www.lhwp.org.ls/overview.html). Unlike Ha Thetsane and Ha Makhalanyane, which are closer to capital city (Maseru), Ha Mohale is the furthest away from urban settlement. Most of the Mohale Basin, and especially its most densely settled part, were inaccessible by road until recently when the transfer tunnel access road was built. All human movement in and out of the area was done by foot or by donkey and horse (Devitt P. and Hitchcock R., 2010: 66).

The socio-economic and political factors that had been used to justify the construction of large dams had been discussed and put to the fore. This was necessary because the previous research concluded that both the positive and negative impact emanate from the construction of large dams. In Lesotho, as in most countries, the question of the current geopolitical structure of wealth and power disadvantages the rural poor people of the highlands in Lesotho (Tilt, 2009). As the Lesotho government increasingly prioritises the commercial uses of resources and the re-organisation of rural resources towards the benefit of the state and urban areas, rural households undergo serious disruption to their livelihoods, absorbing the economic, ecological, and social costs of their resources being restructured. Study participants reported losing sources of potable water and natural springs: decreased access to forests and wooded areas that were submerged in the reservoirs; losing some of the best arable land in the river basin areas; as well as stones and mud for building purposes (Brawn, 2006).

In the same token, Hoover (2001) further indicates that, approximately 1.5 percent of Lesotho's citizenry is directly affected by the project. It weakened local economies and severely strained social fabric of nearby villages. Despite a long-term compensation programme, huge amounts of resources devoted to 'rural development', and many good intentions, the welfare of affected people has been compromised – perhaps irrevocably.

Subscribers to the bottom-up approach contend that this top-down approach gives attention to top-level officials and either ignores or underestimates the effects of lower-level (street-level) officials to either avoid policy or divert it to their own purposes. They argue that implementation studies should focus on lower-level officials and how they interact with their

clients. State and local economic conditions, the attitudes of local officials, and the actions of clients are among the factors affecting implementation according to the bottom-up approach to public policy implementation (Clarke, 1992).

Therefore, the research paradigm that motivates the researcher's study is public policy approach. In public policy implementation, there are two approaches that have to be considered, namely: top-down and bottom-up approach. Top-downers focus on the actions of top-level officials, the factors affecting their behaviour, whether policy goals are attained, and whether policy was reformulated on the basis of experience. The top-down approach assumes that we can usefully view the policy process as a series of chains of command where political leaders articulate a clear policy preference which is then carried out at increasing levels of specificity as it goes through the administrative machinery that serves the government (Clarke, 1992: 222).

Having said this, the LHDA Order of 1986 stipulates that LHWP resettlement programme was carried out during military regime where orders were the business of the day. In this vein, the researcher wishes to suggest the bottom-up approach in the decision making process where people have to be engaged before they could be resettled.

However, in regard to infrastructure and tourism development, the aim is to improve the availability of services to the communities. Specific programmes include electrification, rural roads, cross-reservoir transport, water supply and sanitation, and settlement planning. This programme has been conceived to take advantage of the tourism potential of the project. Areas have been reserved and developed for tourism purposes, which also generated local employment (Cook, 1994: 66). In the contrary, Marcus (2003: 21 – 26), argues that large dams have become a topical issue because of their frequently pervasive and negative environmental impact and socio-economic consequences. Advocates of dam construction generally emphasise advantages of modernisation, technological progress and water supply in arid and semi-arid regions, which in turn lead to regional or national economic development. Opponents place emphasis on a whole range of negative environmental aspects and high socio-economic and political costs of involuntary resettlement.

As a result of these advocates and opponents of construction of large dams, the achievement of sustained and equitable development remains the single greatest challenge facing the human race. According to Hess and Ross (1997: 3), despite good progress over the past generation, more than one billion people still live in acute poverty and suffer grossly inadequate access to the resources – education, health services, infrastructure, land and credit – required to give them a chance for a better life.

Lipsky (1980) reiterates that street-level bureaucrats make choices about the use of scarce resources under pressure, because while they are caught in situations that are fundamentally tragic, they still try to make the best of it. Studies conducted in bottom-up fashion have shown that the success or failure of many programmes often depends on the commitment and skills of the actors directly involved in implementing programmes. This empirical approach to policy implementation research began with all the public and private actors involved in implementing programmes and thereafter systematically examine through interviews and survey research, their personal and organisational goals, their implementation strategies, and the network of contacts they build. This means that the street-level bureaucrats have a direct knowledge of what is going on in the field because they are hands-on in the implementation of many projects.

On the other hand, Sabatier (1988) posits that a policy subsystem is the crucial factor; meaning those actors from a variety of public and private organisations who are actively concerned with a policy problem or issue. This conception has to be broadened to include actors at various levels of government active in policy formulation and implementation, as well as journalists, researchers, and policy analysts who play important roles in the generation, dissemination, and evaluation of policy ideas.

In research conducted by Earle (1990); Pottinger and Lenka (2006); and Thabane (2000), they explore the question of socio-economic and environmental effects experienced by relocated population. Specifically, Earle (1990) concentrates more on corrupt practices committed by high ranking officials that stifle economic development. While Thabane (2000) focuses on how environmental degradation has brought about poverty in that area. Pottinger and Lenka (2006) reiterate the question of reimbursement and unfulfilled promises by the government. This is the reason why the researcher would like to put into picture the element of *public policy approach* which seems to have been left out in that literature. This means that the researcher will put into picture the point that during policy implementation different actors should be consulted for the policy to be effective and successful.

2.2 The economic significance of the Lesotho Highlands Water Project in Lesotho

The Lesotho Highlands Water Project plays a very important role in the economy and infrastructure of the country, as it brings about economic development in different sectors of society. Since the main aim of economic policy in Lesotho is economic growth and increased domestic employment. This project, in turn, is assumed to reduce the country's heavy dependence on South Africa. The present economic integration between Lesotho and South Africa includes elements of economic union, and further extension of coordination and harmonisation of macroeconomic policies can be recommended. Therefore, export orientation provides Lesotho with two markets: the first is the relatively large South African market and

the second is the rest of the world, notably the developed economies (Lundahl, McCarthy & Peterson, 2009: 192). Lesotho has begun selling water to South Africa, earning about US\$44 million annually (October 2001), and Lesotho is now self-sufficient in electricity. The present hydropower output is 72 MW. Major infrastructure has also been put in place, including roads, hydropower plants, administrative centres, and engineering masterpieces such as the 18-m-high Katse Dam and related tunnels through the mountains (Keketso, 2003: 7).

Moreover, as indicated above, capital accumulation has played a dominant role in the growth of Lesotho. The investments related to the LHWP will have a long-term impact on the economy. For instance, Phase 1 of the project has resulted in the development of a northern road network, which facilitates easier access to and from remote areas, thereby creating opportunities for industrial and tourist developments in a new region of the country. The project has also resulted in a significant lasting increase of production in electricity and water. As reflected by Mullins (2004), there is no doubt that the creation of permanent supporting socio-economic infrastructure (i.e. water, electricity, access roads, telecommunications, schools, clinics) has already produced major uplifting effects on the Lesotho economy. The other benefits can be summarised as follow: increased commerce in project development areas; improved telecommunications, domestically and internationally; improved living standards of affected communities as a result of better health service delivery, education and training; and that tourism has increased.

Hassan (2002) asserts that the successful macroeconomic and the substantial impact of construction in the LHWP helped Lesotho achieve an average annual GDP growth of close to 4 percent during the 1990s. Although the World Bank financed an agreement between South Africa and Lesotho, it served as a catalyst in securing external financing, and advised on project formulation and implementation. Pottinger (2009) also reflects that the LHWP had undeniably profound impact on Lesotho's economy. In 1998, it accounted for 13.6 percent of Lesotho's GDP. Royalties from the sale of water and project – related customs dues make up 27.8 percent of all government revenue.

Additionally, Executive Summary Report on micro-economic Phase 1B (2009) stipulates that, previous economic studies conducted in 1996 showed that Phase 1B would yield positive results on the Lesotho economy during its implementation. Of significance at macroeconomic level, it had been estimated that the sum of LHWP expenditure and revenues cumulated over the period 1987 to 2002, would amount to about five times Lesotho's total gross domestic product in 1994. Expenditures on Phase 1B began in 1992 and the construction was ending in 2003. Phase 1B is bringing to Lesotho incremental permanent benefits, as well as the transitory benefits, which relate to construction activities of the phase. Among the permanent benefits, the most important is the infrastructure that has been created, mainly roads, but also in

housing, power and telecommunication systems. Hydropower sales and water transfer royalties are the main permanent benefits. These developments will have a lasting positive effect on Lesotho's economy. The LHWP provides some scope for Lesotho to provide products and services locally, to optimise local employment opportunities and develop skills base through appropriate training.

In support of this view, Keketso (2003) opines that, the project had a positive impact on all sectors of the economy; apart from the increased customs and other tariffs revenues, the construction sector did better, tourism picked up, and there were also indirect benefits from contributions made by the Lesotho Community Development Fund. Moreover, communities near the project areas also are being trained and encouraged to come up with income-generating projects. This is to say that remarkable economic diversity (agriculture, tourism, fishing, forestry) has developed. This could not have happened as quickly with conventional small-scale projects. This has been facilitated by the fact that Lesotho has become a producer of electricity and receives substantial revenues from the sale of water; this in turn provides new institutional and economic impulses (Keketso, 2003: 9).

At the macro-economic level, incomes from LHWP activities accounted for an average of 27.8 percent of total Government revenues during construction of Phase 1A. In 1998, LHWP expenditure accounted for 13.6 percent of Lesotho's Gross Domestic Product (GDP) and 35 percent value-added in building and construction. This means that infrastructure development has been the most prominent spin-off from the LHWP, including the following areas: communication (telephone and cellular network); rural electrification; health (construction of clinics, health posts, intensive care units); community facilities (expansion of community infrastructure including markets, public halls, schools, access roads, water supply and sanitation); and capacity building (education and training that increase capacity and the skills pool of the population).

As mentioned above, because of the millions of dollars that are involved in the LHWP, the possibility exists that high ranking officials could indulge in corrupt practices for personal gain; and that such corrupt practices could contribute to having a negative impact on the livelihoods of the relocated people of Basotho. As the researcher has discussed some corrupt practices that have been detected in the implementation of programmes, and what will be considered next is the impact caused by such practices and the entire resettlement process. Therefore, it is upon this ground that the researcher wishes to expound on the socio-economic and environmental effects of involuntary resettlement.

2.3 The socio-economic and environmental impact of involuntary resettlement

The United Nations (1986) declared that the right to development is an inalienable human right by virtue of which every human person and all peoples are entitled to participate in, contribute,

and enjoy economic, social, cultural and political development, in which all human rights and fundamental freedoms can be usefully realised. On the contrary, social exclusion has a pervasive and troubling impact on the poor, since it distorts public choices in favour of the wealthy and powerful, and reduces the state's ability to provide a social safety net. It hinders economic development, reduces social services, and diverts investments in infrastructure, institutions and social services. Ackerman (1999) argues that, as a result, poverty, poor health, low expectancy, and an unequal distribution of income and wealth are endemic throughout the world. Many countries have very low or negative growth rates. Even some countries that are well endowed with natural resources have poor growth records and low per capita incomes.

Social and political exclusion is detrimental to both political and economic growth. This perennial attitude not only erodes the capacity of state institutions but greatly undermines economic development. Therefore, its harmful effects are especially severe on the poor, who are reliant on the provision of public services and are least capable of paying the extra costs associated with bribery, fraud, and misappropriation of economic privileges (Johnson, 2004: 9). This being the case, socially, the resettlement in LHWP areas has disturbed family structures and other structures within the affected society, which had been built over decades. Some members of a family have been relocated far away from their relatives where they are forced to begin a new life with different people; that is, communities have been suddenly torn apart (Pottinger and Lenka, 2006: 145).

The adverse effects of the LHWP on food security were also examined by Set'sabi and Mashinini (2006), who noted that the significant decline in farming as a source of income for the displaced and resettled populations is directly related to three factors: First, the significant reduction in access to arable land by the displaced populations; second, the reduced access to natural capital resources, particularly pasture, which is important in livestock production; and third, the significant reduction in draught livestock, which made a considerable input in farming activities. They emphasised that the overall decline in farming as a livelihood strategy has resulted in a loss of income, and it may also have led to food insecurity owing to the loss of productive assets related to food production. Set'sabi and Mashinini (2006: 143) argue that there is a link between the two aspects of reduction of income and food security, because food is principally acquired through personal production or the ability to purchase it. The overall result has been deterioration in living conditions, and in some extreme cases, hunger and starvation amongst the affected families and their livestock. Affected communities are no longer able to enjoy their previous lifestyle and culture by personally providing for their basic needs, as they used to do prior to project construction (Mwangi, 2007: 14 – 16).

Besides allegations of corruption, the LHWP which includes the highest dam in Africa has caused the vulnerable Highlands population to lose fields, grazing lands and access to fresh water sources. Despite promises, their livelihoods have not been re-established, and poor people have been pushed closer to the edge for survival. In Lesotho, as in many places, corruption, environmental degradation and increasing poverty have a tendency to go together (Pottinger, 1999: 16). The harmful effects of corruption are especially severe on the poor, and further, the World Bank (2004) observes that, the poor are hardest hit by economic decline; are most reliant on tire provision of public services; and are least capable of paying the extra costs associated with bribery, fraud, and the misappropriation of economic privileges. It further indicates that concerning loss of livelihoods at LHWP, Phases 1A and 1B of the project will together result in the loss of 4,635 hectares of grazing land, and 1,500 hectares of arable land. Measures taken to help the 24, 000 people who lost their farms, homes or access to communal grazing land as a result of Phase 1 of the LHWP have been heavily criticised as ineffective.

Findings of previous research (Lenka, 2006) reveal that the compensation which was to be given to the affected people has been inadequate and remained unfulfilled. It has taken LHDA years to build replacement houses for displaced people. According to Lenka (2006: 145), villagers complained that the payments also failed to take account of the loss of wild plants, fuel wood and building materials. This is to say that LHWP has forced out communities from their homes, submerged farmlands, forests and sacred places; destroyed fisheries, and caused social, cultural and economic impoverishment of the affected communities. People's fields, homes, grazing lands, places where cultural activities have historically been held, all had to be given up for the LHWP.

Hoover (2001: 11) reiterates that in addition to the natural resource losses caused by the waters rising behind LHWP dams, the project brought a number of social traumas to people living in the area. Systems of authority were marginalised; family relationships were strained to the breaking point; belief systems were trivialised, and communities' sense of security was threatened. The huge influx of construction workers and job seekers from Lesotho lowlands and other parts of the mountains was a large part of this social disruption. A study conducted by Thabane (2000: 638-648) on the social and environmental effects of the project construction on 'Molika-liko' in the Mohale area, for example, pointed out several adverse effects upon human security. Crop production in that area was a relatively inexpensive undertaking and brought high returns because of soil fertility. The Mohale area was home to a variety of grasses which were good for animal grazing, especially the cattle. The quantity of produce, especially maize and wheat, from their lands was more than sufficient to satisfy the food needs of their dependents, and they sold the surplus to finance the children's schooling, clothes and other needs. However, as a result of resettlement, the communities suffered palpable losses, the most obvious being the loss of fertile agricultural and good pasture land.

The social costs of involuntary resettlement due to construction of large dams are as striking as the ecological ones. According to Nusser (2003), it is indicated that, between 40 and 80 million people worldwide are forced off their settlements, agricultural lands and forests, and lose other resources due to dam-related flooding. Other people who are affected by dam construction include rural dwellers residing downstream from such dams. Several of these environmental and socio-economic effects apply in the case of the LHWP. The impact of reservoir inundation and dam construction on the quantity and quality of natural resources in the project areas has been enormous, particularly with regard to the loss of arable, crop and grazing land; in others, they lost agricultural and grazing land but not their homes; yet in others, their movement has been hampered because reservoirs have become barriers between their villages and hitherto accessible areas. In some cases, however, people lost everything and were left with only their movable property (Thabane, 2000: 635).

One of the burning issues in the African continent that causes serious problems in the planning and implementation of the development projects is the pitfalls and irregularities discerned in the administration which the researcher would like to discuss at this juncture, in relation to LHWP.

2.4 Leadership and administrative capacity

A number of African states have had rulers who were paranoid, self-seeking and interested in self-enrichment, and many of them have been responsible for unusual capital flight of billions while their countries remain poor due to unbearable debt-servicing obligations, among other things (Ayittey, 1992; Murunde *et al.*, 1996). Although there are relatively few citations of personal use and abuse of donors' money, it is widely known that aid is directly or indirectly surrounded by many types of bureaucratic irregularities such as bribery, extortion, expropriation, favouritism, nepotism, factionalism and patronage (Williams, 1987). Heavy inflows of aid, combined with economic misfortunes and macroeconomic instability and diversion of resources by the state leadership, resulted in impressive aid dependence, poor quality of public sector management, and engendered a vicious cycle of growing poverty.

Lesotho struggles to maintain a clean image of its political leaders in the face of the people. The royalties generated by the highlands project through transfer of water to South Africa were meant for community development projects but have instead gone into large funds plagued by mismanagement and political patronage. According to Levine (2006), this means that public funds that should have gone to promote social development and poverty reduction have been wasted. In going forward, the Transformation Resource Centre therefore demands that, these development processes should be audited to increase transparency (Levine, 2006: 5).

From the discussion, it is evident that lack of good governance and transparency provides the enabling environment for corruption and malpractices by political leaders and public officials. Generally, there is no accountability for either inputs or outcomes in an environment where governments tend to hold the monopoly in service delivery (Pradhan, 1997). A central issue is that these countries are governed badly. This is in the sense that certain objectives and goals which should be sought are not, while others that should not be, are. The core problem is that of power; how to use and exercise it efficiently and responsibly for socially desirable ends (Wilson, 1977).

Brokensha and Scudder (1968) argue that, the construction of large dams is more often than not the result of decisions taken by national governments at the central level, as they are responsible for setting up national priorities geared towards betterment of life – the general masses have no option but to abide by such top-down decisions. Moreover, the UNDP (2002) points out that decision making regarding construction of large dams is not always transparent and offers no opportunities for the participation of those affected by the project. Consequently, involuntary resettlement becomes compulsory because people are compelled to vacate their places of abode in order to give way to development projects.

The construction of large dams in most cases alters the environment and often affects the lives of people negatively (World Bank, 1994). This happens despite the fact that the primary intention of governments to provide for basic needs, these, on the other hand, come at a cost of disturbing the social/human ecology, in that, patterns of living are disturbed through the uprooting of people from their places of residence and then being resettled in totally new environments. This process is referred to as involuntary resettlement. Hence involuntary resettlement herein refers to the displacement or relocation of people from one location to another.

Kotelo-Molaoa (2007) posits that, since the LHWP was first implemented during the era of military regime in Lesotho, the then government of Lesotho did not represent the views of the majority, thus calling into question the legitimacy of its exercise of power over the majority; community involvement in decision making created an interest in terms of how it was done – whether all sectors of the society were represented; how the aspirations of subgroups of the affected communities were factored into the planning process and what stage of the project were stakeholders engaged, if indeed they were. There is a need therefore to understand the articulation of the LHWP resettlement policy in terms of whether it met the needs of those resettled in respect of appropriateness and adequacy as part of the mitigation plan. Once again, the interest is on how the policy was translated into clear strategies/action plans that enabled the resettled people to restore their income-generating capacity.

Resettlement itself is sensitive in that it deals with moving people, and therefore, it requires adequate time to plan and execute. A guiding principle in the form of a policy is therefore a prerequisite. This policy should be well thought out and looks at in-depth consideration of various aspects of the present way of life of the affected population. This requires accumulation of data on the population numbers and structures, the resources in the potential relocation areas. Adequate study of and contact with the affected people in the course of developing such a policy is vital to ensure its congruity with the needs of the displaced people (Kotelo-Molaoa, 2007: 83). As a result, resettlement of the affected people calls for administrative set-up, government policy, expectations from government and government expectation from the people, provision of social amenities. As discussed, previous research on the issue of relocation has shown that relocation of people has often been met with many challenges and limitations that need to be considered by policy implementers in the very initial phases of any relocation project.

2.5 Theoretical Framework

This study has employed public policy implementation theory advocating public participation as the principal theory and 'belly politics' as the secondary theory to understand the issue of fraud and corruption.

Xaba (2009) posits that, in policy implementation theory, policy can be widely defined as a set of guidelines that are clearly outlined and contain predicted outcomes to address a specific problem. Putting such routine ideas into action is commonly referred to as policy implementation. A policy is a hypothesis containing initial conditions and predicted consequences. Policy implementation therefore is a process of interaction between the settings of the goals and actions geared to achieve them. In the same vein, in explaining the theory of policy implementation, Grindle (1980) states that, public policy implementation is an ongoing process of decision-making that concerns a number of actors whom, during the administration of programmes, make certain choices about resources allocation or attempt to influence these decisions.

Extending this argument, Howlet and Ramesh (1995) reiterate that, policy implementation is where decisions are translated into actions. Implementation is defined as the process whereby programmes or policies are carried out, the translation of plans into actions. But this is not just a simple exercise. As Linder and Peters (1991: 131) indicate that policy implementation involves much more than just executing previous decisions or matching goals with means. Accordingly, they endorse the notion that policy implementation can only be meaningfully understood and evaluated in terms of the existing range of actors and institutions within which implementers make their decisions. In this study, there is a need to assess the interaction of such actors and

institutions in order to understand the process of resettlement in Lesotho Highlands Water Project.

Parsons (1995) puts forward that, organizations and key factors involved in the implementation processes of public policy often face the initial problem of achieving the compliance of other actors involved with the objectives or goals of the policy. Whether the mode of implementation is top-down or bottom-up, those in the front line of policy delivery have varying levels of discretion over how they choose to exercise the rules which they are employed to apply. A top-down approach means that bureaucrats impose decisions from the top which prevents too much participation from other actors or institutions. This limits time and the extent to which interest groups, civil societies and organisations are able to participate in implementation decision-making. A bottom-up approach means that the implementation decision-making is tolerant to dissent, representation, consultation and consensus by a range of actors and institutions both in society and within the state. In this regard, there is greater possibility for civil society to influence public policy. Hence, policy implementation is relevant to this study as it will emphasise the significance of engaging in an open and transparent public participation process for gaining public acceptance of resettlement programme. It is therefore necessary in designing a public participation programme, to plan in terms of who the stakeholders are, and what their stake is, so that appropriate means of engaging with each interest group and affected group are appropriately identified.

Venturing into another theory of belly politics, this theory is referred to as the practice whereby individuals have so regularly used their positions of power to accumulate personal fortune that amassing and redistributing of wealth has come to be expected of politicians. Contrary to the popular image of the innocent masses, corruption is not found exclusively among the powerful (Bayart: 238). Monetary wealth and status are often acquired through illegitimate or questionable means. Bayart refers to desires and practices associated with interrelated themes: poverty and food scarcity; accumulation, corruption, and sexual excess, which contribute to social inequality. In the contrary, according to Nafziger *et al* (2000), a basic recommendation is that policies need to be inclusive both politically and economically, with respect to all the major groups within a society so as to reduce horizontal inequalities.

Having said the above, this has been particularly the case in the LHWP because the resettled people have always expressed the feeling of being marginalised because of not being involved in the decision-making processes when the dams were planned or implemented, especially on the issues pertaining to their resettlement and rehabilitation. The previous research conducted by Kotelo Molaoa (2007) revealed that dissatisfaction regarding participation in these forums was further compounded by the fact that LHDA as the implementing agency used these forums for

communicating decisions taken by the project authorities – with little attention being paid to the aspirations of the affected community (Kotelo-Molaoa, 2007: 107 – 187). This theory is significant to this research study in the sense that the possibility exists that high ranking officials in the government and LHDA might divert some of the public funds for their own personal gain.

According to Johnson (2004), corruption is also endemic in many ‘weak states’ that are underdeveloped with fragile political and administrative institutions. In such settings, capricious behaviour and policies often become the norm, and the embezzlement of public funds, tax evasion, and petty theft and graft are routine. Whereas Theobald (1990) states that corruption debilitates administrative capacity in that widespread venality, far from drawing together the different departments and areas of the public service, provokes fragmentation, dissension, inter- and intra-departmental rivalry. The struggle for access to illegal benefits/privileges is usually available only to some, possibly only a minority of public servants stimulates envy, backbiting, constant manoeuvring and factionalism. Basically, the entrenchment of corruption in Africa points to the fact that something has gone wrong in the governance of the individual nation-states. Institutions which are designed for the regulation of the relationships between citizens and the state, are used instead for the personal enrichment of public officials (politicians and bureaucrats) and other corrupt private agents: individuals, groups, businesses (Hope, 2000: 1).

In the same token, this process works to the advantage of the people who are in power. In the real world, there are, it is argued, those at the top with power and the ‘mass’ without power. In the case of this study, the high ranking officials in Lesotho government and in the Lesotho Highlands Development Authority (LHDA) are purported to have used their position to manipulate and exploit Basotho population to influence the award of contract from multinationals in order to secure the LHWP. The theory of ‘belly politics’ will help in the investigation of monopoly of economic practices, widespread poverty and socio-economic inequalities and systematic maladministration concerning the involvement of these officials. This theory will be necessary to this study as it will help the researcher to understand the project within the political environment that was then prevailing in Lesotho. The decision to implement the LHWP was taken during the era of military rule (1986-1992) where decisions were taken by government, with hardly any public participation. As expected, the implementing agency (LHDA) which was also established during this time of military rule, had to ensure that the decision to implement the project was actually put into practice. (Kotelo-Molaoa, 2007: 225).

Again, Fiodorra (2005) reiterates that, after a civilian government replaced the military regime in Lesotho in 1993, the government of Lesotho commissioned an audit of the project’s two bodies, the Lesotho Highlands Water Project, a semi-autonomous state corporation, and the Trans-Caledon Tunnel Authority. So the audit revealed substantial administrative irregularities

within the LHDA and gave rise to an inquiry into the conduct of its chief executive officer, Masupha Ephraim Sole. By 1996, Sole had been dismissed from the LHDA, a decision that was upheld in subsequent appeals. In this regard, according to Pottinger (1999), a dozen of major international dam-building companies involved in the World Bank – funded LHWP have lavishly bribed at least one top official on the project, allegedly giving nearly US \$2 million in bribes over ten years.

2.6 Conclusion

Involuntary resettlement has, in most cases, been fraught with unpleasant experiences. As outlined above, this is due to not having in place policy and legal frameworks, as well as not paying adequate attention to socio-cultural issues of the relocated people. Therefore, one could conclude that the planning of resettlement programmes is characterised by serious procedural failures that fail to recognise the distinctive characteristics of indigenous people and their customary rights. As a result, resettlement programmes are frequently ill-planned, compensation and reparations are therefore inadequate. Participatory mechanisms are also typically weak, with no negotiations or prior and informed consent.

The construction of large dams like all other development initiatives has both positive and negative aspects as discussed above. Although the construction of large dams has been justified on the basis of improving people's standard of living in terms of meeting their basic needs, such as provision of clean potable and reliable water supply, they have on the other hand, had daunting and irreversible impacts such as loss of species-rich rainforests, displacement of people and loss of social capital that people draw upon for their daily sustenance. Having expounded on the theories of public policy implementation advocating public participation and belly politics, these theories will enable the discussion of the impact of the construction of LHWP and Lesotho's experience with resettlement resulting from the construction of large dams, as discussed below.

FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

3.1 Introduction

The primary focus of this chapter is to present the findings and analyse the research data obtained from interviews. The themes developed in the current chapter have been categorised around the issues that were discussed during the course of the researcher's interaction with the participants. As mentioned in chapter one, this research, among others, also aims at establishing the perceptions of respondents with regard to their relocation and the LHWP. The analysis and interpretation of the data thus gathered has been carried with reference to the issue of community/public participation in the policy decision-making processes of the LHWP.

3.2 An overview of research findings

The interview was conducted to determine the perceptions of those households who were resettled at Ha Thetsane and Ha Makhalanyane through the LHWP resettlement programme. The resettled households originally came from Ha Mohale. They had to be moved in order to make way for the construction of the LHWP, Phase 1B. This chapter interrogates resettlers' perceptions of the resettlement programme at the above mentioned areas. One of objectives of the study was to research the extent to which resettlers are satisfied with the resettlement programme – especially after the completion of the physical relocation and after compensation payments have been effected. The resettled households had previously lived in a typical traditional village. The new location does not have the same traditional landscape. For this reason, it is significant to investigate the views of the resettled households regarding these changes.

The study population initially earmarked was 52 members of the public. Questions were read to potential participants. The following participants responded positively in this research study: 44 members of affected community; and 4 officials from different departments to be disclosed below. This was done with the intention to represent and cover the whole area or avoid bias. Therefore, the total study population in this research was 52 participants including community members and officials.

The relocation areas contain households whose movement from the dam area was triggered at various stages of the dam project. The initial group left the area voluntarily due to rumours about the project. In this category, some households left as early as the 1990s even though the official relocation project commenced in 2000. The second group consists of families who were forced to relocate to temporary sites before they were formally transported to permanent sites, which they now inhabit. The families were relocated to make way for the development of the LHWP.

There is a lack of reliable statistics on the exact number of families that were displaced on the side of LHDA or Survey reports estimates. For example, it has been stipulated that, LHDA's major dam at Ha Mohale (Phase 1B) on the Senqunyane River, has already displaced some 321 households in the first two stages of resettlement (and possibly as many as 425) when the removals were complete (PoE Report 47, 2007: 15). With resettlement, it appears that households were presented with various options. One option was to relocate to urban settlements, and this included a choice to go to such areas as Ha Thetsane; and the other option was to go to rural settlements, such as Ha Makhalanyane. Others chose to be resettled elsewhere in their rural areas not far from their place of abode. This included resettlement to the upper and remote areas where the dam water could not reach.

3.2.2 Policy and Legislation guiding the resettlement programme

Kotelo-Molaoa (2007) first puts forward that, the need for legislation in the planning of resettlement programmes is vital. Not only does such legislation provide guidelines for the planning of resettlement programmes; it also provides a background that is independent of the project for the assessment of such scheme(s). Various resettlement schemes have been planned and executed, sometimes with and at other times without the guidance of regulatory legislation. For resettlement policy to be effective, legislation has to be put in place that addresses specific legal matters associated with resettlement. This includes issues of eligibility in terms of spelling out legally who has the right to compensation entitlement. When issues of eligibility are not adequately addressed through a legal instrument, the results therefore are usually not pleasant and involve much controversy.

Resettlement itself is sensitive in that it deals with moving people, and therefore it requires adequate time to plan and to execute. A guiding principle in the form of a policy is therefore a prerequisite. This policy should be well thought out and looks at in-depth consideration of various aspects of the present way of life of the affected population. This requires accumulation of data on the population numbers and structures, the resources that may need to be compensated, availability of land and water resources in the potential relocation areas. Adequate study of and contact with the affected people in the course of developing such a policy is vital to ensure its congruity with the needs of the displaced people. But, based on some of the previous experiences discussed in this study, issues such as the ones just mentioned above have been met with many limitations (Kotelo-Molaoa, 2007: 83).

The respondents were asked to state first time they heard that they were going to be relocated from Ha Mohale. The majority, 65% said they first heard between 1992 and 1995, while 25% heard between 1998 – 2000 which was just about a year or two before the actual physical

relocation in 2001. Only 10% alleged not to remember. The latter had had less time to prepare from resettlement. As such, delays to inform some of the affected households about the possibility of their relocation posed some challenges in people's social lives.

In the research findings, *LHDA1* elaborated further that the land given to the affected community was surveyed and registered in the title deed office registry; and therefore, the people were provided with deeds or leases. The legislation and policy used at the time in that regard was: 1. The Lesotho Constitution: Article 17; 2. The LHDA Order of 1986; and 3. The Treaty of the Lesotho Highlands Water Project.

In this vein, Kotelo-Molaoa (2007) also shows that, the LHWP treaty also addresses issues of the rights and obligations of the parties (Lesotho and South Africa) and lays down the quantities of water to be delivered, the basis for sharing the cost of the project, as well as the formulae for calculating the royalties. The treaty clearly stipulates that South Africa was responsible for most of the costs relating to the transfer of water including the costs of implementing and maintaining the scheme. On the other hand, Lesotho's responsibility covers the entire costs associated with the hydropower generation and other ancillary development programmes.

In terms of project implementation, the LHDA Order of 1986 created the LHDA, whose some of the responsibilities, among other things, are as follow:

Article 7 (18: 27) of the Treaty states that:

“The LHDA shall effect all measures to ensure that members of the local communities in the Kingdom of Lesotho, who will be affected by flooding, construction works or similar project-related causes, will be able to maintain a standard of living not inferior to that obtaining at the time of the first disturbance, provided that such Authority shall effect compensation for any loss to such member as a result of such project-related causes not adequately met by such measures” (GoL, 1986b).

In the case of LHWP, involuntary resettlement has, according to research respondents been fraught with unpleasant experiences. This is due to a number of reasons including the absence of resettlement policy and legal framework, as well as not paying attention to the unquantifiable aspects of resettlement, such as socio-cultural issues. For instance, respondents were asked to show their main source of income while they were still residing in Ha Mohale and after being resettled at Ha Thetsane and Ha Makhalanyaane. Seventy five percent (75%) of the respondents said that in Ha Mohale, they depended mostly on agriculture, while 25% of respondents said they depended on selling dagga in Ha Mohale. As for now, 90% of respondents especially living

in Ha Thetsane no longer have fields to plough crops, however they are employed in the factories, while 10% has some small space to cultivate crops like vegetables.

Therefore, one would presume that planning of resettlement programmes is characterised by serious procedural failures that fail to recognize the distinctive characteristics of indigenous people and their customary rights (Kotelo-Molaoa, 2007: 110). It is important to note that when the resettlement programme was being developed, there was no environmental law or policy. So, basically, the only instrument at the national level was the Land Act of 1979 and the National Settlement Policy.

The LHWP provides for compensation, resettlement, and development initiatives which aim at ensuring that affected people are enabled to at least maintain a standard of living not inferior to the one that existed at the time of the first disturbance (GoL, 1986b). Therefore, the LHDA Compensation Policy aims at restoring the incomes and living standards of those people affected by the project, through addressing specific issues pertaining to losses incurred as detailed below. For instance, regarding loss of arable land, among other things, the Compensation Policy identifies as thus:

The policy does recognize that the rural communities depend for a large part of their income on arable land. Therefore, where land of equivalent size and quantity is available, then such land should be made available as a means of compensation to those directly affected by the project activities. This aspect of policy, particularly as it relates to replacement fields, has not been adequately explored especially in the light of the fact that quite a substantial area of cultivable land is not in use (LHDA, 2002a). This substantiates the response of *LHDA1* when saying that the criteria that were used for the allocation of land to the community affected by construction were that houses were replaced with new houses, garden land with garden land where possible; where impossible, cash was provided. Arable land, trees were compensated with cash.

3.3 Positive and negative socio-economic impacts associated with LHWP

Besides these negative impacts however, there is evidence of some benefits being in the relocation areas. There have been some improvements in the satisfaction of certain needs. These benefits however are not fully enjoyed as they have been achieved at the expense of other needs that families have regarded as essential for their survival. For example, farming/agriculture cannot be substituted for improved housing. The question of benefits mentioned above goes in conjunction with *LHDA2* when asserting that the benefits that were gained by the relocated people from this development project are: roads, schools, bridges, community development training, water and sanitation facilities, communal compensation, agricultural projects and direct compensation.

The World Bank (1994) lists some of the socio-economic costs or risks usually experienced by resettled populations owing to large dam construction. These include: loss of jobs; deterioration of health care; disruption of: labour markets, informal social networks forming part of daily sustenance systems such as providing mutual help in child care, food security, revenue transfers, short-term credit, labour exchange and other issues of social capital that are either threatened or lost. Local organisations that are formal or informal associations disappear as a result of dispersion of their members. Traditional community and authority systems can lose their leaders, while symbolic markers such as ancestral shrines and graves are abandoned, thereby breaking links with the past and cultural identity and further compounding impacts on the social capital.

Therefore, there was a need to understand articulation of the LHWP resettlement policy in terms of whether it met the needs of those resettled in respect of appropriateness and adequacy as part of the mitigation plan. Once again, the interest was on how the policy was translated into clear strategies/action plans that enabled the resettled people to restore their income-generating capacity. However, in terms of determining the satisfaction of the respondents regarding their involvement in the public participation forums, the findings reveal that 35% of respondents were generally satisfied, while 65% of the respondents were dissatisfied. This means that some of the decisions that were taken did not necessarily reflect their views and aspirations in terms of their security and daily living. To that effect, experience has shown that reinstatement of means of livelihoods, especially in cases of limited participation by those affected by LHWP, had posed a major challenge, particularly because the means of sustaining livelihoods would also have changed.

Some families visited, including those living in formal houses, expressed feelings of insecurity with respect to land tenure. While they have built structures and some are continuing to further invest in the small plots of land they occupy, they however lack security of tenure. Some of them have no title deeds. They cannot claim that the land is theirs. This disagrees with the statement of *LHDA1* emphasising that all these people were given their title deeds or leases for their new relocation sites. In the same token, *LHDA2* reiterates that the land given to the affected community was surveyed and registered in the title deed office registry; and therefore, the people were provided with deeds or leases. In relation to how those who were dissatisfied with relocation dealt with the situation, 40% of the respondents said they sought medical services and counselling because they felt stressed up after having been told that they were going to be moved. The remaining 60% said they had done nothing as they could not afford financially and they felt helpless.

For this reason, households have different experiences and attitudes. Due to the nature of a particular relocation area combined with a reasonable socio-economic status, the experiences of some families are more positive with regards to access to energy resources. Those who have electricity in their houses have learnt to appreciate the value of having access to it. *Respondent 1* admits that life was better in the original area, but says that her family was not aware of any other life, and therefore she is now happy. “*Bophelo ba ka bo fetohetse botleng, re ne re le hole le litoropo le lit’sebeletso tse ngata joaloka litliliniki le likolo*” literally translated as “My life has changed to the better, because we were far from the town and facilities such as clinics and schools”.

However, based on the findings, 75% of the respondents were unhappy with the news that they would have to move, but had not been able to do anything about it. Only 15% said they had been happy when they were told that they were to be moved. Another 10% of the respondents said they felt a sense of uncertainty as they did not have a clue of what the future held of them.

Respondent 1 emphasised more on the advantage of having access to electricity. In the original area, the household did not have electricity, and as a result, one was denied access to information. She believes that electricity has made the household life easy. People were given a choice of selecting where they would prefer to move for resettlement, and some chose to move out of the Mohale Basin. Those affected households needed the replacement fields promised by the LHDA. Nonetheless, the households resettled at Ha Thetsane and Ha Makhalanyaane originally came from Ha Mohale, where they had to move in order to facilitate impoundment of the Mohale Reservoir.

Research findings with the community revealed that livelihoods are made up of both cash and in-kind components. In the case of households displaced by the Katse dam, households derived income from various sources. Both *respondents 22 and 25* stated that cash income wages from employment; government compensation and sale of self produced agricultural products were the main source. The dam does not seem to have severely (in the negative sense) affected income derived from formal wage employment. At least for three households visited, there is no evidence that the dam interrupted the employment of people in the formal wage paying institutions. The problem is just a long distance between home and work place for those who were forced by circumstances to resettle far from their workplace. Nonetheless, those who were working continued working in similar areas. Indeed, some of the new locations are too far or too closer to town depending on individual resettles concerning the ease to access employment. For other people, it seems that despite the greater proximity, people still battle to find jobs. The resettlement does not appear to have created any major changes in that regard. This among other things could be because of their lack of appropriate and competitive skills to be absorbed in the

formal job market of these areas. This on the other hand could be due to the high levels of unemployment in the country as a whole.

Furthermore, it is important to note that while wage employment has not been affected, the cash component of income negatively affected by the construction of the dam is that which was derived from sale of self produced agricultural produce. This is related to the loss of land. While some households practised only subsistence farming, others cultivated land for both subsistence and to generate some cash income. These families all reported that they obtained some cash income from sale of agricultural products such as maize, wheat, fruits and vegetables. While some households were involved in a barter system with the tourists in the Mohale area, others sold produce direct in the market. *Respondent 3* indicated that at the moment, he is not working. There is no where he can plant vegetables, because there is no space. Comparatively, life is difficult here in town because in Ha Mohale, he was not paying water bills; he was not buying vegetables or paraffin. In case of facilities, the hospital and school were still there even though they were far; but to him, it was not a stressful situation because he was used to it. He further pointed out that: “*Tlala e mona kea boja-likata*” which literally translates into “We are extremely starving here.”

It was a government decision to construct the dam and that they would have to make way for it to be constructed. It is important here to be mindful of the fact that the decision to proceed with the LHWP was taken during the period of the military rule in 1986. For this reason, the researcher presumes that since planning of the LHWP, Phase IB was done in the mid-1990s when Lesotho had recently ushered in a democratic government after three decades of non-democratic governance. Therefore, people had obviously got used to accepting instructions from the higher authorities.

Respondent 4 commended on the social impact of unemployment in Ha Thetsane. He believes that being in Ha Thetsane has changed the way young people behave themselves. He thinks that the area has produced criminals, alcoholics, teenage pregnancy and lack of respect for adults. He regards this as the effect of unemployment and shortage of entertainment facilities. He believes that the youth have plenty of time, which is wasted or used in wrong ways. He then asserted, “*Ke ne ke na le likhomo; tse ling tsa tsona li shoele ka nako ea phalliso; ha tse ling li utsoitsoe ke batho bana ba lulang mona toropong*, which literally translated as “I had cattle of which some of them died when we were relocated, while others were stolen by these people who are staying here in town”.

The above mentioned sentiment is shared by *respondent 10* when indicating that he also perceives some kind of moral decline, meaning that young people indulge themselves in an

unbecoming behaviour, such as theft and prostitution for their survival. Nonetheless there are some people, for instance *respondents 24 and 40*, who stress that the inconvenience of disregarding the sustainable means of reinstating the livelihoods of the relocated people made by LHDA and government should be rectified. In this case, even though the relocated people differ in opinion, they share mixed feelings regarding these issues.

3.3.1 Food security

Findings of this study reveal that resettlement impacted negatively on the strategies for sustaining access to adequate food. A major change that has taken place is a shift from attempts to maintain food security to only obtaining food for daily survival. It has been a shift from mainly in-kind to mainly cash income generating activities. Initially, families were able to shelter themselves against poverty through practising subsistence farming, involving land cultivation and livestock keeping. All households interviewed put more emphasis on the major role subsistence farming played in maintaining a good quality of life and achieving food security. They said that their former land was big enough to allow them to cultivate such crops as maize, beans, potatoes and vegetables. Such crops form a major component of the traditional Sotho diet, especially in rural areas. They play a major role in maintaining good health status. Therefore, all households believe that hunger and poverty in their original areas was impossible. They believe that it was something one would never even dream of. This is evident from the statement by *respondent 4* when he said: "I am not satisfied with the compensation; and life here in town is difficult generally, in the sense that we do not have fields to cultivate crops."

Moreover, access to land has important implications with respect to food security. Growing vegetables on land supports the livelihoods of poor households. This means that people do not have to have money to buy food all the time. Again, livestock rearing and extended families require sufficient plots of land for grazing and building additional houses to accommodate people. People relied on land in the original areas. This being the case, involuntary resettlement has affected the economic life of the people. Some of the people who were cattle rearers, farmers or petty traders have been forced into cash economy through being displaced by the project. According to May (1996), the well-being of households in rural areas is maintained through the diversification of income resources. This allows households to shelter themselves against risk in their environments. Households engage in a wide range of activities in order to generate a livelihood with which they are able to achieve food security. However, literature reveals that most relocation areas do not provide the utility value that householders have been enjoying in the areas they have inhabited for decades. Dams in this case are human-made hazards, which expose families to the risks of impoverishment (Cernea, 1997). Income (cash and in-kind), the social institutions (i.e. kin, family, village) and gender relations required to

support and sustain a given standard of living, define families' livelihood strategies in the areas of origin (Ellis, 1998). All these are disturbed as families move onto the new sites.

The forms of agricultural production in floodplains include those undertaken for own consumption as well as for sale (Cross et al, 1996). Agriculture is affected too. Agricultural activities include agro-enterprises, which produce crops for sale as independent businesses. It also includes family farming in which exchange is limited to informal networking in the community. Such external forces as dams have been seen as introducing high levels of uncertainty into the household's livelihood strategy. Movement from an area, which has been inhabited for years to a new area, introduces various challenges to families of different vulnerability and resilience levels. *Respondent 6* expressed that concern: "We were dissatisfied because we were uncertain about the type of life our families were going to lead in the new location".

The critical issue discussed above is that the subsistence farming, especially the cultivation of crops that was practised in Ha Mohale played a vital role to improve the livelihoods of relocated people. This practice enhanced people to be able to sustain access to adequate food, which is no longer the case in their relocated areas.

3.3.1.1 Access to livestock

Besides the adverse impact of lost agricultural land, all households expressed negative feelings about being unable to own livestock in relocation areas. In the past, 85% of the respondents had cattle, sheep, goats, pigs and chicken while 15% did not have any of the said animals. For instance, whilst he previously owned ten cattle, *respondent 2* managed to bring only two of these cattle to the relocation area, and even these he cannot continue pasturing because of inadequate land, and conflict with neighbours. The numbers of livestock varied from household to household. All households interviewed in Ha Makhalanyane however share one common characteristic, they now no longer own the initial number of livestock that they originally did. As *respondent 18* puts it that she still owns two cattle, one pig and four chickens, however they are less in number compared to the numbers they had in the past. From the researcher's findings, there seemed to have been a great loss to the relocated people when it comes to the rearing of domestic animals caused by the resettlement programme.

3.3.2 Housing and living conditions

Householders say that in the original areas, they had sufficient land to allow them to build as many houses as they liked in their homesteads. In other words, there was less crowding compared to the relocation areas. Most families in relocation areas are now living in more crowded dwellings. For the four resettled households visited, the researcher discovered that on

average, there had been three houses or structures in the homesteads. There was thus an average of five rooms per homestead before resettlement. With regards to capacity, households in Ha Mohale seemed to be relatively better off. This could be due to the fact that this area is open. In case houses were inadequate because of a growing family, there were no restrictions with regard to building additional houses to accommodate a family. In the relocated areas, 85% of resettled people were built three roomed houses as the average house type which could accommodate the whole family, whether one has two or six children. Whilst 15% has been built rented houses depending on the rooms/houses one person had at Ha Mohale. *Respondent 4* made this point clear: “I had five separate buildings in the rural area. As compensation, they built me a six roomed renting house and two roomed house; three toilets and one water pipe”. In the original areas, he stated that there was no significant money expenditure involved since local and natural resources were employed and utilised. Householders did not worry as to the type of house to build.

From the findings, 80% of the respondents were not happy with the new built houses initially due to their sizes, though 20% seemed to be happy because the houses were electrified with the provision of some modern facilities like watching the television. *Respondent 1* admits that even though she is not happy that she does not have title deeds, and that she and her family have no home somewhere else in rural areas, she believes that she and others are relatively better off. The reason was that she now owns a three roomed compensatory house. She was mostly concerned about those whose socio-economic status is low that they find it difficult to reconstruct their houses. Conversely, asked to compare life in Ha Makhwanyane and in Ha Mohale, *respondent 5* also expressed a strong feeling against not having a proper house for himself and his family: “I am dissatisfied of the type and size of the house they have built me”. In addition, another family of *respondent 12* in Ha Thetsane was worried that they can hardly invest in new furniture. This is because of limited space of the houses they are occupying.

The feeling of *respondent 8* further strengthened the argument that impoverishment of the displaced people also interrupts the local economy as it triggers major losses. If one resident refuses to pay for services, that means loss to the government. If the government forces him to pay rates and yet he is still living in an indecent house and again without a job, it will be acting against its mission of improving the quality of life of all citizens. If it does not force him however, it will continue to be incurring major losses since he is one of all residents.

3.3.3 Health status

Even though the researcher was not able to access proper statistics on the extent to which health status has changed in the relocation areas, many people have been exposed to different health risks. For instance, some families interviewed have experienced pandemic diseases, like

HIV/AIDS and other sexually transmitted infections contracted for economic reasons; as well as diseases related to poor hygiene (associated with overcrowding), and have accumulated social stress. In this case, the researcher could not obtain accurate statistics on the mortality and morbidity rates of the resettled households in comparison with others. Some families perceived a decline in health status due to unfavourable environmental conditions in their communities. Such conditions are believed to have led to major health hazards for resettles. *Respondent 8* of Ha Thetsane believed that, since his family arrived in this area, their lives have been very difficult. He associated many deaths in the community with poor housing conditions: “*Bana barona ba khathatsoa ke let’sollo le mokakallane oa setla bocha,*” which is literally translated as: “Our children are suffering from diarrhoea and HIV/AIDS pandemic.”

This being the case, Cernea (1997) has argued that if not addressed properly, the impoverishment of large numbers of people by large dam projects constantly adds to the problem of worldwide poverty. The rapid onset of impoverishment according to Cernea (1997), results from the cumulative and convergent effects of the following trends: landlessness, joblessness, food insecurity and loss of access to common property. This condition of perceived decline in health status demonstrates the persistence of environmental injustices. Besides poor living conditions in individual households, other poor environmental conditions in these communities have triggered some health risks. In areas where potable water supplies were scarce, this condition has increased vulnerability to diseases such as dysentery and diarrhoea. These diseases were reported in this community, and *respondent 8* complained that he was admitted twice in the clinic in 2010.

It is also important to bear in mind that resettles are not a homogenous group of people. There are subgroups like men, women, the elderly and children. It was therefore necessary to find out how the needs of each of the subgroups had been addressed by the LHWP resettlement programme at Ha Thetsane and Ha Makhalanyane. This was done for instance by interviewing aged respondents whom one of them pointed out that life in the area of relocation is not comfortable because he was used to the traditional style of living. The advantage was the accessibility of clinics and schools as mentioned below. However, 88% of children interviewed showed happiness because they were able to attend better schools, and learning current affairs is easy. While 12% of children said that they were not in the position to express their feelings in relation to this issue.

3.3.3.1 Health services

When asked about the accessibility of different health services in Ha Mohale, the interviewees said that it took about three hours on foot to reach the nearest clinic which was located at Ha Mohale. But the respondents mentioned that at Ha Thetsane, it takes less than ten minutes to

reach all the conventional health services using different modes of transport, even though it is a bit expensive in private hospitals as compared to the government hospital. *Respondent 4* said: “The advantage is only that since I am old, clinics and hospitals are near, as well as schools for our children.”

The implications of the findings are such that since Ha Mohale is located in the remote and mountainous region of the Lesotho, it is evident that it is under-serviced with respect to the provision of health services in comparison to Ha Thetsane in the urban area, where it is much easier to access to these health services. Therefore, moving to Ha Thetsane has made access to health services much easier, which obviously has positive impacts on the lives of the resettles.

3.3.4 Social fabric

In regard to social ties, there is a huge difference between the original and the relocation areas. The original areas had adopted a unique form of social organisation, and there was a traditional lifestyle, which played a vital role in binding the community together. This has been exemplified by the following traditional forms of governance, the extended families and caring neighbourhood. Forced removals in fact did tear apart the existing social fabric of the people. It dispersed and fragmented communities. Although families were displaced in groups, some of the relocated people however had left their relatives behind. They also left their traditional institutions, which played a major role in binding the families together and created a sense of community.

The issues of compensation divided extended families. The family of *respondent 7* which left as early as the late 1990s provides a good example of this. This family once formed part of an extended family. Due to conflict over who was going to receive compensation, this family decided to leave early before compensation was given to the entire family. This meant that this family was divorced from the larger unit and did not receive any part of the compensation paid. This family is still alienated from the extended family. *Respondent 7* said: “*Karohano le ba leloko la rona e re amme habohloko*” (Separation from kinsmen has affected us in the most painful manner).

This sentiment coincides with the response of *PIO* who asserts that: “Due to LHDA’s problematic way of doing research, LHDA fails to identify who has inherited which land after the death of predecessors; and thus end up resettling and compensating the wrong person”. As a result, this causes violence over the estate among the family members to be resettled.” The respondents said they were unhappy with the news that they would have to move, but had not been able to do anything about it. Even if people still survive as individuals, the former community is no more due to the spatial and cultural determinants that have been altered. There

is no more loyalty between people and their chiefs thus exacerbating current conflicts. This is manifested in the struggle by the host community of Ha Makhalanyane, where *respondent 1* posited that: “Some problems have begun to arise now because there is a conflict on the control and usage of the money for natural springs and grazing land between the resettled people and the host community.” Moreover, the relocation areas also have a local culture, which is different from the traditional culture in the original areas. In areas like Ha Thetsane which is near Ha Tsolo rented houses, resettlers are mixed with people from different areas with different backgrounds who came to this area for different reasons.

The family of *respondent 10* believes that this is an unhappy place since neighbours lack “*Botho*” or solidarity. They do not care about each other; every man for himself. One cannot confidently approach a neighbour for help. Similar arguments were also made in Ha Makhalanyane. As a result, 95% share the same feeling that people lack the spirit of togetherness especially if one falls among relocated members. This point is substantiated by *respondent 20* when showing that they were not cordially welcomed by the host community. 5% of respondents accepted that change is not an easy exercise and the behaviour exhibited by the host community is not unusual.

It is evident that the needs for food, shelter, care and security are primary values, which according to Smith (1997) should be met for all human beings. These are needs which do not vary with culture or tradition and which are historically constant. Therefore, in this case, the overall findings revealed that most of the families were marginalised socially, economically, politically and psychologically, in the manner that people are missing the oneness and a sense of belonging they used to cherish.

3.3.4.1 Social stress

Concerning the “social stress”, families were brought to areas of high densities and areas that were inhabited or that already had other neighbouring communities with a distinct culture. This has triggered many conflicts that have exposed these families to violence, crime and death risk. Due to these conditions, households developed feelings of insecurity. This means that, attempts to adapt are very stressful for some families. As they struggle to balance the past and present experiences, they therefore accumulate stress. This concurs with the opinion of *LHDa2* indicating that, negative impacts may be related to the changing of life styles and therefore some people are slow to adapt; changing cultures which enhance a tendency of being dependent on other people, and thus causing what *LHDa1* calls a ‘Dependency Syndrome.’

Crime in these areas includes robbery, theft common and sexual offence. In the expression of this concern, it was especially strongly emphasised in Ha Thetsane which is regarded as a place where one has no freedom to move around at any time of the night. This, from the point of view

of households, does not compare favourably with the original areas where everyone knew that everyone else has to take responsibility of being a community guard.

A drop in social status as a result of loss and abandonment is evident amongst some dam resettles. For example, to lose a decent house has a negative impact on the social status of households, as indicated by *respondent 7* that separation with the kinsmen and the lost social status had affected them in the most painful manner. In the relocation areas, the neighbours regard the resettled people as “squatter settlers and crooks”. Such names describe the negative perceptions people have of the resettled households. Their struggle to challenge the *status quo* indicates that there are elements of neglect and abandonment. This has affected the families since they now believe that their citizenship as Basotho is not fully recognised. This is substantiated by the response of *TRC*, when stating that: “Authorities did nothing about empowerment and the right to development. In this sense, there was no public participation.”

This quotation further provides evidence of social injustice. In line with this citation, *respondent 10* expressed a concern that the dam resettles have been dehumanised, that their lives have been reduced to even below the line of humanity: “*Re hobositsoe ho lekana*”, literally translated as “We have been dehumanised; enough is enough”.

The needs for shelter, to be cared for and to be secure are defined by Smith (1997) as universal features of being human. These further influence needs to be healthy, to avoid harm, to be happy and to function properly. In the case of households resettled by the Mohale dam, the researcher found evidence of household deprivation regarding access to the important basic need of a reasonable shelter. Some relocated families however do have better housing than others. Resettlement has been viewed as an experience that throws a family into a state of crisis that may offer them a range of opportunities, but that exposes them to many risks (Hulewat, 1996). As a turning point, in crisis, things will either get worse or better. Although resettled populations may be optimistic and eager to begin their new lives, they still experience confusion and fear since they are uncertain about what a new life will bring for them. *Respondent 12* said: “*Re ne re sa tsebe hore na bokamoso bo re t’soaretseng* (We did not know what the future held of us)”. It is evident from the discussion so far that a shift from common property resources to modern and/or urban services of piped water, electricity, paraffin and small plots of land has altered the quality of life of families. These services and the related costs incurred raise many questions about affordability. This is a great challenge to the Lesotho Highlands Development Authority (LHDA) which has a duty to improve the quality of life of all residents.

According to Adams (1992: 131), the stress of resettlement is multidimensional, both psychological and socio-cultural. Bad planning and inadequate provision for resettlement often

exacerbates the stress experienced by the resettled populations. Loss of assets, unfamiliar environments, unprepared resettlement sites, poor living conditions and hopeless economic prospects are all elements in the human and economic costs of resettlement. This sentiment is in conjunction with response from *TRC* when stating that: “There were no amenities of life put in place before resettlement: there was no water, no electricity.” The literature reveals that those forced from their homes by construction and inundations often are ignored. It is assumed that they will somehow benefit from the dam. Very little, if any compensation is in many cases provided (Cernea, 1997). Movement to other areas and efforts to adapt to a new environment are part of the visible problem (WCD, 1999). The serious social trauma and conflicts that may accompany resettlement is often not accounted for.

One of the crucial resources for livelihood generation of the displaced families is land. In the places from which resettlees came, it provided space to build houses, to pasture grazing livestock, for cultivation and the like. While all households had rights to certain pieces of land, they did not own the land since it was held under “traditional” land tenure. This however did not deprive them of access to it. There is general consensus amongst the resettlees that the issue of allocation of land as a means of productivity was not properly considered by the decision-makers in the relocation project.

This could be viewed as a form of deprivation as householders lost both natural and man-made capital. For instance, *respondent 6* expanded on the issue of energy, saying that before resettlement he never used to buy water and paraffin. The only available land in most resettlement areas has been limited to building a few houses or rooms.

3.4 Environmental impact

According to Forrest (2001), dams in the Third World states have always been regarded as a powerful symbol of modernisation. The water policy-makers tame and exploit the environment for the purpose of rapid economic development. Economic development however is not the only goal as the establishment of mega-control over natural resources is used to strengthen the political and administrative power of the ruling group of people. Dams have therefore been treated as a means of gaining prestige. They are perceived as heroic engineering projects demonstrating the powers of technology and are pushed by national and multinational corporations.

For all householders interviewed, their major source of *water* in their original areas was ‘Malibat’so’ river as well as ‘Senqunyane’ river. This was a common property resource, without a single household incurring any money costs in having access to it. People insist that water was available in all seasons, and they believe that it was clean enough and capable of

satisfying everyone's needs in the community. Water is used for many purposes, for instance, mainly for cooking, drinking, washing clothes and swimming without any limitations on how much to use. It is a shared resource, i.e. shared within the community by different households and between livestock and human beings.

Another critical resource without which life would be difficult for most traditional and modern societies is *energy*. In their sense and context, firewood is a very important energy source to them. Each source may have a certain value to a particular community at a particular time. At least in this era, electricity provision may be regarded as the highest level of service compared to paraffin, gas and firewood provision.

The relocation areas have provided households with many constraints and some opportunities with regard to access to energy. The majority of households (notably in Ha Makhalanyane) have electricity in close proximity, but some have no house installation. In other words, electricity infrastructure does not exist in the community, but only along the roads. Few of the households interviewed in this community use paraffin and none have had electricity installed in their houses. Householders who rely on paraffin were asked about their attitude to the use of this energy. *Respondent 3* said: "I was not paying water bills; I was not buying vegetables or paraffin." For these families, one of the concerns is that paraffin is very expensive and its price is very unstable. Paraffin erodes the household's income. Households believe that it is more expensive than firewood.

Nevertheless, resettlement has brought improvements in terms of energy used. Now, at Ha Thetsane and Ha Makhalanyane, 70% of the resettles have access to electricity while they did not have previously. While 20% even though they have houses the electricity installation is still underway. The remaining 10% are those who have not yet been built houses. Access to electricity after resettlement has resulted in improvements in the quality of life for those affected. An illustrious example is the fact that women have been saved time to source firewood, and electricity allows women who are responsible for household chores to perform their duties efficiently. Again, the use of electricity does contribute to the reduction of air pollution when compared to the use of cow dung. However, this change in the types of energy used has also, as in the case of water, resulted in a financial burden being imposed on the resettled households; they will always need money to meet their energy needs in the new location, which was not the case with Ha Mohale where firewood or cow dung was freely available, at no charge. As a result, the affected households feel that their lives are more difficult in the new location. To confirm this point, *respondent 2* asserted that: "Life is now difficult. I had a plot to produce crops for survival; and again I was not buying firewood."

The overall findings regarding the environmental impacts of resettlement on the Basotho people reveal that most families were brought to areas with no natural forests and thus could not adopt traditional means of energy generation. These findings clearly indicate that it has been a big challenge for the relocated people to use these modern forms of energy such as electricity. These findings can thus be interpreted to mean that the provision of forms of energy in the relocated areas is therefore expensive. At this point, the researcher would like to expound on the issue of public participation during the implementation of resettlement programme.

3.5 Perceptions of the respondents regarding their Public Participation

Ndlela (2005) defines public participation as a process that gives opportunities to citizens to take charge in any decision-making process that touches their lives, with regard to the economic, social, political and geographical environment.

Three main categories of participants could be identified in the construction of Mohale Dam, namely: i) the planners from government who are responsible for preparing and carrying out development work (e.g. the implementing agency like the LHDA, consultants and contractors); ii) individual households directly affected by the construction of Mohale dam – the residents of Ha Mohale; and iii) intermediaries like NGOs – which are referred to as interested and affected parties. Various approaches could be employed to facilitate participation of the interested and affected parties regarding decisions on how to meet the much-needed water supply or energy needs. But on the other hand, decisions to construct large dams are usually influenced by a number of factors, including political considerations that normally take precedence over other factors.

The responses reflect that 65% of the participants showed that there were public participation forums that were specifically established to deal with issues of resettlement during the planning and implementation stages of the programme. The affected households further elaborated that they had community liaison committees, representatives from the affected households, local authorities and LHDA staff. Some respondents, 25% said they were not aware of those forums. The remaining 10% indicated that there were no such forums and that they were simply going by the decision of the implementing agency, the LHDA.

On the issue of participation forums, Makhetha (2006) showed that during the planning and implementation of this specific resettlement programme, there were community liaison committees (CLCs) comprised of representatives of the affected communities, local authorities and the technical team from the LHDA operating on site. These CLCs were useful because they provided a platform for exchange of information between all parties concerned; and this information was used to facilitate the implementation of the resettlement programme.

In accordance with Kotelo-Molaoa (2007: 187), dissatisfaction regarding participation in these forums was further compounded by the fact that LHDA as the implementing agency used these forums for communicating decisions taken by the project authorities – with little attention being paid to the aspirations of the affected communities. Even though the political environment at the time did not permit participatory decision making, the LHDA did try to consult with the affected households on issues of resettlement through providing them with information (Phakisi, 2006).

Steps that were taken to facilitate the process of participation and communication were as follow:

*Soliciting the views of the affected households on their relocation preferences, which was done, the resettles said that they had been transported to the different places so that they would make informed decisions in terms of site relocation. After their site selection, consultations were made with the authorities responsible for land allocation, like the Commissioner of Lands, Chiefs and Headmen, in the receiving areas. Due to inadequate consultations with some of the stakeholders like the host community, this contributed to conflicts between the resettles and the host community.

*Site investigations were done to inform the resettlement package. The previous research has it that, this was in terms of informing the physical relocation of the affected households, i.e. the investigations were mainly done to address the tangible aspects of resettlement, in terms of how the LHDA was going to address the issues of water supply, electricity, roads. However, issues of compensation for natural resources were not as well addressed when developing the resettlement package. This is unfortunate because such resources contributed to the daily sustenance of the affected households.

*Lastly based on information gathered, a resettlement programme was next developed for the selected resettlement sites, as it was dealing with issues of physical relocation, showing when the construction of houses would be completed, and movement date from Ha Mohale to Ha Thetsane and Ha Makhalanyane. But strategies concerning sustenance of livelihoods were not thoroughly captured in terms of how people would start generating their own income at Ha Thetsane and Ha Makhalanyane.

It is therefore significant to indicate that even though there was no participation regarding the assessment of the options for site selection for the Mohale Dam, this was partly due to a lack of regulatory or policy framework in the country at the time. Nevertheless, participation of the affected households came to the fore when dealing with the consequences of the selected dam

site for the Mohale Dam. Affected households participated in the selection of replacement sites and home type in order to facilitate their physical resettlement.

Concerning the issue of public participation, *TRC* recommends that, “Public participation should first be a Constitutional right; it must form part of the Laws of Lesotho.” While *PIO* points out that resettlees should be adequately consulted and trained in the genuine sense of the term. Unlike LHDA which has established “liaison committees” who act as LHDA puppets because of its dominance and influence to serve its own interests, not the interests of the affected people. Again, affected community is sometimes misinformed; and they do not even understand the compensation process.

On the above mentioned point, *LHDA2* came up with a different view as it is explicitly stated that concerning community involvement, the affected people were included in the decision making before the construction in the manner that those individual households made their own specific decision about where they would like to be relocated. Moreover, consensus was also reached concerning compensation on the basis of the following options: 1) Annual Cash Compensation, 2) Annual Grain and Pulse and/or 3) Once-off Payment (Lump-sum). All paid over 15 year period.

Having said the above, in terms of future resettlement programmes, the affected households highlighted the importance of having forums that deal with issues of specific subgroups like women, children and the elderly because different groups would have different issues that might require different mitigation measures. Nevertheless, experience has shown that reinstatement of means of livelihoods, especially in cases of limited participation by those affected by dam projects, usually poses a major challenge in most resettlement programmes, particularly because the means of sustaining livelihoods would also have changed.

To support this argument, *PIO* further posits that proper authorities should be adequately consulted; and sustainable means of developing and indemnifying resettlees should be devised. For example, LHDA should resort to sustainable programmes instead of providing only monetary compensation that is being consumed within a short period of time.

According to Sello (2006), it was indicated that, once the decisions were made on the overall programmes for constructing the Mohale Dam and the date of inundation, the affected households were informed of the resettlement programme; also when to expect to be moved so that the engineering works could proceed without any hindrances. Since the LHDA was responsible for the planning and implementation of the resettlement programme, it had to ensure that the replacement sites were available on time for constructing replacement houses. From the interviews conducted, the affected people said ‘*lipitso*’ (public gatherings) were held to inform

the affected households that they were going to be resettled and that they would be given the opportunity to select areas that they would prefer for resettlement. For this, LHDA said it would provide transport, which indeed it did. LHDA identified areas that were not occupied and provided transport for the affected households to see these areas so that they could make informed decisions. The Lesotho Housing and Land Development Corporation (LHLDC) bought the land from field owners and converted the land into residential plots and sold them to the willing buyer, which in this case was the LHDA (Pholo, 2006). Therefore, people were given an opportunity to choose the preferred replacement sites. *Respondent 3* indicated that: “Some officials from LHDA arrived at our village and were conducting ‘*lipitso*’ (public gatherings). The main theme was the information that we need to prepare ourselves to resettle because the government is going to construct project dams which might affect our houses. I was given an opportunity to choose any place that I want to live in, either in the rural or in the urban.”

According to *respondent 30*, it was only after decisions had been taken regarding the location of the dam and its associated infrastructure that the LHDA informed those whose property was going to be affected that they would be moved, meaning before broader public participation actually could take place. In this regard, engineering decisions seemed to be taking precedence over environmental and social issues of concern. The surveillance of the options for locating the dam and the eventual site selection of the dam did not incorporate the views of the public.

In the same vein, Kotelo-Molaoa (2007) further posits that, although the affected people were not engaged in the selection of the Mohale Dam site, they were however engaged at the stage of managing the resettlement programme. The affected households participated in the selection of their preferred replacement sites. The LHDA was thus responsible for the logistical arrangements like providing the affected households with transport to visit areas that were unoccupied so that they could make informed decisions in terms of selecting their preferred replacement sites.

Again, the respondents were also asked whether they had encountered any problems concerning issues of transport, labour, finances or on any other issue during their physical relocation from Ha Mohale to Ha Thetsane and Ha Makhalanyaane. 95% of the respondents reported not to have had any transport problems. The LHDA actually provided transport to move their belongings. One household encountered problems with labour and another reported as having encountered problems with finances resulting from having to hire labour locally to assist them during their physical relocation. Otherwise no other problems were encountered.

Moreover, the affected households also participated in the selection of the type of replacement house(s) they would prefer. In instances where households had separate house units, the household head would indicate whether they would prefer their house units to be built separately as in the old site or built as one house with a number of rooms. The LHDA Resettlement Policy (LHDA, 1997d) requires that whatever happens, the internal surface floor area should at least be equal to the house inhabited before relocation. It is also important to mention that in selecting the house type, the affected households also indicated their preferred building material in terms of whether they wanted stone houses, concrete bricks, thatch roof or corrugated iron sheets. After the selection of the house type, the affected people were asked to select an area within the new replacement site where the house was to be erected (Sello, 2006). Thereafter, the implementing agency proceeded with the construction of the houses. However, participation of the affected households became evident when dealing with the consequences of the selected dam site for the Mohale Dam. Affected households participated in the selection of replacement sites and house type in order to facilitate their physical resettlement. For this reason, LHDA identified areas that were not occupied and provided transport for the affected households to see those sites.

According to King C. *et al.*, (1998), empowering citizens means designing processes where citizens know that their participation has the potential to have an impact, where a representative range of citizens are included, and where there are visible outcomes. The central issue is one of access. Creating opportunities for people to participate is the key. It is all about access to skill building and to information. It is further stated that educating people is having people feel confident and informed, directing their energies towards a specific goal instead of sitting there being angry with their situation. Empowerment comes from education. With a shared base of knowledge, citizens and administrators can work together from the very beginning when issues are being defined and framed. Citizens need to be involved from the beginning rather than brought in at the end when questions are already framed in ways that are not amenable to open decision making. In addition, citizens and administrators can work together to develop methods of investigation and select techniques for addressing problems.

There is therefore an increased desire among citizens to participate in decisions that will affect them, and an increasing need for the policy development process to be informed by input from diverse sources, especially from those involved or affected. It is critical for those developing public policy to know who has important information about an issue or policy area; who will be affected by a decision; and who may be able to affect a decision. Once we identify these people and understand their interests, we can begin to see when and how it may be appropriate to engage them in the process (Smith, 2003: 22). For this reason, administrators need to examine their basic assumptions and practices regarding power. They need to become cooperative

participants in the discourse, moving from a self-regarding intentionality where the goal is to protect self, promote self-interests, and hoard power, to a situation regarding intentionality where power and community are grounded in the needs of the issue or situation (Fox and Miller, 1995).

Having dealt with the issue of public participation which is the crux of this research study, the issue of policy implementation will be discussed below.

3.6 Policy Implementation in LHWP Resettlement Programme

There are several factors which affect proper implementation of the project and that require remedial action, among other things, namely: first, the project needs to get commitment and buy in from all role-players and stakeholders. The possibility of inviting other partners (community based organisations, NGOs, social services, educational and housing agencies) to join the committee in regular extended meetings should be examined. This would allow for all key stakeholders to join forces and share their knowledge and capacities to orient the programme. Community participation is the corner stone of assessing the needs and developing and implementing the various initiatives. In order to consolidate this project as well as laying the ground for the next phase of the LHWP, strategic issues have to be identified that require special attention. As outlined in the introduction, the strategy requires revision in order to make it more relevant and manageable.

According to Herrera *et al.*, (2007) it is contended that, as regards strategy implementation, the principle of participation by all of society's stakeholders heralds new ways of conducting national affairs in the future. With its emphasis on the right to information and freedom of speech, participation meets the goal of tackling the exclusion and marginalisation aspects of poverty. Yet this precept could cover much more ground. Participation can only really make a difference if it helps correct dysfunctions in the workings of democracy in poor countries. It should therefore strengthen the capacities and powers of intermediate bodies (the media, trade unions, associations) and allow the different stakeholders to put pressure on and even penalise the State if it fails. In short, the challenge is to ensure that the principle of accountability takes root, making the State responsible to its citizens for its actions. This concept of a participatory process should enhance the debate and help devise a more appropriate strategy that meets real social needs. This approach, known as empowerment, is intended to give the general public and the poor in particular, a chance to influence policies that affect their living conditions by improving the definition and consideration of their problems and expectations.

It is common that in most cases, the people who are negatively affected by dam projects are not fully represented in the decision-making system. These people in many cases have no political

power to influence the decisions and are already living in poor conditions. They are thus a group of people that are vulnerable due to their social and economic contexts. They resemble groups who according to Blaikie *et al* (1994) have limited capacity to anticipate, cope with, resist and recover from the impacts of a disaster or hazard event. The flooding of the land for dam construction, if not properly planned for, can have the same impact on poor communities as a natural disaster.

From the research findings, it seems that the Water Scheme policy in LHWP appears to have come out of a consultancy done for the project rather than a fully participative consultative process. Some interviewees were of the opinion that insufficient consultation was done in the process of drawing up the strategy. *Respondent 7* clarified this point: ‘‘We were just told that the government has a plan to construct some project dams at our place, Ha Mohale.’’

The important role players, such as local community, have been ignored in the strategy. The interventions laid out in the strategy indicate that little consultation was done with academic institutions, non-governmental organisations, local business community. On the contrary, the conception of involving all stakeholders has to be broadened to include actors at various levels of government active in policy formulation and implementation, as well as researchers and policy analysts who play important roles in the generation, dissemination, and evaluation of policy implementation.

Smith (2003) opines that, regardless of whether policy is vertical or horizontal, it should be developed by a team. Leadership will be assigned to the group, agency or department with the most direct responsibility for the outcome. Membership should include groups or departments who ‘‘own’’ part of the issue; individuals with a range of knowledge and skills; individuals with process expertise and knowledge of stakeholders and the community; representatives of central agencies with a role in approval; and those who will be responsible for implementation. Therefore, there is a growing interest in the inclusion of stakeholders as members of the policy development team. This is consistent with the concepts of citizen engagement and the emerging policy community (particularly those responsible for implementation).

However, Xaba (2009) asserts that, organisational structures involve individuals and groups that seek to maximise their influence during the implementation process. Conflicts are more likely to emerge during implementation, therefore at this stage; there is a need for bargaining. It is for this reason that Bardach (1977: 470) argues that, implementation actors are playing to win as much control as possible, and endeavouring to play the system so as to achieve their own goals and objectives. Consequently, conflicts and bargaining take place within shared goals. This

creates a need for individuals or groups to resolve their differences in order to attain effective implementation and to put policy into action.

In the research findings, *respondent 20* asserted that they were cordially welcomed by the headman at Ha Makhwanyane, even though the host community did not show any appreciation. It is in this vein that the researcher puts forward that the current Lesotho government policies and strategies lack both political commitment in national and local government. Due to the existing economic and social problems, ultimately, the test of our leadership will be how decisively they address the enduring problems (poverty, inequality and inadequate infrastructure) faced by relocated people.

The most important stage in the public process is the implementation of a policy. Policy implementation encompasses those actions by public or private individuals or groups that are directed at the achievement of objectives set forth in prior policy decisions. Policy implementation must be understood as the ability to forge subsequent links in the causal chain so as to obtain the desired result. In this study, the researcher shall refer to the implementation of all government policies that are in response to the needs of resettlers. Most government implementation processes operate at several levels. For example, Water Scheme policy or Environmental policy may operate at several levels. To achieve required objectives as stated by the policy, these multiple levels need to be in agreement with implementation processes. For instance, *respondent 40* indicated that during the implementation of LHWP, the LHDA officials came with the caskets and exhumation process took place. Additionally, he stressed the point that his houses and fields were affected by the Dam waters and that was a bitter experience to him.

In relation to the above sentiment, the researcher wishes to state that the role of the public sector in developing monitoring systems is one that engages the general public in the decision-making process. For instance, public participation in resource management and environmental issues is a basic democratic principle that provides the opportunity to take part in the formulation, implementation and evaluation of environmental plans and policies (Steelman and Ascher, 1997). In the same token, Kotelo-Molaoa (2007) states that the human rights of those people affected were thus violated. Even when there are plans in place to try and minimise the likely atrocities, such plans are either lacking in design, or the main challenge is the actual implementation of the resettlement programme, which poses a serious challenge to many institutions charged with the implementation of resettlement programmes. Brokensha & Scudder (1968) moreover observed that whenever resettlement programmes are being initiated, views of the affected people are hardly sought since they rarely participate in the decisions

regarding the construction of large dams being planned in their area. In the process, their right to participate in the development programme is thus violated.

Sharing the same sentiment, *respondent 39* clearly showed that he was not against the whole process, but the method that has been employed excludes the affected society. To substantiate this point, Etzioni (1968: 24) reiterates that the citizen should be seen as someone who can be involved in making a productive input to public policy. Despite the fact that evaluative process has been primarily framed by managerial or technical values, however, regarding control as having a political and wider social dimension, then evaluation should provide a significant opportunity for social learning and the promotion of social skills or active 'citizenship' (Coote (ed.), 1992; Warren *et al.*, 1992). At this juncture, the researcher would propose an employment of both top-down and bottom-up approaches in the policy implementation.

According to the top-down approach, perfect implementation depends and starts from the authoritative policy decisions at the central top level of government. Top-down theorists (Mazmanian D. and Sabatier P., 1983) argue that perfect management could be defined as circumstances in which resources availability and political capacity, brought together with administration, would produce perfect policy implementation. In regard to resettled communities, the relevant Ministry and LHDA would be required to construct an implementation plan for department (LHDA) officials. These departments need to develop clear and consistent objectives that will be adopted by those who will be implementing their policies. The success of the top-down approach is based on the availability of resources and a complete understanding of the objectives of policy by policy implementers. The necessary cautions given to implementing officials would be that, they need to be committed to policy objectives and to make use of their skills.

In terms of the bottom-up approach, attainable implementation depends on those who are charged with carrying out policy, rather than those who formulate and convey policy. In this context, the concerned ministries need to identify those actors that are involved in service delivery (street-level bureaucrats, communities) and ask them about possible implementation plans. It is perhaps not absolutely necessary that those involved in delivery have discretion, but it is desirable because it is necessary for policies to be adapted so that they better fit local needs. The bottom-up approach relies on the implementers in the public policy process.

Both perspectives provide useful insights into the implementation process; both demonstrate significant explanatory strengths as well as weaknesses; each may be relevant, *albeit* at different stages of the complex and dynamic implementation process. In the same token, according to

Mthembu (2005), community participation in planning and development are very important aspects of thoroughly thought, planned and implemented projects. This is important because through such projects, communities become an integral part of the vision and implementation, because it is they who have detailed knowledge of their geographical area and the prevailing social, economic and political characteristics of the area and its developmental needs (Social Policy Programme, 2000; 2004).

Conversely, people affected by the construction of large dams usually feel marginalised because of not being involved in the decision-making processes when dams are planned or implemented, especially on the issues pertaining to their resettlement and rehabilitation. The research found that due to the non-participation of the people, many of them were resettled in urban areas, whereas their initial settlement had been rural. But even where people were consulted on the preferred location of the site, some who had opted to be resettled in rural areas were nevertheless resettled in the urban resettlement. It was thus no surprise that the later assessment of the resettlement programme revealed that most of the affected people would have preferred to have been resettled as a group, or at least next to people with whom they had familiar relations (Kotelo-Molaoa, 2007: 107). Whenever resettlement becomes a necessity in order to make way for the construction of large dams, little regard is paid to the individual or societal current and future needs in terms of whether they would find sustainable employment, receive education and health care; retain their cultural milieu and societal identity, safety assurance and societal continuity.

On the contrary, *TRC* affirmed that: “There are no livelihoods mechanisms in place. No sustainable programs beyond compensation.”

In collaboration with this affirmation, *PIO* further elaborated that sustainable means of developing and indemnifying resettlees should be devised. For example, LHDA should resort to sustainable programmes instead of providing only monetary compensation that is being consumed within a short period of time.

It is therefore important to recognise that a well-articulated resettlement policy incorporating the aspirations of the stakeholders through a public participation process is a precursor to a successful resettlement programme. However, it is always important to note that a well articulated policy does not necessarily guarantee a successful resettlement programme. A deliberate effort has to be made to translate such a policy into concrete actions.

3.7 Coping strategies

It is necessary to discuss the concepts of vulnerability and resilience. In dealing with the issues of loss and dependence, resettled populations may emerge with different characteristics. Dams

affect the already vulnerable members of society. The degree of vulnerability may however not be the same for all households as some may have more capabilities to cope with a disaster. There are those who are “most vulnerable” and those who tend to be more “resilient”. These conditions determine how the particular household adapts in the new environment. This therefore means that, as a strategy of measuring displacement impact depends on the understanding of the historical background of the concerned families.

The previous chapters embarked on the socio-economic and environmental conditions of the former areas of dam resettles. Some of the everyday life challenges that relocated families have faced are insufficient housing to accommodate extended families, insufficient land to allow for subsistence farming, unavailability of common property resources, ongoing demands on cash money and unfavourable institutional structures. Therefore, given the nature of their previous lifestyles and biophysical environments, the question to be answered therefore is how have these families adapted to this new environment?

3.7.1 Government support

For Lesotho government to reconstruct the quality of life of the displaced households, the researcher’s assumption is that the administrators have followed a “top-down” approach and placed more emphasis on compensation, than on development. This assumption has been confirmed in that, according to research respondents, compensation was made in the form of cash/money. The provision of land and houses also formed part of compensation. Families were however limited in terms of the compensation that they received, and did not receive all forms of compensation. This is to say that, while some families received money and land, others received money and housing. Some families were compensated with only money and others received no compensation at all. Since the relocated people were not satisfied about the way compensation process was conducted due to inadequacy of compensation, they sought Lesotho Ombudsman intervention.

Findings of the research indicate that the methods of compensation adopted by the LHWP were inadequate as according to research participants, they did not assist in restoring the previous quality of life. Community members felt that the approach overlooked many of the social and economic costs, (for example, loss of access to common property resources and housing) and as such, these costs were not compensated. For this reason, research respondents asserted that the resettlement programme/policy was not successfully implemented because project-affected people were not left the same nor better off, instead they did become poorer. In responding to this issue, *TRC* opined that sustainable livelihoods programme should be put in place before resettlement. Land for land compensation should be opted for. Water and sanitation should be provided before actual resettlement could be implemented.

These are different forms of compensation:

Compensatory land – The land at Ha Makhalanyaane and Ha Thetsana were purchased by the LHDA in conjunction with the Lesotho government from certain individuals who owned big fields and spacious land in compensation for lost land of the relocated people.

Compensatory housing – The main housing type that was provided are loti-brick houses with corrugated iron sheets. It must be noted however that only some of the families received such compensatory houses. Others in the same community of Ha Makhalanyaane did not receive these houses at all. *Respondent 9* described how his family and others were left out of the housing scheme: “Some of us up until today are without houses, those people are not trustworthy.”

Water provision – Where resource water was scarce, attempts were made to provide water. For instance, *respondent 4* put forward that: “As compensation, they built me a six roomed renting house and a two roomed out-house; three toilets and one water pipe”.

Based on the above findings, most of the respondents at Ha Makhalanyaane rely on LHDA compensation as their main source of income. There appears to be a high level of dependency on LHDA for income which is paid annually or in a lump sum. This is substantiated by *LHDA1* when saying: “People seem to be suffering from a “Dependency syndrome.” Dependency of the people at Ha Makhalanyaane on LHDA could be appropriate in the short to medium term while other more sustainable means of reinstating livelihoods are being sought. However, this does not seem to be the case with the resettles at Ha Makhalanyaane in the sense that there is no initiative made to sustain the lives of the relocated people. On the other hand, at Ha Thetsane, for instance, all the interviewed resettles stated that they have their own water stand pipes in their yards, which they used for all purposes, be it for drinking, cooking, bathing or washing clothes, but at Ha Mohale, they relied on the river which was comparatively cheaper.

Findings of the research indicate that resettlement has brought a definite improvement regarding the community’s access to safe drinking water at Ha Thetsane. Access to the drinking water has reduced the risks of environmental health in the form of spread of water-borne diseases, especially because some of the respondents said they used water from unprotected springs for drinking purposes at Ha Mohale. Now, the disadvantage is that, they have to pay Water and Sewage Authority (WASA) for the units of water consumed. Yet in Ha Mohale, although the water was not very safe, it was free in that they did not have to pay any money for using it. In this way, improved access to good water quality has come at a price, which means that a financial burden has been imposed on the resettles.

Compensatory money paid to relocated people by LHDA was in the form of cash. Compensation amounts paid by LHDA were not equal for all families, but were provided mainly for lost property and other assets. In the case of residents from Mohale dam area, cash was not issued to compensate for lost land and many other common property resources. For families the researcher visited, cash compensation ranged between minimum of R1, 000.00 and a maximum of R5, 000.00 for each family. *Respondent 4* reiterated that: “I was given ‘disturbance allowance’ amounting to R1, 000.00 three times for three years. It was useless.”

Those who were dissatisfied with the compensation payments were asked to state some of the actions they took to express their dissatisfaction. 85% of the respondents stated that they had lodged a complaint before Lesotho Ombudsman to mediate against LHDA on the issue of lack of fulfilling promises they made to the resettled households. One respondent said this issue of LHDA not honouring its promises was discussed with the rest of the community members to solicit support, and another respondent stated that nothing was done. Whilst 15% of respondents went to the courts of law to lodge cases concerning their payments. The outcome was not uniform due to the variance and merits of the respondents’ cases; meaning that the judgement was in favour of some respondents, and not all. Again, the meetings were held between the LHDA and Lesotho Ombudsman for compensatory negotiations, resulting in the assertion by LHDA that it will still stick to their initial compensation policy. Nevertheless, Lesotho Ombudsman gave guidance on the method of approach in dealing with the respondents’ complaint.

The discussion above reveals that the kind of support the government provided varied between different households in different relocation areas. This raises many questions of justice. It is highly questionable as to what criteria were used to justify equal treatment of resettles in terms of resource allocation. This is the reason why the *PIO* asserted that: “In some instances, there is a lack of consistency on the side of LHDA in relation to paying out “Disturbance Allowance”, whereby some people are paid annually; others have been paid once, while others have not been paid at all.”

In addition, according to the respondents, as part of the resettlement package, the affected households also received a disturbance allowance in order to meet the demands of the new locality. How the amount of the disturbance allowance was arrived at is not very clear, but the implementing agency, in giving the allowance, made a distinction between relocation and resettlement. They defined relocation as when the affected people are physically moved out of the critical area but still remaining within their communities, whilst resettlement is where people move out of Mohale Basin to a completely new environment, which was the case with those who had moved to Ha Thetsane (Sefeane, 2006). Therefore, those who had been resettled received double the amount received by those who had merely been relocated.

Research findings reveal that both LHWC and LHDA to a certain extent denied dealing with the complainants (resettlees), but merely took the position that the Ombudsman had already made a decision on the payment of this class of compensation. They relied on the 2003 Report. The complainants were thus forced to go back to the Ombudsman. In turn, the Ombudsman, feeling that these authorities did not grasp the Ombudsman's view of the matter, wrote back to record his standpoint and to guide the said authorities on how to approach the complaint.

According to the researcher's point of view, the above point contrasts the *LHDA1* when saying that, to cater for people's needs, LHDA had established 'A Complainant Management System' to address and follow-up such complaints for ultimate resolution.

In comparing the main sources of income between the communities of Ha Mohale and Ha Thetsane, the research reveals that the former (Ha Mohale) appear to be more reliant on agricultural farming as their main source of income. The reason for this is that in Ha Mohale, arable land is available which has made agricultural production possible, whereas at Ha Thetsane, there seems to be a heavier reliance on cash. This may be a result of the fact that, Ha Thetsane is located in the urban area, where cash plays an important role in the economy. Ha Mohale, which is in the rural areas where although arable land is available, production is however more for subsistence.

This change in the main source of income from agricultural production to cash has made the lives of resettleees difficult at Ha Thetsane. For one to secure a job, a person is required to have competitive skills - which the respondents do not have. Other menial jobs are also difficult to find. As indicated in the document (*Ombudsman Determination*) *Case No. 2007/0175, dated September 2009*, Maseru resettleees were to receive different amount of compensation from other resettleees such as Ha Makhalanyaane. The reasons for their being treated as an exceptional case are that they are no longer going to rear animals; no longer going to get free drinking water, free fuel. All these require money. In the same vein, it has been stressed that organisations charged with responsibilities such as those of LHWC and LHDA should not cower from taking decisions even if it means reversing their earlier decisions. Making decisions and re-making them is inextricably in the nature of the responsibilities of LHWC and LHDA which have, in their operations, touched the lives of other people such as the affected individuals in LHWP areas.

3.7.2 The process of adaptation

In adapting to resettlement, the common reality for members of all households interviewed is that the process has been a difficult one. Many factors have both promoted and hindered effective adaptation of families.

In assessing how the resettles view their life circumstances at Ha Thetsane and Ha Makhalanyane, research participants were asked to rate the services they had or had access to at the present relocation sites against what they previously had in their area of abode. 55% of the respondents admitted that their housing had improved in terms of the quality of the structure and the house in general. Moreover, at their new relocation areas, the respondents now have VIP toilets and electricity which they did not have in Ha Mohale, even though water in Ha Mohale was much better in terms of taste, reliability and the fact that it was free. Whilst 35% is not happy about the new housing type, saying that it is over-crowded. In relation to schools, the respondents (former and latter) said that there had been no huge change, while the remaining 10% said that there was now better access to advanced schools especially near Ha Thetsane.

3.7.2.1 Attitudes to adaptation

Research findings reveal that households emerged as having developed different attitudes to adaptation. Families changed from one character to the other as time went on. During the period of migration and arrival in the new place, all households were still expecting further assistance in the form of promised assets such as land, housing, from the government. Some of the families began to realise that prolonged dependence hinders them from getting on with their lives. Nevertheless, research findings portray that there are families who are still trapped in this dependency attitude. Various reasons exist that explain their inability to move on in regard to constraints to adaptation, one major factor is the low level of socio-economic status of the research participants.

On the issue of socio-economic status, *respondent 5* stated that: “Life has deteriorated for most households after resettlement due to the failure or delay in adapting to the new environment and that it is going to take time for the respondents to match the standard of living at relocated areas which is different from their previous one.”

As pertinent to the above statement, most of the respondents were of the opinion that their life circumstances had deteriorated at Ha Thetsane and Ha Makhalanyane despite the improved access to the stated social services which they now had in the new location. As part of the research, respondents were asked to suggest ways in which future resettlement programmes could be handled. *Respondent 3* expressed the need for assistance to kick-start a sustainable project.

According to the research findings, some households seemed to be very inquisitive and ready to kick-start their projects and gain control of their lives, and move on to become independent. Therefore, this category basically needs some minute financial support from the government. For instance, *respondent 3* posited: “I told them that I have a plan to rear pigs, and I therefore request for their assistance. Their negative response was that they have paid me, so they cannot help me in any manner.” As a result, the coping strategies of displaced people are perceived to be different. These strategies are informed by the goals and objectives of a particular relocated group. The above stated predicament is not in agreement with the response of *LHDA1* when saying that: LHDA ensured agricultural production support and extension to the affected community.

3.7.2.2 Individual coping mechanisms versus group coping mechanisms

Households have managed to reconstruct the community structures that seemed to have broken apart through collective group effort, for instance, establishing community associations, like ‘cooperatives’ and liaison committees, even though this is done in a different form. This is facilitated by the fact that communities share common characteristics; more commonalities than differences. *PIO* points out that: “An example is where LHDA fails to fulfil promises such as compensation for the loss of communal assets, like arable land and grazing land, firewood, medicinal plants, and water springs. This amount is expressed in millions because it is mainly used for establishing ‘cooperatives’ for local development.” Committees to challenge the question of monetary compensation through negotiations with central and local government officials have been established. Relocated families are still continuing to demand monetary compensation. *Respondent 4* pointed out that: “The committee was established which acted as our representatives to address issues which had to do with compensation and other related matters; which to my perception was bribed by LHDA, and as a result ineffective.”

Representing the office of Lesotho Ombudsman, *respondent PIO* confirmed that complaints had been received by his office from the affected communities. The concerns had included, among others, (i) late payment of compensation; (ii) nil payments of interest on delayed compensation payments; and (iii) no compensation paid for loss of natural resources, despite promises having been made in this regard. According to the *PIO*, the root cause of the problems was poor management of the resettlement programme due to the poor attitude of the LHDA officers, inadequate consultations and communication with all the stakeholders.

In this case, there is consensus on the question of claims that were frequently brought by the affected community as *LHDA1* mentions the following: loss of resources, loss of social structure, road structure diverting water into the fields. However, there is non-concurrence of

respondents on the point of catering for people's needs by LHDA, where it is indicated that LHDA has established a Complainant Management System to address and follow-up such complaints for ultimate resolution. The findings of the research revealed that, even though this system exists in principle, it has proved to be practically ineffective. *PIO* indicated that: there is no consistency on the side of LHDA in relation to paying out "Disturbance Allowance", whereby some people are paid annually; others have been paid once, while others have not been paid at all.

3.7.3 Restoring food security

Some households still plant such crops as vegetables and beans. This strategy depends on access to adequate land/plots. *Respondent 10* said that he regards soil as the most valuable resource. The practice of cultivating land has always formed part of his culture: "As long as we still have access to these smaller plots, we will never stop cultivating land."

It is common knowledge that fruits and vegetables contribute substantially to the nutritional status of people. Lack of access to fruits and vegetables may give rise to poor nutrition in human beings. In rural areas, different types of grass that are found in the wilderness have different uses for example, making of brooms - which is an income-generating activity, providing thatch grass for roofing of houses, and various others. Lack of access to these resources has given rise to a loss of independence regarding their ability to take advantage of economic opportunities. These circumstances have negatively affected the sustainability of the livelihoods of the people of Ha Thetsane and Ha Makhalanyaane.

The change of locality to which the resettled households have been subjected has resulted in loss of access to some of the natural resources that had previously sustained the lives of resettles while in Ha Mohale. The loss of some of these natural resources, like medicinal plants, has affected the spiritual aspect of the lives of those who have been resettled. The respondents are worried of the fact that they have left behind medicinal plants, as well as the ancestors (where exhumation process did not take place) which form part of the respondents' spirituality and belief systems. Symbolic markers such as ancestral shrines and graves have been abandoned and thus breaking links with the past.

3.7.4 Rebuilding housing

All members of the resettled community have experienced the loss of their homes in their previous location. For some resettles, the loss of housing and shelter was only temporary. Other resettles have been compelled to live in temporary relocation shelters, which were used as a fallback solution. Only a few householders have been built well-structured formal houses made of blocks, cement and corrugated iron sheets. Participation of households in the

construction of their houses and in the formation of cooperatives formation has empowered them and created a sense of belonging.

3.7.5 Constraints to adaptation

Even though a number of successes have been achieved in the adaptation process of the resettled people, the process has not been an easy one for most households in these communities. Various factors have hindered effective adaptation. There has been a series of interlinked socio-economic and environmental effects which have prevented effective adaptation in relocation areas. Constraints to adaptation include: rules and regulations – prohibiting families from undertaking any unplanned development; low level of socio-economic status (for example, difficulty in reconstructing housing, installing piped water, or moving elsewhere, where there are no opportunities for a better quality of life); unfavourable urban biophysical environment (for instance, inadequate land to build adequate houses, to cultivate crops and rear livestock; and there was no longer river or spring water); conflict in relocation areas (creation of insecurity has led some households to stop breeding livestock, owning chickens, pigs; and this has led to further migration as a result of violence from host community; and lack of transparency and accountability of development schemes (mistrust on host chiefs and committees in the usage of money compensated collectively for the loss of natural resources and arable land).

According to the research findings, in assessing the impact of socio-economic and environmental impact of the involuntary resettlement on the population of Basotho population in Ha Makhalanyane and Ha Thetsane, the resettles have been vulnerable to social stress and poverty in this manner: loss of arable and agricultural land for cultivation of crops and natural springs; financial burden (they need money to buy some items e.g. paraffin, water); decline in health status due to unfavourable environmental conditions (and poor living conditions); lack of adequate consultation with the affected community by Lesotho government and LHDA (implementing agency) brought about unprepared resettlement sites, and as a result, the respondents felt that they did not participate fully in the resettlement programme; the compensation process was not properly conducted because there have been inconsistencies in regard to how the households were compensated; traditional community and authority systems torn apart. In relation to understanding how resettles have been adjusting and coping in their new relocated areas, there is a need for relocated people to be provided with opportunities to generate the income they had previously earned from assets literally acquired by the project to sustain their livelihoods.

3.8 Conclusion

Concerning public participation in the decision-making process, in spite of the fact that the decision to implement the LHWP was taken during the era of military rule (1986-1992) where decisions were taken by government, with hardly any public participation, the affected households were at least provided with an opportunity to select the type of houses from the prototype designs provided by the LHDA. The research study has also revealed that there is much dissatisfaction with the resettlement package despite the fact that, through resettlement, there are improvements in the physical aspects such as the better structures of compensation houses, and being provided with toilets and electricity irrespective of whether those households had previously had toilets or not, and also despite the fact that they are now closer to social services like health facilities and schools. This dissatisfaction could partly be attributed to unfulfilled promises made by the LHDA or the apparent conflict that existed between the host population and the resettles. However, the fact that resettles now have access to toilets and safe drinking water means that issues of environmental health have been to a large extent improved.

The Ha Thetsane and Ha Mkhanyane resettlement programme has major impacts in the manner that the means of livelihood have changed, not only in terms of sustaining the daily living, but also in terms of the assets owned. The conclusions of the study are dealt with in detail in Chapter Four. Therefore, having gone through this undertaking, the researcher has made recommendations as discussed below.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1 Introduction

Kofi Annan, the former Secretary General of the United Nations, in his opening address at the 9th International Anti-Corruption Conference in Durban on 10th October 1999, stated that:

“It is increasingly recognised that integrity and good governance are essential building blocks for meeting the objectives of sustainable development, prosperity and peace. Good governance and integrity require the rule of law, effective state institutions, transparency and accountability in the management of public affairs, respect for human rights, and the meaningful participation of all citizens.”

The above statement supports the researcher’s findings that the economy of Lesotho would be maximised and poverty would be alleviated if the resources and development programmes are well managed, specifically in the Lesotho Highlands Water Project.

The findings of the research study reveal that some positive and negative aspects of relocation process have been realised. Such positive aspects are new household buildings, electricity, roads and facilities such as clinics, stores. Nevertheless, it is also important to note that the negative impacts of relocation on the displaced families are still felt in the relocation areas. In this article, the researcher has attempted to assess critically the impact of involuntary resettlement on the lives of Basotho people, by specifically citing the case of Lesotho Highlands Water Project, and pin-pointing the socio-economic and environmental effects experienced by the affected population and the entire nation. From the research findings, one can conclude that poverty, economic development and institutional strengthening are major challenges facing Lesotho. The issue of corruption, flawed decision making process and social exclusion also appear to exacerbate the challenges experienced as a result of relocation of the Basotho people.

As mentioned in Chapters Two and Three, the resettlement programme at Ha Thetsane and Ha Makhalanyane has resulted in definite changes in the lives of the resettles, both positive and negative. This chapter therefore starts by providing the summarised positive and negative impacts of the overall experience with the resettlement programme at Ha Thetsane and Ha Makhalanyane. Thereafter, the specific conclusions are discussed. The final section of the chapter comprises the recommendations.

The Ha Thetsane and Ha Makhalanyaane case study confirms that the challenge still remains of ensuring that resettlement programmes result in satisfying outcomes. In this resettlement programme, considerations were more economic with hardly any concern for either social or cultural costs as well as reinstatement of the income-generating capacities of those affected by resettlement. The physical aspects that are quantifiable and can thus be expressed in monetary value terms were mainly addressed with hardly any consideration for issues of social networks and cultural issues.

This section discusses the specific conclusions of the study. These conclusions include issues pertaining to participation of the affected households in the resettlement programme: whether resettlees have sustainable means of livelihood, and access to social services, whether promises had been honoured, and whether intangible aspects have been adequately addressed.

4.2 Conclusions

Conclusion 1: Inadequate public participation by the affected people

The study findings have revealed the need to engage with all stakeholders affected by involuntary resettlement through an open and transparent public participation process right from the inception phase to the post-implementation phase of a resettlement programme. Thus, increasing chances of having a resettlement programme that has satisfying results, especially amongst the marginalised and vulnerable groups. In the case of the LHWP, inadequate engagement with the stakeholders resulted in devastating consequences, where there was conflict between the host and the resettled households.

Conclusion 2: A need for an alternative sustainable means of livelihood

The findings point to the need to pay attention to the identification of more sustainable means of livelihoods for people affected by resettlement. This is a critical issue because the treaty on the LHWP and the LHDA Order, both of 1986, allude to the need to reinstate the standard of living of those people who are affected by the project activities. In the case of LHWP, there is an observable dependency on compensation payments, which has resulted in the abandonment of agriculture production.

Conclusion 3: Improved access to social services comes at a cost

Although the resettlement programme has brought improvements in terms of access to social services such as clean water supply and electricity, these are costly and expensive, which seems to have caused much dissatisfaction amongst the resettlees. Therefore, there is a need to ensure that when people are presented with resettlement options, they are also given information on the costs and benefits associated with each of the options so as to enable them to make informed

decisions. For example, electricity and water bills need to be paid depending on how much electricity and water have been used. In this way, paying water and electricity bills will not be seen as an imposed cost burden in that people will have made informed decisions.

Conclusion 4: The importance of honouring compensation promises

The importance of honouring promises made by those charged with the implementation of resettlement programmes is fundamental in the sense that it builds trust between the implementing agency and the resettles.

Having discussed the above, strengthening relations with citizens is a sound investment in better policy-making and a core element of good governance. It allows government to tap new sources of policy-relevant ideas, information and resources when making decisions. Equally important, it contributes to building public trust in government, raising the quality of democracy and strengthening community capacity. Irrespective of unpleasant past failures with regard to involuntary resettlement, it is possible, with skilful participatory planning and sufficient funding, to avoid some of the past mistakes. Goodland (1995) also observed that improvements have been achieved over the last few decades in the way resettlement schemes have been handled. It has now become an acceptable practice to treat resettlement costs as an integral part of the overall engineering projects. The work of the WCD (2000), which provided a new framework for decision making in respect of dam construction, and other initiatives from civil society, provide hope for the future in terms of how resettlement programmes are handled, and as such, the future in as far as resettlement programmes are concerned, is not as bleak as it was two decades ago.

Lenka (2010) recapitulates that, water is one of nature's most important gifts to mankind essential to life, and a person's survival depends on it, as it is one of the most elements to good health and a key component in determining the quality of one's life. Based on its necessity, it is quite imperative that every 'Mosothe' has access to clean water as water is a right, and no one should ever feel the obligation of buying it. The fact that Lesotho has this precious gift 'water', it is essential that the community which has been affected by the Lesotho Highlands Water Project benefits most in attaining water.

4.3 Recommendations

The LHWP is a huge water management project designed to promote benefit to both South Africa and Lesotho. This project was thought to bring 'win-win' situation because Lesotho receives royalties from South Africa for the transferred water. Indeed, the LHWP enhanced the economic situation in both countries, especially in Lesotho. However, from the research findings, it appears that the social impacts on local citizens of Lesotho were not adequately addressed by the Lesotho government. The social consequences of the resettlement have included poverty, vulnerability to pandemic diseases, criminal behaviour and drunkenness

amongst youths, and the torn apart social ties, and have had a negative effect on the daily lives of the relocated population. Based on the research findings, the researcher believes that good governance, sustainable development and public integrity of both individuals and institutions, is necessary to bring about socio-economic emancipation. This can be achieved by introducing sustainable programmes in the development projects; and inculcating the culture of transparency and reliability in the leadership.

Lack of accountability breeds corruption. For this reason, the researcher recommends in-service training programmes in order to sensitise the government and LHDA officials about the negative consequences of corruption. The on-going systematic evaluations in the service delivery should be employed by applying monitoring and evaluation (M&E) systems to increase accountability; and strengthening legal and financial management institutions to improve their ability to monitor public sector performance. This exercise could be done by intensifying already existing legal and financial strategies.

In managing resettlement programmes, it is essential to adopt a multidisciplinary approach specifically because resettlement itself, as seen in the case of Ha Thetsane and Ha Makhalanyane, required inputs from different experts. For instance, civil and electrical engineers who would obviously have to be part of the management team of the LHWP to ensure that infrastructure services like water, waste-water disposal system, access roads, are provided in the new location.

Guided by good practice processes, government departments should prioritise the concretisation of consultation standards and the purpose that such standards need to fulfil. Given that there are different stakeholders that departments often need to serve, it would be crucial to assess different consultation mechanisms and then ensure that the most feasible, effective and efficient ones are implemented. Such mechanisms could include citizens' satisfaction surveys, citizens' forums, 'pitsos', and service delivery hearings.

It may be true to argue that this project (LHWP) is for public good; and that it has contributed and is still contributing to improving the quality of life of many people. However, the fact that there are still many resettlers who, even twenty years after the dam was completed, are still suffering the consequences of the dam cannot be ignored. This situation, arising from poor planning, insufficient compensation and continued neglect or lack of support mechanisms in the relocation areas requires intervention to remedy past injustices. A very important but ignored issue is that of recognising relocated people at Ha Thetsane and Ha Makhalanyane, making sure that they are well cared for and their plight attended to. This is vital to make them realise that their existence as citizens is still important. Moreover, there is also a need for the provision of

housing, basic services to families; as well as a need to clarify the unresolved conflict over land and money compensation.

Bibliography

References: Primary sources:

Interviews/Fieldwork

1st category:

Two officials in Lesotho Highlands Development Agency = (LHDa1) and (LHDa2)

2nd category:

Local NGO official = (TRC)

Ombudsman – Principal Investigation Officer = (PIO)

3rd category:

44 affected community members = (Respondents 1, 2, 3, 4, 5.....etc)

Documents

GoL, Government of Lesotho. 1993. *The Lesotho Constitution*, Gazette No. 35, Maseru: Government Printers.

GoL, Government of Lesotho. 1989. *National Settlement Policy* – working paper No.6 on Land Use and Land Tenure, Maseru: Department of Lands Surveys and Physical Planning

Lesotho National Environment Policy. 1998.

GoL, Government of Lesotho. 1986a. *LHDA Order No. 23*, Maseru: Government Printers.

GoL, Government of Lesotho. 1979. *The Land Act* – Act No. 17 of 1979, Maseru: Government Printers.

References: Relevant unpublished research (dissertations/theses):

Ndlela, P., 2005. *The Role of NGOs in Capacity Building for Democracy in KZN: A Case Study of the CPP and DDP*, 2005. University of KwaZulu – Natal.

Xaba, S., 2009. *An Examination of the Extent of, and Process of, Public Participation in Public Policy Decision-Making: The Case of the Name Changing of St. Lucia Wetland Park to Isimangaliso Wetland Park*, Nov. 2009, University of KwaZulu – Natal.

Books:

Ackerman, S. R., 1990. *Corruption and good government: causes, consequences, and reform*, Cambridge. United Kingdom: C.U.P. pp. 1.

- Ackerman, S. R., 2006. *International Handbook on the Economics of Corruption*; Cheltenham, U.K. Northampton Massachusetts USA: Edward Elgar. pp. 22 – 27.
- Cook, C., 1994 *Involuntary Resettlement in Africa*. Volume 23, World Bank, Makerere Institute of Social Research. Washington D.C. USA. pp. 66.
- Devitt, P. and Hitchcock R., 2010. *Who Drives Resettlement? The Case of Lesotho: Mohale Dam* – Hunting-Consult 4 Joint Venture. Michigan, pp. 16.
- Hassan, F., 2002. *Lesotho: Development in a challenging environment*. A joint World Bank. The International World for Construction and Development: The African Development Bank. Washington D.C. pp. (xi).
- Herrera, J. et al., 2007. *Governance, Democracy and Poverty Reduction: Lessons Drawn from Household Surveys in Sub-Saharan Africa and Latin America*. International Statistical Review. Blackwell, Oxford, pp. 70 – 95.
- Hess, P. and Ross, C., 1997. *Economic Development: theories, evidence, and policies*: Dryden. pp. 3 – 8.
- Hope, K., 2000. *Corruption and Development in Africa: Lessons from Country Case Studies*. Palgrave. pp. 1 – 2.
- Johnson, R., 2004. *The Struggle Against Corruption: A Comparative Study*. Palgrave Macmillan, New York. pp. 7 – 9.
- Keketso, L., 2003. *The Mixed Blessings of the Lesotho Water Project: An Assessment Based on Local Perspective*, Mountain Research and Development. Vol.23. No. 1, Feb. 2003. pp. 7 – 9.
- King, C. et al., 1998. *The Question of Participation: Toward Authentic Public Participation in Public Administration* – Public Administration Review, Vol. 58, No. 4, July 1998, pp. 317 – 326
- Kotelo-Molaoa, M., 2007. *The Socio-Economic Impact of the Lesotho Highlands Water Project Resettlement Programme at Makhoakhoeng*. The University of the Free State, Bloemfontein, Nov. 2007.

Parsons, W., 1995. *Public Policy: An Introduction to the Theory and Practice of Analysis*. Edward Elgar, Cheltenham, U.K.

Smith, B., 2003. *Public Policy and Public Participation Engaging Citizens and Community in the Development of Public Policy*. Sep. 2003, Canada.

Theobald, R. 1990. *Corruption, Development and Underdevelopment*. London: Macmillan, pp. 1 -11.

Book Chapters:

Pottinger, L., 1999. *Corruption and World Bank: International Rivers*. Washington Post Company, Berkeley, Calif, Aug. 1999. pp.16.

Sabatier, P., 1988. *An Advocacy Coalition Framework of Policy Change and the Role of Policy-Oriented Learning Therein*. Policy Sciences. Kluwer Academic Publishers, California. pp. 129 – 168.

Journals:

Lenka, T., 2006. *On the Wrong Side of Development: Lessons learned from the LHWP – Transformation Resource Centre*. MASERU, Lesotho, 2006. pp. 145.

Mwangi, O., 2008. *Environmental Change and Human Security in Lesotho: The Role of the Lesotho Highlands Water Project in Environmental Degradation*. African Security Review. Vol. 17, No. 3, Sep. 2008.

Inambao, A., 2007. *Lesotho Highlands Water Project: Report prepared for the Lesotho Highlands Development Authority*. Panel of Experts (PoE Report 47). pp. 1 – 19.

Tilt, B., 2009. *Understanding and linking the biophysical, socio-economic and geopolitical effects of dams*. Journal of Environmental Management. Vol. 90, Supplement 3, July 2009, pp. 249 – 257.

Wolfowitz, P., 2007. *‘Cross-debarment by banks could become routine.’* Public Eye – Business and Economy, 30th March, 2007, pp.8.

Internet Sources:

Earle, A., 2007. *The Role of Governance in Countering Corruption*. Water Policy 9 Supplement, Cape Town: IWA, pp. 69 – 81, available online <http://www.bing.com/search?q=antonearle>.

Hoover, R., 2001. *The World Bank's Failed Efforts to Restore Lives and Livelihoods of Dam-Affected People in Lesotho*, International Rivers, Berkeley, USA, available online <http://www.internationalrivers.org/en/node/96>.

Mullins, D., 2004. *Macroeconomic Impact Study of Phase 1B – Lesotho Highlands Development Authority*, Pretoria, South Africa. pp. 102, available online www.ihwp.org.ls/MacroEconomic%20impact%20Phase%201B.pdf.

Nusser, M., 2003. *Environmental Change and Human Security in Lesotho – The Role of Lesotho*, ISS, Sep. 2008. available online <http://www.iss.co.za/index.php?link-id=4056&slink>.

Pottinger, L., 2005. *Communities Affected by World Bank's Largest Dam Project in Africa Protest its Impoverishing Effects as Next Dam Moves Forward*, available online <http://www.internationalrivers.org/en/africa/communitie>.

Southern African portal on corruption, 2005. *The Lesotho Highlands Water Highlands Project Case Study*, Institute for Security Studies available online <http://www.pocafrika.org/cases/highlands/index.htm>.

Appendices

Appendix A:

1st category: Interview guide for the implementing agency (LHDA)

1. How does the Lesotho government view or define resettlement?
2. According to you, is there any policy or document of the resettlement process with regard to LHWP?
3. How was the resettlement process carried out?
4. What was the role of the Lesotho government in this process?
5. In your official capacity, what role did you play in the resettlement process?
6. How did the public participate in this program? Please, give examples.
7. What were the forums for the public to participate?
8. According to your understanding, what is the government's role in providing participation by the public?
9. Was there any compensation provided to the people affected by the removals? If yes, please provide specific examples.
10. Do you think the compensation package paid is adequate? Please, substantiate your answer...
11. Is the compensation always paid timeously? If no, what are the reasons for late/delayed payments?

12. Do you have any additional comments regarding resettlement program which have not been reflected in the questionnaire?

Appendix B

2nd category: Checklist of questions for Transformation Resource Centre

1. According to you, what is resettlement?

2. Are there any documents or policy for resettlement process related to LHWP?

3. How was the resettlement process conducted?

4. According to you, was there any public participation in this process? If yes, how did the public participate?

5. Do you think all relevant stakeholders were engaged adequately in the resettlement program? Substantiate....

6. In your opinion, do you think the resettlement project has achieved its goals of relocating and improving the livelihoods of the people affected by the project? Please, substantiate.....

7. If you had an opportunity to change any aspect (s) of resettlement program, which aspect (s) would you change to improve similar resettlement programs in future?

8. Taking into account the issue of public participation, how do you think this policy should be implemented?

9. Do you have any suggestions for managing future resettlement programs?

Appendix C

3rd category: Interview questions for the office of Ombudsman

1. According to you, what is resettlement?
2. How is your office included in this resettlement process?
3. Has it been the case that your office received and addressed some complaints from relocated people? If yes, please provide examples.
4. How did you intervene in such circumstances?
5. If you had an opportunity to change any aspect(s) of resettlement program, which aspect(s) would you change to improve similar resettlement programs in future?
6. Taking into account the issue of public participation, how do you think this policy should be implemented?
7. Do you have any suggestions for managing future resettlement programs?

Appendix D

4th category: Interview questions for households resettled at Ha Thetsane and Ha Makhalanyane

1. What is your understanding of resettlement?
2. How were you included in this resettlement process?
3. Did any of your family members participate in the decision-making processes on issues of resettlement and compensation? Please, explain your answer....
4. How was resettlement conducted? Please give some examples.
5. Did you (or any of your household members) have an opportunity to raise concerns and needs during the resettlement program? Please, explain.....
6. What was the involvement of the government in this process?
7. How were you compensated? Please provide examples.
8. Other than the compensation received, were there any other compensation promises made to your household? If yes, what were they?
9. Were the promises fulfilled? If no, do you know why not?
10. In general, are you satisfied or dissatisfied with your resettlement and compensation payments? Please, explain.....
11. If you are dissatisfied, what steps have you taken to express your dissatisfaction? What has been the outcome of these steps?

12. In your opinion, has life improved/remained the same/or deteriorated for most households in your village, after resettlement? If yes, why do you say so? If no, why do you say so?

13. Are there any specific problems that you have encountered since your arrival at this relocation area? If yes, please explain.....

14. Do you have access to natural resources for your daily needs as was in the previous location? Please, explain....

15. Do you have any additional comments that have not been covered in the questionnaire?