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Kai Schmidt-Soltau: Resettlement and Conservation in the Central-African Rainforest
Introduction and Executive Summary

Compared with other relocation programmes, the involuntary resettlement of people out of national parks is very limited by number, in projects and number of displaced people. The resettlement scheme of Korup National Park in Cameroon, which will stand in the centre of the following paper, was the first of its kind in the central African rainforest. The famous Rio-Conference declared conservation of biodiversity and the creation of national parks as priority. Relocation of people living inside these areas is therefore on the increase.

The resettlement of Ekundu-Kundu - the pilot village of the Korup National Park Resettlement Scheme - began in 1993, but in February 2000 the majority of the inhabitants were still living at the old site inside the Korup National Park. On February 25th 2000, the Cameroonian Minister for Environment and Forest officially inaugurated a new site, but the people of Ekundu-Kundu were not invited to participate. A recent evaluation came to the result that neither the infrastructure nor the socio-economic situation created for them in the new site is sustainable. Crops rot on the farms and the houses start to fall apart before anybody moves in. The youth, which generated income from the construction of houses at the resettlement site, is preparing to move back into the national park. Ekundu-Kundu seems to be a perfect example of a failure and one starts to wonder why experienced international donors like EU, WWF, (ODA) DFID, GTZ and US-DoD granted Korup Project enormous financial backing (1 Mil. ECU) to carry out a scheme which resulted in a tragedy.

The plan to resettle Ekundu-Kundu is ageing. During the times of British colonialism in Western Cameroon, parts of the dense rainforest in the extreme south-west were demarcated and installed as the Korup Native Administration Forest Reserve. The inhabitants of the villages were consulted. Thanks to their positive attitude towards the creation of the forest reserve, they received the right to harvest, hunt and farm in the entire area to a certain level. After an inventory in the sixties clarified that Korup Forest was not worth exploitation, the authorities decided that the area was too remote for development. Until 1986, the only way to travel to the region was a weekly river-boat of a palm-oil plantation in Mundemba. But remote areas attract conservationists. In the late seventies and early eighties, European researchers discovered that Korup is a unique place: more than 3000 species of trees, plants, animals, insects and 25% of African's primate species are living in a forest, which is seen as one of the oldest in Africa. Based on this research, first conservation activities were carried out by Earthlife Foundation and the Government of Cameroon. In 1982 the first governmental delegation, after 22 years of independence, visited Ekundu-Kundu together with the researchers. They informed the inhabitants "that the villages inside the prospected Korup National Park were to be resettled." The villagers were told that if they accepted resettlement, they would receive compensation, if they "cause trouble, the armed forces would
drive them out”. The chiefs agreed and enabled the Cameroonian Government to fulfil the agenda of national parks at that time, which prosecuted human settlements inside parks. On October 30th, 1986, the Korup National Park with an area of 125,900 ha was gazetted.

Funded by WWF-UK and ODA, a first project proposal to secure the Korup National Park was elaborated and signed on February 3rd, 1988 by the Government of Cameroon and WWF. The objective of Korup Project is seen in the protection of Korup National Park through rural development in the support zone, through the change of hunter-and-gatherer societies into farmers and through the resettlement of all villages inside the national park. It was in that light that the donors agreed to assist the government in resettling the villages in the park. Neither at that time nor in the following decade did any of the actors see a need to justify the decision to resettle villages because of conservation goals. Until now, nobody is able to say if the resettlement of villages inside the park is able to reduce the hunting pressure or not. While this impact seems logical at first sight, experiences in other parks - especially in eastern Africa - prove the contrary. It seems as if communities inside the parks protect their hunting zones against hunters from other regions, who do not have an interest to hunt successfully also in the future. Nobody realised so far, that the traditional methods of conservation ("secret forest", annual shifting hunting and gathering zones and defence against all interventions from outside) are more related to the latest fashion of conservation (biosphere reserves) than the protectionist approach. This is even more important in Africa, where governments - due to economic problems and omnipresent corruption - are unable to fight against poaching. It was only after the tragedy of the resettlement of Ekundu-Kundu - the first resettlement for "conservation needs" in Central Africa - that officials were willing to discuss other options.

The story of the resettlement itself is short but nevertheless interesting. In contrast to all protocols for resettlement, the villagers themselves were hardly involved in the process of decision-making. The Government of Cameroon, who was and is the official facilitator, is financially not in the position to organise even a workshop and failed for years to produce any agreement or contract with the villagers. It was only in 1997 that a very vague agreement was signed. At that time Korup Project had spent already ECU 250,000,- for road construction, tree felling and "administration". No strategy was elaborated or applied with the result that in 2000 more than ECU 550,000,- was spent without any active participation of the villagers. The unclear responsibilities, interests and strategies resulted in 214 ha of felled primary rainforest - nearly 10 ha per household - and a town which was supposed to be a village (56 houses in the new site instead of 23 in the old site). While the average size of farms in the region is less than one ha, the Ekundu-Kundu people received more than 4 ha each, but no training or preparation for the change from a hunter-and-gatherer society to intensive farming was organised. They were not informed or consulted on the socio-cultural impacts. It was only during the process of ordered transfer that the officials realised
they had established something which is contrary to what the people asked for.

While it is obvious that the unskilled performance of the resettlement facilitators of Ekundu-Kundu increased the failure and tragedy of the process, it is also obvious that an involuntary resettlement due to uncertain conservation premises cannot be managed like displacement for a dam, a pipeline or a road. As long as the local population does not see the need for conservation of their forest and their wildlife, they will always find a way to continue hunting and gathering. If they take note of the destruction of their environment, there will no longer be a need for resettlement. The involuntary resettlement of villages in national parks has to be stopped and replaced by a participatory management of their resources.

Table 1: The old Ekundu-Kundu - a small village with 23 houses. In the background the school compound donated by Korup Project in 1994.

**Literature Review**

The cases of resettlement due to conservation aims are - as said before - in Africa till recently, quite limited. Consequently, the literature on these special cases of relocation - given in the bibliography - is easily comprehensible. Cernea came to the conclusion that most "eviction from traditional lands has been typically disastrous to those effected" (Cernea 2000, 27). Hardly any resettlement of inhabitants of national parks has been successful. These failures resulted mostly in a resistance to move or even the return to their former villages inside the national park, because their traditional land was - in contrast to other displacements - still accessible and suitable for human settlements. To solve this problem conservation projects in some cases used the argument of force, after the force of argument had failed. In the Kibale game corridor in Uganda game guards and foresters burned down several villages and killed those people on the spot, who insistently refused to move
for the sake of wildlife (Cernea 1997, 26/27). Nevertheless, resettlement is for now the most common practice to deal with people, who live by accident in African national parks (Sayer 1991; Wells, Brandon and Hannah 1992), but the risks which arise from these resettlement culminates for some scientists in a rethink. Based on several case studies - including Korup National Park - Marcus Colchester summarised that, "the world over, conservationists are now beginning to realise that the strategy of locking up biodiversity in small parks, while ignoring wider social and political realities, has been an ineffective strategy" (Colchester 1997, 107). Michael Cernea emphasised that "it will be increasingly important to monitor forthcoming forestry related programmes in African countries for their displacement implications and to develop alternative strategies" (Cernea 1997,34).

Table. 2: The Ekundu-Kundu resettlement site - a town which supposed to be a village

One of these displacements for conservation is the resettlement of Ekundu-Kundu, the pilot village in the resettlement scheme of Korup National Park. The first recorded European visitors to the Korup region, in the extreme south-west of Cameroon, were the 'Kamerun Hinterland Handelsexpedition' in 1894 (Besse 1898, Cadman 1922, 7-10). They also named the forest Korup. It is the name of the people living in the southern park of the area, which incorporates today's Korup National Park. In 1923, F.B. Carr surveyed the Korup Region for the British administration, which received the mandate over Western Cameroon after WW I from the League of Nations. He analysed the area not only in view of military or economic interest, but described the traditional belief systems and customs of the inhabitants. His study was employed for this paper as background material.

In the mid-eighties Parrott carried out research of all villages inside an area, which was prospected to become the Korup National Park. The aim was to collect baseline data for negotiations in case of resettlements. In 1988, Infield
analysed the socio-economic and biological impact of hunting, trapping and fishing in the region and Devitt surveyed the village infrastructure, attitudes and customs of the inhabitants. Nevertheless, all these baseline studies did not result in the elaboration of a resettlement strategy nor in analysis of other options, to reduce the human pressure on the forest.

In May 1999 the socio-economic impacts of the resettlement of Ekundu-Kundu was analysed and in November 1999 all other villages in the resettlement-scheme were visited. In February 2000 the Delegation of the Commission of the European Union in Cameroon, which represents the main donor, granted an evaluation of the overall resettlement scheme. In 1999 54 % of the overall adult population of Ekundu-Kudu were interviewed (66 villagers) utilising PRA methods. During additional field visits (July 1999, November 1999, January 2000, February 2000) mostly interviews (group and individuals) were carried out to follow up the process and survey changes in the perception of the resettlement scheme.

The Resettlement Process

The people of the Korup region in Southwest Cameroon were, till recently, used to a system of shifting cultivation. It is said, "that the whole tribe once lived between the present sites of Ekong and Ekundu-Kundu on a hill known as Jun a Korup" (Carr 1923, B3; cf. Inyang 1988, 2). Three villages of the Korup Tribe (Okpabe, Okabe and Ekonenaku) had resettled during WWI to Nigeria (Carr 1923, B1,7). The village of Ekong, until 1972 located at the northern boundaries of Korup Forest Reserve, had started to split its settlement in 1937, one part moving south into the forest reserve (today's Erat or Ekong II) and one to the southwest (today's Ekong I).

In 1937, the British administration for Southern Cameroon established the "Korup Native Administration Forest Reserve", which was smaller than today's Korup National Park (Korup Report 1936; 44, 61-67). The forest reserve did not surround Ekundu-Kundu, but other villages, for whom enclaves were demarcated, to allow them to carry out their farming, hunting and fishing (Korup Report 1936, 65-67). The villages at the boundaries of the reserve, such as Ekundu-Kundu, were exclusively allowed to fish, to hunt, to gather NTFP's and even log timber within the reserve for private use and even for trading to certain limits, which were to be controlled by the local authorities (Korup Report 1936, 65). These rights were guarantied through a written contract, signed on September 22nd 1937 (Korup Report 1936, 44).

The idea to resettle villages within the boundaries of the existing Korup Forest Reserve and villages, which were to have been surrounded by the prospected Korup National Park, was discussed for the first time in public in December 1981. The SDO (Senior District Officer) of N'dian Division wrote a letter to the chiefs of Bera, Esukutan, Ikenge and Bareka Batanga, situated
inside the forest reserve, to inform them that "it is envisaged that you be moved for resettlement elsewhere so that you can enjoy better facilities in future" (in: Devitt 1988, 40). The people of Ekundu-Kundu were told that resettlement was inevitable and imminent, but that it would offer better amenities and opportunities than those currently available. It was said that the establishment of the National Park would attract development to the area and many jobs would be created (Devitt 1988,40). The development promised in 1981 did not take place. A road was constructed in 1986, but the 300 tourists, who find their way to Mundemba each year, created only a few jobs.

In 1982 the first governmental delegation, after 22 years of independence, together with the two European promoters of the Korup National Park, visited the villages and informed the inhabitants "that the villages inside the prospected Korup National Park were to be resettled" (Report 1982). The villagers were told that if they resettle voluntarily, they would receive compensation, if they "cause trouble, the armed forces would drive them out" (Gartlan 1982, Report 1982). The chiefs "agreed".

On October 30th, 1986, the Korup National Park with an area of 125,900 ha was gazetted. To secure the Korup National Park, Korup Project - funded by WWF-UK and ODA - was implemented on February 3rd 1988. Its objective is seen in the protection of Korup National Park through rural development in the support zone, through the change of hunter-and-gatherer societies into farmers and through the resettlement of all villages inside the national park.

Ekong I, a village which is located outside the Korup National Park, but sandwiched between the Korup and the Cross River National Park in Nigeria is included in the resettlement scheme, because the officials hold the view that Ekong I is unable to develop in its momentary location without hunting and gathering in one of the parks. Nevertheless, the resettlement of Ekong I cannot be covered by the law, because the Cameroonian law for national parks mentions nothing about buffer zones.

![Fig. 1: The Korup Project resettlement scheme](image-url)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village-Name</th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Inhabitants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bareka Batanga</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bera</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ekung II (Erat)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ekundu-Kundu</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esukutan</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ikunge</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Ekong I)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>149</strong></td>
<td><strong>211</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
That the process of negotiations on resettlement was all but voluntary, becomes obvious in workshop documents: in his opening speech of the major resettlement workshop (6 July 1991), the SDO Ndian stated: "It is true that a forest reserve cannot be said to be conserved if it is inhabited by people who, in their effort to eke out a living, are bound to carry out activities that destroy what we want to preserve. That is therefore the reason why it has been found necessary to displace the population of the villages presently situated within the Park to a new site considerably removed from the Park" (WWF 1991, 2).

The representative of the WWF in Cameroon used in his address a form of extortion: "WWF would like to see the villages from inside the park resettled to a site where benefits can be brought to them" (WWF 1991, 5). "WWF can do nothing unless there is quick choice of a site; there is a real danger that funding agencies seeing the discussions, debates and arguments will decide not to fund any site or any resettlement programme" (WWF 1991, 6). The conservator of Korup National Park used cynical elements in his speech, when he said, that "a national park is a large tract of land declared to be public property by a national government (...) Hiking, camping, game viewing, photography and science research are permitted because they do not alter the park" (WWF 1991, 11). How many villagers will enjoy these opportunities?

In contrast to the official statements, the legal background of resettlement in the context of national park management is not clear: according to the Cameroonian law, people are only not allowed to carry out activities like hunting, farming, fishing etc., which are related to human settlement, within the boundaries of a national park, if these activities interfere with management plans for the national park, but does this prosecute all human settlements? (Ruitenbeek 1988a 4-7 cf. Law No. 94/01 of 20th January 1994 and the Decree No. 95/466 of 20 July, 1995). According to a forestry-law expert, it should be possible to include human activities up to a certain level legally into the management plan of a national park. Despite this unclear situation the government decided to resettle all villages by paying compensation in form of better houses and infrastructure. While the neighbouring Central African Republic has a national resettlement policy - following and parallel to the World Bank policy (Cernea 1997, 24/25) -, the Cameoonian government based their decision on the vague construction of a "public purpose" for this resettlement (Ruitenbeek 1988a, 16-18). The lack of an appropriate resettlement policy in Cameroon resulted even in the suspension of a World Bank financed urban resettlement programme in Douala, the economic capital of Cameroon (World Bank 1996, 25; Cenea 1997, 32). But this critique did neither culminate in a revision of resettlement programmes in Cameroon, nor in a general discussion of the existing resettlement policy. The resettlement scheme of Korup National Park continued.

After the occurrence of enormous political and ethnic problems within the resettlement programme for the villages of the Bakoko clan (Bera, Esukutan and Ikenge) in 1991, Korup Project decided that Ekundu-Kundu should
become the pilot village for resettlement. In February 1993 the Project Manager of Korup Project went on a sensitisation mission to Ekundu-Kundu. He made clear, that "it is government, which is moving the people and not the project, the project is merely assisting the people to guide them to make a good choice of where to resettle" (Report 1993). This official interpretation still used in 2000 contrasts with the reality, because the Government of Cameroon is, due to budget problems, not even in a position to contribute with technical staff free of charge. From the very first beginning it was Korup Project, funded by EU, WWF, (ODA) DFID, GTZ and US-DoD, who resettled Cameroonians in Cameroon. This is important to mention, because these agencies can - in contrast to the government of Cameroon - hardly claim that they did not have knowledge of appropriate resettlements procedures or the value of social sciences for this process or sufficient funding. Due to that the Korup resettlement scheme would have been able to avoid a large number of traps which are seen as causes of failures of resettlement projects in Africa (Cernea 1997, 21/22).

Following the above mentioned meeting in 1993, the village authorities of Ekundu-Kundu "decided:
1. that they have agreed and accepted to be resettled at the River Mbute site.
2. that houses and other amenities should be provided on the chosen site.
3. that necessary logistics should be put in place to ensure that the land should not revert to the present owners (Fabe) in future. In other words, that ownership of the land be given to them to forestall any unforeseen disturbance of quiet enjoyment." (Report 1993)

Based on this agreement, first activities started (road construction and clearing), but neither a strategy was elaborated nor a detailed agreement signed. It was only after nearly 5 years of resettlement work, that the first and last agreement letter was signed by the village chief and the SDO Ndian on December 9th 1997: "The facilitator (Government of Cameroon) had requested the resettling village to voluntary (sic) identify a viable relocation site outside the Korup National Park and resettle there. The resettling village is willing and has accepted voluntarily to relocate." One does not have to be a law-expert to see that a government can hardly "request" a person to do something voluntarily. It also does not make much sense to say, that one accepts something voluntarily. Either it is done voluntarily or it is requested and accepted. Another major problem arises from the fact, that in the socio-cultural environment of Southwest Cameroon and the Korup area especially, representation through chiefs was imposed by the colonialists to buy community land from individuals. By not including the various households in the decision-making process, the government could not separate from this practise. The government is requested by this contract:
The resettling village agrees:
a) to move voluntarily immediately the houses are constructed.
b) to participate fully in the resettlement process and respect all decisions of resettlement meetings. As said before, it is difficult to believe that the officials do not know, that these kind of "promises" can hardly be subject of a contract or agreement - with this kind of contracts, villages were sold into slavery.
c) to encourage women to participate. See b)
d) to work on their farms and help in the construction. It is difficult to understand, why the undersigning parties do not include any information on financial agreements or farm-sizes.
e) not to hunt in the park or develop farms and/or any other activities that are against the park regulation after relocation (Agreement 1997).

Based on a very critical Mid-Term Review Report (February 1997) an Action Plan for Restructuring was elaborated and finally presented in February 1998. Following the approved agenda of international organisations (c.f. Cernea 1994, 23; Cook 1994) different assignments were given to the resettlement unit of Korup Project:

- "Studies on a viable resettlement strategy for Korup National Park available." **Present situation:** Unfulfilled. Four studies were carried out (Schmidt-Soltau 1999a and 1999b, Evaluation 2000, Röschenthaler 2000), but no appropriate strategy resulted from the findings. Instead, the resettlement coordinator is asking for different consultants to come out with more positive results.
- "Resettlement action plan approved by authorised bodies." **Present situation:** Unfulfilled. An action plan has been elaborated but never applied for approval.
- "Implementing bodies are operating." **Present situation:** Unfulfilled, especially the co-operation of the different bodies and their responsibilities and not clarified.
- "Active participation of villagers in resettlement programme effective." **Present situation:** Unfulfilled, especially letters of agreement are missing or unclear.
- "Suitable sites for resettlement developed." **Present situation:** Fulfilled, but only in concern of Ekundu-Kundu. (Action Plan 1998).
In October 1998 the construction work started with the first houses but on January 13th 2000. More than half a year after the houses were ready only seven families had transferred their property (Letter 2000).

On February 25th 2000, the resettlement site of Ekundu-Kundu was officially inaugurated by the Cameroonian Minister of Environment and Forest. The villagers were expected to clean the village for free - which they refused -, but they were not invited to participate actively in the ceremony. Neither the chief nor the president of the task force was asked to welcome the donors or to express the view of the villagers.

**Results, Risks and Resolutions**

In 2000, seven years after the resettlement of Ekundu-Kundu was agreed on, it is still difficult to assess the socio-economic situation at the resettlement site. Only 7 families had in January 2000 transferred their properties to the new site and made it their centre of living. Nobody is able to say, what will happen after the official inauguration. Are the Ekundu-Kundu villagers rushing back to their old site? Are they all staying permanently - or at least most of the time - at the new site? Do they split up? Based on that, it is only possible to compare the socio-economic reality in the old site with the prospected socio-economic opportunities in the new site. Nobody is able to say today, whether the expected positive or negative developments in the new site are coming to fruition or not. Nevertheless, the last part of the resettlement of Ekundu-Kundu has started. According to the 1997 agreement, starting from February 2001, the Ekundu-Kundu villagers are not allowed to enter the Korup National Park without authorisation.

---

**Fig. 2: Some background information on Ekundu-Kundu**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men (18-50)</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>(90)</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men (above 50)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(34)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women (18-50)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(29)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women (&gt; 50)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>(31)</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>500 m</td>
<td>300 m</td>
<td>50 m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huts used</td>
<td>240</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5 km</td>
<td>9 km</td>
<td>9 km</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance to water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 min</td>
<td>0 min</td>
<td>0 min</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance to road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25 km</td>
<td>9 km</td>
<td>9 km</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dist. to market</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dist. to hospital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town hall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Hall</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Primary (same)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The discussion will follow the Impoverishment Risk and Reconstruction (IRR) model (Cernea 1999, 2000), which identifies the following dimensions of impoverishment:

- **Landlessness** (expropriation of land assets)
- **Joblessness** (even when the resettlement creates some temporary jobs)
- **Homelessness** (loss of not merely the physical houses, but of the family and communal home and cultural space, with resulting alienation)
- **Marginalisation** (socially, psychologically and economically downward mobility)
- **Food insecurity** (malnourishment, etc.)
- **Increased morbidity and mortality**
- **Loss of access to common property** (such as forests, bodies of water, wastelands, cultural sites, customs and traditions)
- **Social disarticulation**

### The Risk of Landlessness

To find unoccupied land is not difficult in the African rainforest. With an average population density of 30 inhabitants per km² in the South-West Province and less than 10 inhabitants per km² in the Ndian Division, the facilitators of the resettlement of Ekundu-Kundu were able to reduce the risk of landlessness. The problem, which occurred in the case of Ekundu-Kundu was not the lack of land available for houses, farms and hunting and gathering areas, but a complicated legal status of landownership. Officially all land, which was not claimed as personal property (plantations etc.) till 1974 is state property, but unofficially traditional ownership of land exists all over the country and is tolerated by the local administrations. If one follows this traditional landownership, no "unoccupied land" exists. In the traditional form of shifting settlements the settlers are expected to compensate the "host-villages" for a number of years (mostly one generation) and follow like a quarter of the village up to a certain extent, the advise and decisions of the traditional council of the host village. Since the government requested the land from the two host villages of the Ekundu-Kundu resettlement site, different forms of compensation were agreed on, but the villagers of Ekundu-Kundu are afraid, that the host villages request, in the long run, the traditional compensation as well. One option to solve the problem arose from a new forestry law, implemented in 1997. The law promotes communal ownership of forests, but the administration slows down the process of implementing these community forests, because it reduces their opportunities to generate money from forest exploitation. Till now Ekundu-Kundu has not received an official...
land title for the site, which was demarcated nearly ten years ago as their new home.

The host villages
The resettlement site of Ekundu-Kundu is more than 5 km away from the next village, but two villages (Ituka and Fabe) are claiming traditional ownership for the land and the prospected community forest of the resettlement site. Ekundu-Kundu is highly welcomed by its host-villages. For the people of Fabe, which is quite developed and active, the problem of ownership is more related to prestige and honour, while in Ituka, which is a dying place, the requested compensation is seen as the last chance to stop the migration of their youth. The question of compensation is accompanying the excellent infrastructure and the modern houses in the resettlement site, which produces jealousy among the inhabitants of the host-villages. To reduce the conflicts it was agreed to compensate both villages by constructing access roads to the villages. Fabe received its road in 1994 and the people are satisfied. Because the road construction to Ituka - a village with 6 houses - was seen as too expensive, the village was invited to resettle at the newly constructed Mundemba-Fabe road (Meeting 1994). The villagers refused to resettle for free, while Ekundu-Kundu received enormous compensation for the same exercise. In an agreement (Undertaking 2/2/1998) the government promised to build the five kilometre road, but nothing has happened.

The risk of joblessness
In the case of Ekundu-Kundu, this risk does not arise from the risk of losing wage employment, because the remote location foils the people living permanently in the village to enter employment outside their farming, fishing and gathering activities. In 1923, farming was the only source of income next to hunting and gathering, but "farming is carried out in the most haphazard and slovenly manner" (Carr 1923,24). "Farming is mainly in the hands of the women. (...) Men may join for mutual help in cleaning the ground, or a rich man may call for helpers, and give them a present of food, and a goat, in return for their labours" (Carr 1923,24). The area used as a farm was between one acre (4046.24 m²) and one acre and a half (6069.36 m²) per family (Carr 1923,25).

As one can see from the figures not much has changed until now. The economic activities of Ekundu-Kundu villagers are still connected to the hunting and gathering style of living. While fresh bush-meat is sold solely to Nigeria, dried meat is transported to various markets. Hunting is the main source of cash-income. The illegal aspect of hunting inside the national park did not count for the hunters. Instead of welcoming the resettlement to an area where hunting could be legalised, the hunters fear increased controls through game-guards and tax-collectors at their new site, which is easier accessible. Officially hunting always requires a licence, but controls are only known in areas accessible by roads. As a consequence of these negative
aspects of the resettlement-process and due to the fact that the hunters do not appreciate their new hunting zone, they stated that they will continue hunting inside Korup National Park, where controls are limited and easy to avoid. Another reason for this negative perception of the entire resettlement programme, is their impression that farming would not offer them the same income as hunting.

It is obvious, that in remote areas, economic systems and societal expectations are either working or not. In the case of Ekundu-Kundu it seems as if the high Nigerian interest in bush-meat, provides the villagers with suitable and satisfying economic activities. 75% of the Ekundu-Kundu villagers and even 88% of the decision-makers are satisfied with their economic opportunities in the old Ekundu-Kundu. Only 25% of the people claimed that the resettlement site would improve their income.

On the other hand, the developments in many villages in the regions prove that it is possible to earn a living from farming. While this was carried out in Ekundu-Kundu mostly by women at the resettlement-site, all inhabitants received their own farms. This change is related to the expectation that intensive farming should become the main occupation of the villagers. Two major problems were seen in the lack of personal land-certificates for their farms and in the exposure of the farms to thieves. The agriculture system, which was imposed on them is, in general, not sustainable and embodies the risk of food insecurity.

Fishing was carried out by men and women in the old site. While fishing for private consumption with fish-traps and netting is more women's business, the fishing for selling as dried fish with poison (gamalin) was carried out by men. The Mundemba market, as a place to generate personal income from selling fish, could force them to increase this activity, but they agreed that it is more difficult to fish at the new site. Women especially complained, that fish-traps were stolen and that other people use "their rivers" for gamalin fishing.
Livestock was limited at the old site of Ekundu-Kundu. Most families had goats, chicken and dogs for sale. They kept them as a form of account, because they were only sold in hard times. Some people stated that they wanted to change that at the new site, because they observed that these goods are rare in the Mundemba market. In 2000 such a change did not take place. In 1999 they asked Korup Project to grant them pigs and the necessary buildings and instruments, but this was rejected.

Trading is seen as the positive impact of the resettlement, but if all people, who want to become rich through trading, start a shop in the resettlement site it will soon look like a market lacking customers. The expectations are so high that satisfaction seems impossible. The first credit was given out in January 2000 to start a shop in the village. It can be questioned if this strategy will be successful, because each villager received huge amounts of money during the house construction period and from clearing their farms (more than the official annual salary of a minister), but nobody seems to have invested this money wisely. One gets the impression, that the villagers did not learn money management - no training was offered.

Other forms of income-generating activities are seen in the field of construction work. The young men involved in the construction of the resettlement site, hope that they will be contracted to construct other resettlement sites and village infrastructure programmes. They see in it a reasonable source of income, but the limited area of Ndian Division cannot offer jobs for all of them.

Some of the villagers realised that the resettlement itself is a chance to become rich and provide a better future to the youth. An enormous increase of village population in the resettlement-documents has to be seen from that perspective. The village administration managed to receive more houses, more farms, more compensation than they should have. Even if they did not receive the differences between reality and manufactured reality in cash, they are aware that Korup Project spent without many complaints more that ECU 6600,- for each adult villager, which is more than ten times the annual average income in Cameroon. While Korup Project is spending money "like it is going out of fashion", it is wishful thinking, that villagers will rely on themselves after the inauguration. Korup Project moved without need into the position of the "patron" and it will be impossible for them to interact with Ekundu-Kundu as with any other village.

It is obvious that if the offered economic opportunities at the new site do not satisfy the inhabitants of Ekundu-Kundu, they will not change their life towards a farming-based society, with reduced hunting activities. The main aims of the resettlement will be missed. 214 ha of primary forest were cleared for nothing and cast doubt on the resettlement of the other villages. This hypothesis seems to be still more realistic than the hopes of Korup Project.
that the villagers change into successful farmers within a short period. In general, it seems obvious that neither sustainability nor adequacy was ever taken into consideration.

**The Risk of Homelessness**

Home is understood following the IRR model in a broader sense. It includes community infrastructure, personal homes and cultural space and access to the outside world. In 1923 "bush tracks, which are extremely rough and hilly" (Carr 1923,33) were leading to Ekundu-Kundu. Bridges were rarely found but used at rivers, which were too deep to cross by foot. They were either hammock bridges or "by single tree trunks stretching from bank to bank" (Carr 1923,33). In 1923, the nearest school was found in Ngumu and Mosoniseli, more than two day tracking (Carr 1923,35). In 1923, houses were oblong in shape with mud walls, and were roofed with mats made from leaves of the raffia palm. All had doors and windows, which were carefully made of timber (Carr 1923,51). In 1994 Ekundu-Kundu received a primary school from Korup Project. Nevertheless, the school seems to be the only major change between 1923 and 2000. Only two houses in Ekundu-Kundu have a zinc roof, but none is built with bricks or cement. The only "modern" products available in the old Ekundu-Kundu are matches and kerosene for bush-lamps. The foot-path is narrow and one has to pass several streams.

80% of the villagers in 1999 were satisfied with the new location, but 58% asked for electricity, 42% for a school up to class 7, 39% for a church, 32% for tap water and 32% for a health centre. In 2000 tap water is available, but not appreciated by the villagers. In general, the infrastructure has to be seen as better than in the old site. The improvement is mostly related to the access road. The opportunities for health care and the transport of farm products, which arise from the road, are highly appreciated. Some people realised some negative impacts, especially the exposure to strangers. Thefts, a phenomena, which was said to be unknown at the old site, seems to be a serious problem at the new site.

The key question on the infrastructure is the question of sustainability and adequacy. The sustainability of infrastructure depends on the quality of buildings and installations and if the inhabitants are technically or financially able to maintain them.

**Communal infrastructure**

The quality of the community buildings is poor. Creaks in walls and floors, leaking roofs, and unfinished bits and pieces are common in all three buildings (school, community hall and ekpe hall). It will be expensive to maintain these buildings, because they are constructed with cement blocks and zinc roofing. The villagers claim that repairs and maintenance should be funded by Korup Project, while the Project sees either the US-DoD (the funding agent for these three buildings) or the villagers as responsible. The US-DoD expect the
villagers to take care of the structures donated to them. This unclear situation is based on the lack of contracts or agreements on the maintenance of the community buildings. That the villagers are not able or willing to carry out this community labour arises from the fact, that Korup Project failed in the area of capacity building. Since the Ekundu-Kundu villagers joined the resettlement programme, they were paid for everything and lost their ability to organise their community by themselves. It was a failure not to have asked the villagers to contribute to the construction of community houses, because experience show that people feel little responsibility for something, which was given for free. This is underlined by the villagers' boycott of the inauguration ceremony (February 25th 2000): the villagers refused to clean the village as long as they were not paid. They do not understand, why they should clean something, not seen as their property.

Another communal infrastructure which was poorly planned and constructed is the water system in the village, which embodies a high risk of increased morbidity and mortality. Until now no water committee was installed in the resettlement site for maintenance and repairs. Korup Project was seen as responsible, while Korup Project saw responsibility as the villagers'. Again the absence of a capacity building programme has to be seen as responsible for the failure and it seems to be only a question of time, till the water supply breaks down.

The ekpe hall has to be seen as an example of an inadequate infrastructure. While the member of the ekpe secret society still holds the view, that this is a suitable building for their traditional society, it is obvious, that it is not. Traditions can hardly be performed in a super-modern structure like the ekpe hall of Ekundu-Kundu. It is well to have huge windows in a building, but how does one "protect" the place, when secret rituals are performed? The ekpe-hall is also, from the view point of the donors, not adequate, because the most impressive building in town is only used by a small minority.
Table 3: The hall of the ekpe secret society in the old Ekundu-Kundu

**Individual infrastructure**

The majority of the villagers do not like the houses (56%), because they are said to be too small. The fact, that some of the houses have cracks and that some bricks do not survive the rain, has to be seen in the light that their old houses were just compiled of sticks and mud. The individual infrastructure (personal houses) is theoretically sustainable. The quality is satisfactory and based on the use of local material and the training of the villagers easy to maintain, if necessary machines are provided. The problem now occurs, that the villagers do not feel responsible for their houses. They now expect Korup Project to pay for everything as well as in the future. This seems to be related to the fact, that - in contrast to the instructions of the donor - the villagers did not contribute to the construction of the houses. They were paid for everything and the ECU 120,000,-, which was spent for labour in the house-construction process, did not help the villagers - as it was indeed intended - but sabotaged their feeling of belonging.

Another problem arises from the enormous number of houses. Everybody agrees that most of the houses will not be used all the time, because the people do not see Ekundu-Kundu as a centre of their living. It can be expected that in some years a number of houses will be covered by grass. This will have negative impact on the substance of the houses, because necessary repairs would be carried out too late.

The individual houses are inadequate. One has to blame the donors not stopping Korup Project from building a town instead of a village. While the old place has 23 living houses, the new one has 53. For what? Some people expressed the view, that it is better to spend money on houses which are not needed, than on an unproductive administration. It is not only a waste of money, material and energy, but also a negative influence to village social structure.

**THE RISK OF MARGINALISATION**

The risk of marginalisation arises in the case of Ekundu-Kundu not that much from the risk of becoming a stranger at the new site, because the old location is less than 3 hours trekking and they have good relations with the neighbouring Fabe (intermarriages are common and they understand each other's language). The risk appears from the resettlement itself. For the past twenty years, the villages inside the area of the Korup National Park received special treatment. Ministers, ambassadors, scientists, foreigners, project staff visited Ekundu-Kundu and donated things and entertained the village. From examples of other villages in the area, which received attention of donors for some years, one can expect that soon a feeling of being abandoned will make an appearance among the villagers of Ekundu-Kundu (Schmidt-Soltau 2000). Following the resettlement schedule Ekundu-Kundu will be treated as any other of the 187 villages in the support zone of the Korup Project from January
2001. These villages are often not visited for months of even years and are expected to contribute financially to any assistance granted to them.

Another form of marginalisation is related to the changing social and economic system. The chiefs, traditional councils, secret societies, which are very powerful in the old village will be marginalized as documented below. Also special skills, which are no longer required - traditional doctors, affoladies (producing local 'whiskey'), palm wine tappers, porters (carrying up to 50 kilos for more than 40 km a day) and to a certain level hunters (their knowledge of the environment of the old site becomes useless) will soon become marginalized if no form of social compensation allows them to develop new skills. The whole aspect of psychological marginalisation has to be seriously monitored and resolutions are scarce (Fernandes 2000).

**THE RISK OF FOOD INSECURITY**

The agriculture system, which was imposed on Ekundu-Kundu villagers, is in general unsustainable and could result in food insecurity. "From the evaluation, it was seen that the state of their farms will not generate enough income and food to sustain their families when they eventually move to the new site. The big reason being that the farms were not well cared for" (Report 1999). But no additional training was offered to enable the villagers to establish proper farms on their land. Instead more farmland than requested was donated. To donate things when training is required, does not result in a sustainable use of the natural resources. This insecurity of food from the farms will not result directly in under-nourishment, since the forest offers all nutrition requested, but in the long run a hunter-and-gatherer-society can not survive at the location of the resettlement site. While the national park and the remoteness of the old location secured wildlife and forest products for generations, the villagers will face in their new location a high and quickly increasing human pressure of the natural resources. If no alternative sources of food supply are implemented in the future, this will result in serious under-nourishment.

**THE RISK OF INCREASED MORBIDITY AND MORTALITY**

In the short run morbidity will reduce due to easier access to medical services. This is seen as the main improvement of the resettlement site. But many factors can counteract this advantage and result in an increased morbidity. The main constraint is the poorly planned and constructed water system in the village, which embodies a high risk of increased morbidity and mortality. The water source dwindled drastically in the dry season 2000. The pipes are running sometimes above the surface. In February 2000 no water committee was installed for maintenance and repairs. It is only a question of time, till the water supply breaks down with tremendous impact on the health situation. The water quality will be worse than in the old village. While the old Ekundu-Kundu has a major river close by, the next permanent water source at the resettlement site is a small stream about 2 km away, which is also used for fishing with poison. To reduce the negative perception of the resettlement site
and to camouflage the problem, Korup Project pumped water into the system during the 2000 dry season. It can be expected that they would not do so forever. Questioned, the officials stated that this is not their problem and the Ekundu-Kundu villagers should reduce their usage of water.

**THE RISK OF LOSS OF ACCESS TO COMMON PROPERTY**

According to Carr the customs of the Bima, Balundu Badiku and Korup ethnic group, which is classified as a semi-bantu tribe, are similar (Carr 1923, 1). It seems as if they moved into the region of Korup from Beboka (Lipenja-region), when the population of this region became too large for their territory (Carr 1923,9). Inyang claimed that "the Korup people originated from the Bantoid race in Central African Republic. They immigrated into Cameroon about the fourteenth century, where they first settled with the Bamenda people for about three years before finally finding their permanent settlement in a place called Kitok" (Inyang 1988,2).

In Carr’s report on ethnological facts of the region (Carr 1923, 44-48) no ritual or custom is described, which is related to a specific area. It seems that this is due to the needs of the shifting lifestyle of the inhabitants of the Korup region. Like in most other ethnic groups in that region "each man is supposed to possess a soul in some animal. He is himself aware of the animal in which his soul resides, but he does not, under any circumstances, disclose the name of the animal to anybody. The death of the animal in which his soul resides, is supposed to cause the death of the man. This does not prevent him hunting and killing the species of animal to which he is allied, as it is but one in which his soul resides. Should the man and the animal meet, it is believed that recognition would immediately take place, and naturally no harm would occur to either" (Carr 1923,48). As long as it is believed that this relation exists mostly with animals - or even natural phenomena such as rainbows - which are situated in the nearer surrounding of the place of birth, the resettlement seems to raise the problem of hunters of other areas, who hunt in the former hunting area of Ekundu-Ekundu after the village is resettled without knowing which animal is related to a villager and which one is "free". The totemistic belief of the villagers, which can also be interpreted as a traditional form of conservation, could cause problems as long as Korup National Park is unable to guarantee that no other hunters move into the hunting area of Ekundu-Kundu. In 1988, Infield received a statement which expresses this potential danger: "If the people leave the forest, others from Nigeria will move in and there will be war" (Infield 1988, 58).

In 1999 Ekundu-Kundu villagers stated that they wanted to continue with their rituals and worship their traditional gods, but on the other hand, 29% of them asked for a Christian church. While the details of the rituals and the belief system are not of so much interest, it is worth mentioning, that in contrast to the willingness of the villagers to keep their traditions in mind, they were of the view that witchcraft will be reduced in the new environment.
While elder people criticised this change, young people and women look forward to the new lifestyle. They state that they hate the domination of the elders in the village. Women, who we met alone talked quite negatively about the birth-rituals. They were hoping that they would be able to deliver in the Mundemba hospital in the future and use "modern medicine". The access to "modern doctors" has to be seen as a development in the field of health care, but it reduces the "power" of witchcraft and through that the traditional basis of the society.

Witchcraft, which has to be seen as the driving force of the traditional society, only works in its universal and original meaning in places like the old Ekundu-Kundu. None of the 25 pupils were able to name the president of Cameroon. They did not know about Nigeria, Iran or America. In such an environment, rituals get a meaning which is far beyond folkloristic traditions, which are found in the major villages and towns. On February 22nd 2000 the last ekpe stone was transferred into the "super-modern" ekpe-hall at the resettlement site. Some of the experts hold the view, that the various donated libations can be seen as a useful contribution for an active traditional life at the new site. But one could also think the contrary: soon villagers will think of libations only in terms of money and their stage of drunkenness and not of real belief.

Table 4: The ekpe hall at the resettlement site. A place to worship traditional Gods?

However, the conservation of human societies and indigenous knowledge is neither an objective of Korup National Park, nor a common aim of the Cameroonian government. Some younger people of Ekundu-Kundu already adopted traditional elements to their new lifestyle and stated that they have had an ancestral song for a log time with the inspiring title "KORUP Has Taken Our Forest".
THE RISK OF SOCIAL DISARTICULATION

My 1999 research documented that the economic changes will affect the social system, because their hunter and gatherer society can barely survive so close to a town. The fact that money will become a major element of social interaction in the new site, cannot be overestimated in its social impact. The resettlement process had already affected the traditional institutions of societal stratification:

![Fig. 4: In the case of conflicts, where do you go for a solution?](https://example.com/image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ekundu-Kundu</th>
<th>Resettlement-Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elder</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KORUP-Project</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While in Ekundu-Kundu 57% wanted to consult the chief in case of a conflict, in the resettlement-site 70% saw Korup as conflict-manager. This tendency increased in 2000. In conflicts concerning unfinished houses or money, the villagers directly contacted Korup Project instead of approaching the chief to forward their request. While in the traditional world of the old Ekundu-Kundu witchcraft and social prestige are social realities, the new site could be seen as ruled by the donor of the resettlement.

We discovered a significant gender inequality. Women were, according to their statements, neither involved in the discussions on the resettlement site, nor were they consulted when new houses were chosen. Most women and children could not remember a family meeting related to the above-mentioned decisions (80% and 88%), while all men stated that they had long and open discussion on these topics. A significant majority among the female villagers complained that no farms were given to them. This has not yet been changed.

While in the modern world, moral norms - whether based on tradition, convention, or belief - appear unable to provide means by which human beings can live together without conflict, in Ekundu-Kundu all these forces are seen as realities. "If you did something wrong you have to give afo-fo to the elders and to the gods." Witchcraft only works in closed societies - without the possibility to escape - and it is the driving force of the moral norms of Ekundu-Kundu people: "If somebody did something wrong in the village we will push him to follow the law or kill him with witchcraft, but at the new site we can only send him to prison. The youth will no longer follow the laws, because we will lose our power." "The laws will change at the new site, because so near the road the ju-ju can not come out as they like. We have to dance and carry out sacrifices before it works." An everyday phenomena in Ekundu-Kundu becomes a rare exception at the resettlement site. "Things Fall..."
Apart" as Chinua Achebe (1988) states. While all the above quoted statements come from elders or village-authorities, the youth adore the change: "We still will go to the chief to ask for conflict solutions, but if the solution is not satisfactory, we contact the administrative authorities."

This change, from a society based on tradition and belief to a society based on money and written laws, can be seen as the background for the requested land certificates and signed agreements, because village authorities do not trust their old style of libation-based contracts. This invention of modernity is also related to the feeling that the Ekundu-Kundu villagers are exposed at their new site. Some opinion leaders of the youth were attracted and settled down in Mundemba and only use the resettlement site as a base for farming and hunting, but no longer as a centre of living.

The villagers are aware of the substantial impact of resettlement for the social system of Ekundu-Kundu. According to their position towards resettlement they either feared the changes or did not mind them, because of the expected economic advantages. If the hopes will be satisfied or not is still open, but it is obvious that Korup Project forced the villagers of Ekundu-Kundu to change their lifestyle through the construction of "something" which has nothing to do with what the people were used to. The people are still the same, but their lives will never be.

**OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF THE SOCIO-ECONOMIC IMPACT**

Korup Project forced the villagers of Ekundu-Kundu without need into a new lifestyle. This was never agreed on and until the presentation of my 1999 report, never thought about. The reasons for that are unclear. It is my impression, that incompetent staff not only in the government and Korup Project, but also in the supervising donors understood the resettlement of Ekundu-Kundu solely as technical exercise. Why did they construct a town instead of a village? Why did they force the villagers to change their lifestyles by pouring millions and millions on them? The Korup Project staff do not recognise their responsibility for what has happened to the Ekundu-Kundu villagers. They claim that they were forced by the villagers to spend more and more money, but it is difficult, if not impossible, to follow their argumentation. That the villagers asked for more money, more houses, more farms etc. is no surprise and understandable. It was the responsibility of the facilitators to keep the resettlement of Ekundu-Kundu in a normal range. It was agreed in 1993 to relocate Ekundu-Kundu at a new location outside the Korup National Park and not to create a town, where the Ekundu-Kundu people become lost. This was unnecessary. Even before the resettlement of Ekundu-Kundu was agreed on West and Brenchin mentioned that, "the social impact of displacement and relocation is too little understood, both by professionals and scholars. When resident peoples are forced to move, certain general impacts can be expected" (West and Brenchin 1991, 17).
The adequacy of utilisation of funds

One of the chronic causes, why resettlement fails is the underfinancing of the whole exercise. The facilitators of the resettlement of Ekundu-Kundu cannot claim be caught by that trap. They had more than enough money (1 Mill. ECU) budgeted for resettlement, but they did not spend the money wisely. It is of minor importance for the discussion of the resettlement of Ekundu-Kundu to document the details of this careless attitude of the facilitator towards money (cf. the Budget in the Appendix - 665 FCFA are 1 ECU). Who is and was responsible and who benefited from the money spent without reason is difficult to say. But there must be a reason that Korup Project spent in total more than 79% without good reason. Calls for tenders were unknown in all economic operations. In contrast to the recommendation of the donors, companies from the capital received overpriced contracts for manual labour jobs like tree felling, where the effected population would have been able to carry out the exercise. To offer as many contracts as possible to the local population would have been cheaper, better for their feeling of ownership and involvement and a contribution to the alleviation of poverty in the region. Even if one remembers that Cameroon is, according to Transparency International, the most corrupt country in the world, Korup Project and Korup National Park, which are development and conservation projects financed by foreign donors, they should have been able to resist. In Cameroon it is common that an administrator, which gives out contracts, receives 50% of the total amount as "compensation" for his effort, but WWF, EU and US-DoD are not obliged to follow this practice. They spent ECU 550.000,- for 189 villagers, but it would have been possible - if not better - to carry out the whole resettlement of Ekundu-Kundu for ECU 110.000,-. Especially the fact that they spent more money on administration, than the whole resettlement could and should have cost, says more than any "details".

The perception of resettlement

The involvement of the population effected by displacement for conservation can be seen as the key for a successful resettlement. Korup Project never, ever tried to involve the local population of the national park into a sustainable wildlife and forest management or in the resettlement activities. They do not even know, whether the wildlife in the traditional village hunting zones is reducing or not. But instead of employing the hunters to carry out a bio-monitoring of their forest (Wells, Brandon and Hannah 1992), Korup Project focuses solemnly on the resettlement options. One could have the impression, that Korup Project ignored the worldwide discussion on community based conservation to carry on with the resettlement process.

Fig 5: Proportion of Ekundu-Kundu villagers prepared to resettle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1988a</th>
<th>1997a</th>
<th>1999</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An interesting question, which gave rise to long discussions, was the decision-making process towards the resettlement. A significant majority of the villagers are of the view that Korup Project chose a location and a village layout without participation of the village. They made Korup Project responsible for the whole resettlement process, from the very first planning till the construction of the last wall.

Nevertheless, a majority of the people could remember some village meetings, but most villagers complained that it was not an open discussion with participatory decisions. They reiterated that they were just informed about the resettlement without being consulted. Again one has to consider that this was totally unnecessary. The resettlement experts were preaching active participation for years, but Korup National Park only adopted the word - creating "participative resettlement" - but not the meaning. "In Africa, communication and participatory planning processes have proven to be a very weak point in resettlement. Resettlement experts have emphasised repeatedly the need to involve local organisations among both host and resettler populations in resettlement planning and implementation" (Cernea 1997,32/33). The facilitators and donors of the resettlement of Ekundu-Kundu do not see a need to change anything in that perspective - the results are known for long: "Treating resettlement as a mechanism only to get people out of the way of a project (…) has proved to be the cause of untold human misery" (Cernea 1997,22).

The impact of resettlement on the protection of the Korup National Park
Nobody is able to say today, whether the assumed positive impact for the wildlife and for the forest, which were the original motivation to promote the resettlement, are coming to fruition. While in the seventies and eighties most scientists agreed that it is necessary and useful for the wildlife to transfer people out of National Parks, in the late nineties most scientists changed their minds, because the wildlife population was not rising inside those National Parks without villages. It was in fact reduced by multiple effects. In Kenya, which was known for its strict policies of resettlement, "most wildlife exists outside of national parks. We have to make sure that wildlife has value to the people who must live with it" (Western; in: Butler 1998, 14). The latest idea to secure wildlife and forest in national parks seems to be "community-based conservation, in which local people participate in decision making and benefit directly from protecting wildlife on their land" (Butler 1998, 14; cf. Alverson 1996, Adams and McShane 1996, Furze 1996, Stevens 1997). Scientist like the widely-discussed Melissa Leach and Robin Mearn's book on the "Lie Of The Land" (1996) came to the conclusion that not only wildlife can be better preserved by inhabitants inside National Parks, but also the rainforest itself.

It is important to differentiate between different forms of and needs for resettlement. On the one hand there are self-reliant resettlements, as in the traditional form of shifting settlements (Vansina 1990, 35-69), or the voluntary resettlement of the villages in the Korup region, which are mentioned above. More complex issues are involuntary resettlements. There it is useful to differentiate between a common need to resettle people (to build something, which is of common interest) and situations where people are resettled for specific interests. It seems common with supports of resettlement to mix these two needs, not reflecting on the perception of the inhabitants towards this. Devitt tried at the conclusion of his excellent study to relate the resettlement of villages within Korup National Park to the resettlement of 14 villages, which had to move because of the Mape Dam, which was build to supply the Cameroon capital Yaoundé with water (Devitt 1988, 56). But if the needs for the two resettlement schemes are surveyed, one will discover that the example of Mape Dam has no bearing on the resettlement of villages within a National Park. That a dam contributes to the development of an area and a society to a certain extent, is indisputable in development sciences (c.f. Cernea 1999 and Guggenheim 1994), but as Devitt states himself, "in several villages there is the belief that the Korup National Park is a white people's, and not a Cameroonian initiative. Some people think the whites have bought the land from the Government because it has some value, which the local people are unaware of" (Devitt 1988, 41; cf. Infield 1988, 35, Sayer 1991, 38, Colchester 1997, 107). It is useless to discuss here, whether Korup National Park is a "white men business" or not, because it was established as a National Park by the Cameroonian Government, but it is obvious that the people in the villages do not understand the need to leave the area. They received the impression that they have to go, because of private interests of foreigners and not to contribute to the development of their whole region.
The major question of the whole exercise of the resettlement of Ekundu-Kundu as the pilot village of the Korup National Park resettlement scheme, is the question whether the resettlement reduces the human pressure on forest and wildlife or not. If this question could be answered positively, one would have to think about other forms of resettlement to reduce the negative impacts, but if the answer would be negative, one would wonder, why so much money was spent for nothing. As mostly in life, no easy answer arises from the findings:

Carr describes the area as "purely pagan" (Carr 1923,3). "The whole area is covered with dense forest, and even in the highest parts, no decrease in density is noticed" (Carr 1923,5). The villages cleared only the ground but did not cut the major trees. Palm trees were planted around the farms (Carr 1923,27). During the German colonial times only ebony was exploited as timber and camwood was used in small quantities for local consumption (Carr 1923,28).

Table 5: The youth of Ekundu-Kundu and a highly endangered drill
The main purpose to resettle Ekundu-Kundu outside the Korup National Park, is the impression that hunting activities of the villagers reduce the wildlife population. The Infield Report (1988) gave comprehensive information about hunters, hunting and the ecological dimension of this source of income for the villagers, but he did not carry out bio-monitoring to give a scientific answer to that question. Infield asked the villagers about their willingness to stop hunting, which was seen by him as the only alternative to resettlement:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. 7: Attitude towards the ban of hunting</th>
<th>1988a</th>
<th>1999</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am prepared to stop hunting</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am not interested to reduce hunting</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The hunters who did not want to stop hunting, also agreed that they do not fear sanctions by game guards, because they stated to know the forest better than anybody else and that they are able to hide there even if a whole battalion is searching for them. Another problem is produced by Korup Project itself. The young men earned a substantial amount of money through their involvement in construction work in the resettlement site and used this money to buy better guns and traps. The majority of the villagers appreciate these increasing hunting activities, because now they are able to eat from time to time some game themselves, while before everything was directly exported to Nigeria. Inside the Korup National Park a lively bush-meat trade takes place, which is the major source of monetary income for the village, and is seen as an important step towards development. Most of the time one or two bush-meat traders are waiting in Ekundu-Kundu for the "fresh" meat (monkeys, drills and deer), which they transfer to Nigeria, while the dried meat from the traps is also sold in Cameroon. The hunters as well as the traders stated that as long as Ekundu-Kundu people hunt in their hunting-zone no foreign hunters enter that area, but all agree that as soon as Ekundu-Kundu people give up controlling this area, other hunters come in.

Another interesting point is strongly related to this: as long as the villagers and especially the hunters do not have the impression that their activity reduces the wildlife population, it will be difficult for the authorities to convince the people of Ekundu-Kundu to stop hunting, trapping or fishing inside the National Park.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. 8: Perception of wildlife</th>
<th>1988a</th>
<th>1999</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wildlife has reduced</td>
<td>36 %</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wildlife has not reduced</td>
<td>64 %</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Infield related his findings to the reduction of wildlife around the villages, while he suggested that outside the one day hunting area, it still remained the same as before (Infield 1988, 39). "Many of the villagers engaged in hunting
and trapping are young men who have completed their education but have been unable to secure employment, or have lost jobs as a result of the worsening economic situation in the country. Generally these men have no strong attachment to the way of life and would eagerly turn to alternative ways of making a living, if provided with an equivalent level of income” (Infield 1988, 47). Infield indicates that Korup National Park should offer the active hunters from the park-villages a better paid job (Infield 1988, 48). But who should pay or control them?

All these problems originate from a different perception of forest as such. Korup National Park tries to conserve forest and its wildlife, because Cameroonian government and international donors are interested in the abstract idea of environmental conservation. The villagers of Ekundu-Kundu do not join in this abstract view and in their majority do not even understand it. The tropical rainforest “is very nice to me. I use it for trapping and hunting. My heart is glad, when I shoot or catch animals in the forest.” This statement is representative for the people of Ekundu-Kundu. They all focused in their perception of their surrounding on the exploitability and productivity of the forest.

It seems obvious that all Ekundu-Kundu villagers have at least some knowledge about the objectives and aims of Korup National Park. But an abstract knowledge, which includes that Korup Project wants to protect forest and wildlife, still gives rise to a large variety of interpretations and opinions. Some villagers are of the view, that the government tries to stop hunting inside the park, because “they want to create a place where animals are kept to eat later, when the animals of the other forests are finished.” A significant majority (77%) expresses that Korup National Park is a white men’s idea, which is not useful for Cameroonian. After all the village meetings, workshops, task-force discussions and aid, 70% of the Ekundu-Kundu inhabitants have a negative feeling towards Korup Project and their objectives, because they do not see any change in their environment and due to that perceive no need for protection.

While it is obvious that the unskilled performance of the facilitators of the resettlement of Ekundu-Kundu increased the failure and tragedy of the process, it is also obvious that an involuntary resettlement due to uncertain conservation premises cannot be managed as with a displacement for a dam, a pipeline or a road. As long as the local population does not see the need for the conservation of their forest and their wildlife, they will always find a way to continue hunting and gathering. If they take note of the destruction of their environment, there will no longer be a need for resettlement. The involuntary resettlement of villages in national parks has to be stopped and replaced by a participatory management of their natural recourses.
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