



Stakeholder submission to the Universal Periodic Review of the Republic of Ethiopia

Right to Livelihood, Right to Culture

For much of Ethiopia's population, access to land and natural resources is a requisite of their sustenance and survival. The primary issues of land administration in Ethiopia are grounded in government control, and represent inconsistencies between what is adopted in the legal framework and constitution, and what the implementation and reality on the ground, as well as a lack of respect for the rights of land access and customary tenure of indigenous communities. Moreover, the criteria for secure land tenure, in practice, appear to be different from region to region, leading to disproportionate dispossession of land-dependent peoples in Afar, BeniShangul-Gumuz, Gambella, Oromiya, SNNP and Somali regions.

The legal framework regulating land rests in two documents: the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia Constitution,¹ which addresses land issues and other related rights, and Proclamation no. 456/2005, which addresses the administration of rural land. It is important to note that most of the land-related policies regulate rural land, and very little provisions exists for the governance of urban land. Each region is able to form its own regional land administration and policies; however, actual land registration can only be found in five of the nine regions in the country.²

The Constitution of Ethiopia provides for protection of rights related to nondiscrimination and self-determination (articles 25 and 39), as well as the right to property and the protection of natural resources, specifically land, as the "inalienable common property of the nations, nationalities and peoples of Ethiopia" (article 40).

Rural Land Administration and Land Use Proclamation (no. 456/2005)³ theoretically set out many protections for rural farmers and pastoralist communities. Any citizen engaged in agriculture for their livelihood will be given land free of charge. Provision 7(3) also protects persons who are evicted from their lands, stating "Holder of rural land who is evicted for purpose of public use shall be given compensation proportional to the development he has made on the land and the property acquired, or shall be given substitute land thereon." Protection from eviction is also found in the Constitution, which states in article 40(4), that "the right of Ethiopian peasants to free allotment of land and not to be evicted therefrom is guaranteed."

Despite some protections for the people, severe deficits prevail. The Constitution and legal system do not recognize or mention specifically the land rights of indigenous communities, and address rural communities only as farmers, peasants, pastoralists, and semipastoralists. Many indigenous communities in Ethiopia engage in grazing activities, for which they lack secure rights to land access.

A core issue, however, is that all land is considered government owned and, although, according to law, all citizens can gain access to the land, it is a usufruct right that prevents persons who have historically or traditionally worked/utilized the land to sell, mortgage or otherwise dispose of it. This usufruct right gives rural people's little tenure security or protection against evictions. In fact, the federal government and the regional authority retain absolute power to confiscate land for public interest and development programs.⁴ In proclamation no. 465/2005 the government is listed as the owner of rural land, and thus "communal rural holdings can be changed to private holdings as necessary" (5(3)). No clear criteria apply to define what constitutes a "development program." However, as the past several years have shown, this complete central ownership has allowed the government to lease land use rights with generous conditions favoring foreign companies and investors, primarily for agricultural export ventures.

While many of the positive provisions listed above have been replicated in the various regional land systems, but also embody the same potential for abuse. A worrying provision adopted in all regional rural land laws is that found in the rural land law 456/2005, article 5(4)(a), which states "Private investors that engage in agricultural development activities shall have the right to use rural land in accordance with the investment policies and laws at federal and regional levels." Specific mention of privatization, combined with the government's ability to privatize land at will and the investment reality on the ground causes grave concern over issues of corruption and lack of transparency and clarity regarding land laws and their application.

The World Bank report on corruption in Ethiopia indicates that the land sector in Ethiopia is "particularly susceptible to corruption and rent seeking."⁵ That report reviews the primary land-related issues that affect both the rural and urban sectors by way of the lack of clarity or consistency between land rights and restrictions. In rural areas, as mentioned above, the idea of "public land" has been stretched to infer "government land," giving the government at the federal and regional levels ultimate control over all land decisions, rather than allowing for the adjudication of competing tenure claims. As mentioned above, the land system has many provisions that protect government control over land, and create a space for abuse of power via vague criteria and enable dispossession.

Land corruption, according to the Bank's report, is "influenced strongly by the way policy and legislation are formulated and enforced."⁶ The two primary problem areas related to corruption identified by this report include: the ability of land

capture by a “weak policy and legal framework and poor systems to implement existing policies and laws,” and corruption in the implementation of land policy and laws, specifically the institutionalization of informal feeds, fraudulent actions of officials to allocate land to themselves, willingness of officials to respond to bribes and nepotism, and the issuance of forged land documents.⁷

Human Rights Violations and Forced Evictions

In 2010 the Ethiopian Government reauthorized the National Food Security Program (NFSP), a nationwide initiative that includes the “Voluntary Resettlement Program” (VRP). On-the-ground reports make clear that resettlement, particularly in the Gambella and Lower Omo regions, have been far from voluntary and have entailed prolonged and systemic human rights violations. While official statements defend the ambitious relocation program as a precondition to socioeconomic development and the realization of basic human rights, research suggests that forced displacement is exacerbating human insecurity, while violating international human rights law.⁸

The government’s 2010 Growth and Transformation Plan called for the relocation of an estimated 1.5 million people in the country’s Gambella, Afar, Somali, Lower Omo, and Benishangul-Gumuz regions.⁹ Those targeted for resettlement are mostly lowland pastoral communities, who are dependent on access to land to meet their basic needs and livelihoods. The stated purpose of these “voluntary” resettlements is the provision of “socioeconomic infrastructure” and as former Minister of Federal Affairs Shiferaw Teklemariam explained in 2011, “to tackle poverty and ignorance.”¹⁰ On-the-ground research by the Oakland Institute corroborates widespread reports of forced and increasingly violent evictions under the villagization program.¹¹

Violations of Ethiopians’ right to self-determination and adequate standards of living—as guaranteed in the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR) articles 1 and 11—provoked by the government’s forced-resettlement scheme have involved both political and physical coercion. At government-hosted meetings, communities were “notified,” rather than consulted, of their impending resettlement. As Human Rights Watch found, “if communities were not cooperative, or indicated their refusal to move, the next meeting, usually several weeks later, involved visits from the Ethiopian army, regional police, local militias, and government officials.”¹² Mursi community representatives explained to investigators from DfID that “the government doesn’t discuss their plans with the Mursi...they are making all their decisions in their own places, and they are just coming and going ahead with their plans.”¹³ Investigation conducted by the Oakland Institute in Lower Omo found that no person interviewed believed their relocation to have been voluntary, corroborating the conclusion of another investigation in Gambella.¹⁴

Moreover, research by the Oakland Institute has found that forced evictions have been characterized by physical violence in the hands of regional and federal security forces.¹⁵ Reports of arbitrary arrest, beatings and assaults, rapes and sexual violence are widespread. Supporting our findings, another independent investigation found that leaders of “antivillagization’ communities” were arrested for the purposes of intimidation, as they were publically arrested and were never charged or taken before a jury.¹⁶ Allegations of torture and killings have also been recorded.¹⁷ Violence does not appear to be random, or the result of rogue local forces. Rather, violence has been instrumental and deliberate in implementing this unpopular program.

Displacement and Conditions of Relocation

Many violations of human rights in the villagization process occur after forced resettlement, undermining the government’s stated purpose for resettlement as well as ICESCR article 11(1), stipulating “the right of everyone to...adequate food, clothing, and housing, and to a continuous improvement of living conditions...based on free consent.”¹⁸ In the Gambella region, those subjected to resettlement were “forced” to build their own homes in new villages. The Oakland has collected first-hand accounts of the forced labor that accompanies forced resettlement. “Here in Koka, the roads that we, the Suri people, have built were destroyed by the plantation’s trucks! Nothing is done to help us; the school, the clinic, the water, it’s [we] who did everything,” explained a victim of relocation in Lower Omo.¹⁹ A different investigation observed that, “soldiers were there to intimidate and ensure that villagers built their *tukuls* swiftly.”²⁰

The Ethiopian government also has fallen drastically short on its commitments of infrastructure and public services in new villages. While the 2010 Villagization Action Program purports that “the erection of socioeconomic infrastructure is paramount important and should be in place before moving the target population to the new sites,” on-the-ground investigation shows that villagization is deepening human insecurity.²¹

Food insecurity has been exacerbated by villagization in a few ways. First, in Gambella the “overwhelming majority” of resettlements occurred at the time of harvest. While displaced communities interviewed were told they would be able to return for their crops after their new villages were constructed, the high levels of vigilance around new villages prevented their return before their crops were destroyed.²² Moreover, the Ethiopian government has fallen dramatically short on its assurance of “up to 3–4 hectare[s]” of land to each displaced household, both by reneging on promises to provide assistance in clearing woodlands and by providing insufficient land to sustain displaced households.²³ Our research shows that in Lower Omo, where displacement is making way for large-scale irrigation dams and plantations, agropastoral communities are being forced to give up their cattle even as their cultivation sites along the banks of the Omo River are rapidly drying up, effectively aggravating food insecurity and hunger.²⁴

Article 6(1) of the ICESCR ensures the “right of everyone to the opportunity to gain his living by work [that] he freely chooses or accepts...”²⁵ The resettlement scheme denies this right to pastoral and agropastoral communities by favoring foreign-funded, large-scale agriculture and essentially coercing these communities into providing labor for these farms. As one SNNPR official conceded, “People are being resettled to provide labor for farms.”²⁶

Yet, our research indicated that the labor provided is uneven and insufficient. In one resettled community in Lower Omo, only 20 plantation jobs were created. Those interviewed hoped to work enough to buy a cow and restore some of their lost cultural practices.²⁷ Moreover, a significant number of the jobs created are given to cheaper migrant Ethiopians, and not to dispossessed and resettled community members.²⁸

Those persons and communities subject to involuntary resettlement, a form of forced eviction, are entitled to reparations as victims of a gross violation of human rights.²⁹

Right to Food and Food as a Weapon

With nearly 40 percent of Ethiopians considered chronically hungry, a number that translates to 34 million people, Ethiopia remains among the top recipients of humanitarian and development assistance in the world.³⁰ In recent years, Ethiopia has been the world’s largest recipient of food aid.³¹ However, political manipulation and uneven distribution of humanitarian aid by the Ethiopian government places securing political power over alleviating hunger. General Comment No. 12 on the Right to Adequate food, adopted by the UN Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (CESCR), interprets that “any discrimination in access to food, as well as to means and entitlements for its procurement, on the grounds of race, colour, sex, language, age, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status with the purpose or effect of nullifying or impairing the equal enjoyment or exercise of economic social and cultural rights constitutes a violation of the Covenant.”³²

This practice gained attention around the 2010 elections, when reports of politically motivated food distribution surfaced. In some instances, aid was outright denied to members of opposition parties, with one village chairman instructing a farmer in Amhara, “Let the party that you belong to give you aid.”³³ In other cases, aid disbursements were strategically made after the elections.³⁴

The political criterion for distribution of humanitarian and food aid appears to be a widely known, and tolerated, fact. As one civil society spokesperson explained, “Everybody knows about this kind of intimidation, if you don’t vote for so-and-so, you won’t get your 25 kilograms of wheat.”³⁵ Members of the Ethiopian People's

Revolutionary Democratic Front (EPRDF) opposition parties are denied food aid, agricultural inputs and public services.

Civil society analysts have pointed to this practice as a method for the ruling party to constrict political space, among “one hundred ways of putting pressure” on populations to support the central government.³⁶ This leveraging of humanitarian services occurs most widely at the local *kebele* level, yet, as researchers have pointed out, “the *kebele* and *woreda* structure provides a potent intrusive mechanism for the ruling party to gather information on and control communities.”³⁷

Right to Association and Access to Justice

The widely recognized crowding out of formal political opposition by the EPRDF requires sustained coercion and consequently incites sustained social opposition.³⁸ Particularly targeted have been investigative journalists, the leaders of opposition political parties and the Muslim community.

The U.S. State Department’s 2012 *Human Rights Report* has found that “the most significant human rights problems included restrictions on freedoms of expression and association through politically motivated trials and convictions of opposition political figures, activists, journalists, and bloggers, as well as increased restrictions of print media.”³⁹ The persecution of investigative journalists is particularly widespread. As of July 2012, 54 had been convicted under terrorism charges, including 31 journalists and at least four opposition party supporters.⁴⁰

Illustrating both violations of press and association freedoms is the targeting of Muslim media outlets by the Ethiopian government. In 2012, following demonstrations opposing government policies that interfered with the religious affairs of Ethiopian Muslims, the government charged Yusaf Getachew, editor-in-chief of the now defunct *YeMuslimoch Guday* (Muslim Affairs) with treason and incitement to violence.⁴¹ The government also blocked from publication 30,000 copies of the critical weekly *Fetch*. With state control over printing presses, government authorities effectively have shut down critical press outlets.

We share the concern expressed in the 2012 Report of the Special Rapporteur on torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment, that the persecution of political dissenters violates the UN Convention against Torture.⁴²

Comment on Human Rights Action Plan

In 2013, a draft of Ethiopia’s National Human Rights Action Plan for 2013–2015 (NHRAP) was released. While the document is an encouraging step toward comprehensively diagnosing and addressing human rights violations in Ethiopia, the document misdiagnoses or ignores structural mechanisms and official policies that violate citizens’ human rights.

In the section on “The Right to Adequate Housing,” focus on urban homelessness is well placed, but makes no mention of rural land dispossession or the shortfalls in housing provision to displaced pastoral and agropastoral communities.⁴³ Similarly, the sizable section on “The Right to Food,” neglects to mention the disruption to local practices of subsistence resulting from the government’s support of large-scale, export-oriented agriculture. This is despite the common ICCPR and ICESCR prohibition in Article 1.2 that states: “In no case may a people be deprived of its own means of subsistence.”

The Plan also contains grave omissions and distortions regarding the rights of thought, opinion and expression, free association, and religion and belief. The NHRAP makes no mention of the political prosecution of political opponents and journalists, such as the widely reported case of Eskinder Nega. Shortfalls in the provision of these rights are attributed to Derg-era (1974–1991) military regime holdovers, and not to the current Tigrayan People’s Liberation Front (TPLF) government’s proactive efforts to exercise political hegemony. The movement away from Derg-era political abuse, the document contends, is synonymous with the government’s economic-development strategy. The Anti-Terrorism Proclamation is mentioned in the Plan, but only in the context of the government’s efforts to secure the “right to life” of its citizens.

Omission and Violation of Indigenous Rights

Noticeably omitted from chapter four of the NHRAP on “Rights of Vulnerable Groups,” is any mention of Ethiopia’s indigenous populations.⁴⁴ Indigenous populations in Ethiopia’s lowlands have been acutely affected by the government’s villagization program, and have been an active source of resistance. Instead of recognizing indigenous rights, government forces misuse the Anti-Terrorism Proclamation to justify the arrest of political dissenters.⁴⁵

It should be noted that Ethiopia also abstained from voting on the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (2007), which asserts that “no relocation shall take place without free, prior and informed consent of the indigenous people’s concerned and, after agreement, on just and fair compensation and, where possible, with the option of return.”⁴⁶ The Plan’s section on “the right to culture” makes no mention of the protection of indigenous practices, rather merely citing them as a subject of numerous activities to attract tourism.⁴⁷

Human Rights-centered Development

The fundamental shortfall of the NHRAP is that it does not address the institutional, state-sponsored policies and practices that violate the human rights of Ethiopians. Oakland Institute research suggests that the brand of economic development relentlessly pursued by the Ethiopian government almost always faces resistance. The Ethiopian government was not developed a development strategy that enables debate and consensus. Instead, the government punishes this resistance with the

deprivation of human and political rights. The government's stated purpose is to implement the NHRAP in tandem with the Growth and Transformation Plan.

The NHRAP is one of a series of actions taken by the Ethiopian government to promote human rights, including the establishment of a Ethiopian Human Rights Commission. Based on mounting evidence, it is our opinion that no Ethiopian human rights strategy can be comprehensive without challenging key strategies in the Growth and Transformation Plan. Rather than a human rights strategy adapting to an economic development strategy, the Ethiopian government's development strategy—as in all states—should be founded on principles of democratic participation and the primacy of human rights.

Recommendations to the Republic of Ethiopia

- The Republic of Ethiopia (RoE) and other nonstate actors (i.e., international corporations, investors, international financial institutions) respect the principles of free, prior and informed consent when relocating any community, particularly those that fall under categories of indigenous communities.
- The GoE must stop forced resettlement immediately and ensure full reparations for those previously subjected to this gross violation.
- The state must ensure transparency in tenure systems and the application of land-use criteria, ensuring the rule of law as an over-riding principle of its implementation of ICESCR and other human rights treaty obligations.
- The state must ensure full reparations for persons and communities subject to displacement under any development project, program or policy, including the Villagization Action Program and Growth and Transformation Plan.
- The RoE should revise the Growth and Transformation Plan, in order to enable alternative development paradigms and to ensure the primacy of human rights within all development projects, programs and policies undertaken within the territory of its jurisdiction and effective control.
- The RoE should specify language in its Anti-Terrorism Proclamation to prevent its political use and other excesses that lead to violations of human rights.
- The RoE should recognize rights of indigenous populations within the territory of its jurisdiction and effective control and develop indigenous populations protections in human rights strategies, including the National Human Rights Action Plan.

Recommendations to Other States

- Any state providing humanitarian or development assistance in Ethiopia bears the extraterritorial obligation to ensure that human rights are respected,

protected and fulfilled in so doing, including the requirement to scrupulously avoid forced evictions and to ensure full reparations in the case of gross violations of human rights. States members of multilateral institutions, including international finance institutions, bear a special obligation to ensure that their decisions and actions are consistent with these extraterritorial human rights obligations.

-
- ¹ *Ethiopian Constitution*, http://www.africa.upenn.edu/Hornet/Ethiopian_Constitution.html.
 - ² Tony Burns and Kate Dalrymple, "Land Sector Corruption in Ethiopia," in Janelle Plummer, ed., *Diagnosing Corruption in Ethiopia* (Washington: The World Bank, 2012), p. 298.
 - ³ Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia Rural Land Administration and Land Use Proclamation no. 456/2005, at: www.fao.org/docstore/pdf/eth95459.pdf.
 - ⁴ See article 40(8) of the Constitution which states: "Without prejudice to the right to private property, the government may expropriate private property for public purposes subject to payment in advance of compensation commensurate to the value of the property" and Proclamation No. 456/2005, article 7(3): "Holder of rural land who is evicted for purpose of public use shall be given compensation proportional to the development he has made on the land and the property acquired, or shall be given substitute land thereon. Where the rural landholder is evicted by federal government, the rate of compensation would be determined based on the federal land administration law. Where, the rural land holder is evicted by regional governments, the rate, of compensation would be determined based on the rural land administration laws of regions."
 - ⁵ Tony Burns and Kate Dalrymple, "Land Sector Corruption in Ethiopia", *Diagnosing Corruption in Ethiopia*, Ed. Janelle Plummer, The World Bank, 2012, p. 285.
 - ⁶ *Ibid.*, 286.
 - ⁷ *Ibid.*, 287.
 - ⁸ Oakland Institute, "Unheard Voices: The Human Rights Impact of Land Investments on Indigenous Communities in Ethiopia," 2013, pp. 9–11.
 - ⁹ William Davidson, "Ethiopia plans ambitious resettlement of people buffeted by East Africa drought," *Christian Science Monitor*, 1 August 2011, at: <http://www.csmonitor.com/World/Africa/2011/0801/Ethiopia-plans-ambitious-resettlement-of-people-buffeted-by-East-Africa-drought>, (accessed 2 September 2013).
 - ¹⁰ Gambella People's national Regional State, "Villagization Program Action Plan (2003 EFY)", August 2002 EC (Ethiopian calendar), (2010 for the European calendar); Letter from the Minister of Federal Affairs Shiferaw Teklemariam to Human Rights Watch, 19 December 2011.
 - ¹¹ Oakland Institute, "Omo: Local Tribes under Threat. A field Report From the Omo Valley, Ethiopia," January 2013; Oakland Institute and NYU International Human Rights Clinic, "Unheard Voices: The Human Rights Impact of Land Investments on Indigenous Communities in Gambella," 2013; Clar Ni Chonghaile, "Ethiopia's resettlement scheme leaves lives shattered and UK facing questions," 22 January 2013.
 - ¹² Human Rights Watch, "Waiting Here for Death: Forced Displacement and 'Villagization' in Ethiopia's Gambella Region," January 2012, pp. 25–26.
 - ¹³ Will Hurd, "DFID/USAID Investigation Recordings South Omo, Ethiopia," January 2012, pp. 3–4; access recordings at <http://www.oaklandinstitute.org/dfid-and-usaid-investigation-recordings>, (accessed September 9, 2013).
 - ¹⁴ Oakland Institute, "Omo: Local Tribes Under Threat"; Oakland Institute; Human Rights Watch, "Waiting Here for Death," 29.
 - ¹⁵ Oakland Institute, "Omo: Local Tribes under Threat."
 - ¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 34.
 - ¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 36; US Department of State Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor, "Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 2012: Ethiopia," p.1-2.
 - ¹⁸ International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, Article 11.
 - ¹⁹ Oakland Institute, "Omo: Local Tribes under Threat. A field Report from the Omo Valley, Ethiopia," January 2013, p. 7.

-
- ²⁰ Human Rights Watch, "Waiting Here for Death," 35.
- ²¹ Gambella Peoples' National Regional State, "Villagization Program Action Plan (2003 EFY)," August 2002 EC (Ethiopian calendar), (2010 for the European calendar), p. 2.
- ²² Human Rights Watch, "Waiting Here for Death," 40.
- ²³ Gambella Peoples' National Regional State, "Villagization Program Action Plan (2003 EFY)," August 2002 EC (Ethiopian calendar), (2010 for the European calendar), p. 1.
- ²⁴ Oakland Institute, "Omo: Local Tribes Under Threat. A field Report From the Omo Valley, Ethiopia," January 2013; also see: Human Rights Watch, "'What Will Happen if Hunger Comes?' Abuses against the Indigenous Peoples of Ethiopia's Lower Omo Valley," June 2012, p. 56–59.
- ²⁵ International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, Article 6.
- ²⁶ Quoted in: Human Rights Watch, "'What Will Happen if Hunger Comes?'" p. 54.
- ²⁷ Oakland Institute, "Omo: Local Tribes under Threat. A Field Report from the Omo Valley, Ethiopia," January 2013, p.8.
- ²⁸ Ibid; Oakland Institute, "Understanding Land Deals in Africa: Ethiopia," 2011, pp.34–35.
- ²⁹ Commission on Human Rights resolution 1993/77, paragraph one affirms that "the practice of forced evictions constitutes a gross violation of human rights, in particular the right to adequate housing." See also CESCR General Comment No. 7 "forced evictions (1997). The reparations framework is provided in the consensus resolution of the General Assembly, "Basic Principles and Guidelines on the Right to a Remedy and Reparation for Victims of Gross Violations of International Human Rights Law and Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law," A/RES/60/147, 21 March 2006, at: <http://www2.ohchr.org/english/law/remedy.htm>.
- ³⁰ Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations website, <http://www.fao.org/hunger/en>, (accessed September 6, 2013); Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development website, <http://stats.oecd.org>, (accessed September 6, 2013).
- ³¹ Oakland Institute, "Understanding Land Deals in Africa: Ethiopia," 2011, pp. 9–10.
- ³² Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, General Comment No.12
- ³³ "Ethiopia: Government denies aid "manipulated" for political gain," *IRIN: Humanitarian News and Analysis*, 7 June 2010.
- ³⁴ Ibid.
- ³⁵ Quoted in: Human Rights Watch, "Development without Freedom: How Aid Underwrites Repression in Ethiopia," October 2010, p. 46.
- ³⁶ Human Rights Watch, "'One Hundred Ways of Putting Pressure' Violations of Freedom of Expression and Association in Ethiopia," March 2010, p. 22–28.
- ³⁷ Ibid., 22, 24.
- ³⁸ USAID Ethiopia, "Country Development Cooperation Strategy 2011–2015: Accelerating the Transformation Toward Prosperity," March 2012, p.66.
- ³⁹ U.S. State Department, "Ethiopia 2012 Human Rights Report," 2012, p.1.
- ⁴⁰ Human Rights Watch, "Ethiopia: Terrorism Law Used to Crush Free Speech," 27 June 2012. <http://www.hrw.org/news/2012/06/27/ethiopia-terrorism-law-used-crush-free-speech>, (accessed 6 September 2013). One month after this article was published, 20 journalists, including Nega, were sentenced under terrorism-related charges.
- ⁴¹ Committee to Protect Journalists, "Ethiopian authorities crack down on Muslim press," 9 August 2012, at: <http://www.cpj.org/2012/08/ethiopian-authorities-crack-down-on-muslim-press.php>, (accessed 6 September 2013); "Ethiopia's government crackdown will not resolve dispute with Muslims: CPJ," *Sudan Tribune*, 11 August 2013, at: <http://www.sudantribune.com/spip.php?article47622>, (accessed 6 September 2013).
- ⁴² UN Human Rights Council, "Opinions adopted by the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention at its sixty-fifth session, 14-23 November 2012, p.7.
- ⁴³ The Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, "National Human Rights Action Plan 2013–2015," draft translation, 2013.
- ⁴⁴ Republic of Ethiopia, "National Human Rights Action Plan," p. 130.
- ⁴⁵ A letter by the Ethiopian government's Ministry of Foreign Affairs denies the first-hand accounts of state violence by suggesting: "informants deployed appear to be politically and ideologically

driven.” Ethiopian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, “The Oakland Institute’s campaigns to perpetuate people’s poverty,” *A Week in the Horn*, 9 March 2012.

⁴⁶ United Nations General Assembly, United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, 2006.

⁴⁷ Republic of Ethiopia, “National Human Rights Action Plan,” p. 123–25.