

**SABOTAGE INDUCED OIL SPILLAGES AND HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATION IN
NIGERIA'S NIGER DELTA**

By: Ibaba Samuel Ibaba and John C. Olumati

ABSTRACT

This paper examined the relationship between sabotage induced oil spillages and human rights violations in the Niger Delta. To achieve the objectives, the paper was divided into five sections. The first section, the introduction, provided the background and setting of the study. The next section discussed the impact of oil spillages on the economy and society of the Oil Producing Communities and noted the devastation it has caused the environment and livelihoods. The third section examined the laws governing the oil industry and highlighted their roles in the disempowerment and violation of the people's rights. The fourth section analyzed the issue of compensatory payments and human rights violation. We argue that the policy which abhors compensation for sabotage-induced spills violates economic rights. We contend that it is wrong to deny claimants or victims compensation, when their complicity is not established. This, we posit, is the basis for the violation of their rights. Although we share the objective of the policy, which seeks to curtail the vandalization of oil installations, we note that it is defective. In our view, the integration of the people into the oil economy will make them have proprietary interest, and for this reason, take interests in protecting oil installations. Also, oil pipelines should be buried deeper, while communities, not individuals should be contracted to protect such installations.

Keywords: Sabotage, Oil Spillage, Human Rights, Compensation, Niger Delta

INTRODUCTION

The Niger Delta region of Nigeria lies within the Ibo Plateau and the Cross River valley (Willink Report, 1958:34). It is one of the world's largest wetlands and Africa's delta covers some 70,000 km² (World Bank, 1995:2). The area is the mainstay of Nigeria's oil industry, which accounts for about 75 percent of national revenue (Okowa, 2007:9). But what has been the impact of oil on the people and environment of the Niger Delta?

Oil exploration and production have induced environmental degradation that has resulted to productivity losses, the exacerbation of poverty, social conflicts, population displacement, occupational disorientation, and the violation of human rights (Ikporukpo, 1983; Ikein, 1991; World Bank, 1995; UNDP, 2006). Oil spills, the spilling of crude oil, have been identified as a major culprit in this regard.

Oil spillage is a common occurrence in Nigeria's oil industry. For example, available data show that since 1989, the Shell Petroleum Development Company (SPDC) has recorded an average of 221 spills per year, involving a total of 7,350 barrels annually (SPDC, 1995:3). Similarly, 40,000 barrels of light crude oil were spilled in 1998 by Mobil in Eket (Da Costa, 2001). Again, other statistics show that a total of 2,796 oil spills were recorded between 1976 and 1990, leading to the spilling of 2,105,393 barrels of oil (*Punch*, February 20, 1991:2). Also, three million barrels of oil were lost to 6,817 oil spill incidents between 1976 and 2001, and over 70 percent of the spilt oil was not recovered (UNDP, 2006:181).

The incidence of oil spills have been blamed on equipment failure which, according to the Department of Petroleum Resources (DPR), account for 88 percent of oil spillages (*South-South Express*, June 17, 2002:8) and sabotage. This paper takes interest in sabotage induced oil spills, due to its catalytic role in conflicts involving oil companies and Oil Producing Communities and the destructive potentials on the environment. Okoko (1998), Ikporukpo (2004), and Aaron (2006) have acknowledged the menace of oil spills caused by sabotage. Sabotage spills are caused by deliberate damage to crude oil installations, such as pipelines and manifolds.

Oil industry operators blame a substantial part of oil spills on sabotage. For example, the SPDC blamed 40 percent of oil spills resulting from its operations in 2000 on sabotage (SPDC, 2000). Although local communities dispute such claims, the fact of the matter is that such incidents do take place. But what are the causes? The answer to this question has elicited differing views. According to Aaron (2006: 208–209),

“The official explanation is that petroleum pipeline vandalism is the handiwork of criminals, usually indigenous contractors and local chiefs who expect to be awarded clean-up contracts, or the evil machinations of detractors determined to derail the democratic projects in Nigeria... I insist that petroleum pipeline vandalism should be contextualized as an aspect of the struggle to reacquire a lost human right: ‘the right to indigenous people to control their land and natural resources’ – a right the Niger Delta people have been brutally deprived of by the Nigerian State and oil transnational’s.”

The argument made here by Aaron is premised on the assumption that the sabotaging of oil installations is a community project, which it is not. We contend that although sabotage induced oil spillages is a way of protest against deprivation, as well as an economic venture, it is an activity of groups, and not communities. Indeed, the economic motive is central. The official position, which attributes such incidents to the activities of people who expect economic gains from the oil spills, is therefore plausible. Okoko (1998:20) supports this viewpoint when he declared that:

“... The entire issue of sabotage appears perplexing, since the communities protests the destruction of farmlands and fishing grounds by oil spillages. The question therefore arises, why do we still have these acts of sabotage? ...this seeming paradox lies in the types of persons engaged in these acts of sabotage... these individuals have no stake in the consequences of spillages. They are neither farmers nor fishermen. They are landless and have no claim to fishing ponds... sabotage to these groups is simply a form of ‘business’, the credibility of which is not of concern to them. Those who support such acts feel justified in line with the national syndrome of national

cake-sharing, besides the prevailing feeling of discontent occasioned by neglect and deprivation.”

It is clear that not all members of the Oil Producing Communities take part in acts of sabotage. Significantly, however, even those who do not take part are victims of the devastating impact of the resulting oil spills. It can be argued that those who do not take part condone such acts, since they do not report culprits to relevant authorities. This will mean that they are as guilty as the actual saboteurs. The point must be made that the sabotage of crude oil installations is a clandestine activity that is not done in the open.

This raises the question that this study attempts to address – Is it just not to pay compensation for damages caused by sabotage induced oil spillages? The paper argues that the policy, which excludes damages caused by sabotage from compensatory payments, infringes on the economic rights of third party victims who are not culprits in the unholy act of sabotage. Given this, the paper addresses the following issues:

- (i) What is the impact of sabotage-induced oil spillages on third party victims?
- (ii) To what extent does state legislation/policy on the payment of compensation for sabotage-induced oil spillages violates the human rights of third party victims.

The remaining part of this paper is divided into four sections. The next section discusses the effect of oil spills on the economy and society of the Oil Producing Niger Delta Communities, while the subsequent section discusses the legislative framework that governs the oil industry. The third section analyses the interconnectedness between the government’s policy on compensatory payments for sabotage related oil spillage and human rights violation in the Niger Delta. The last section concludes.

OIL SPILLAGES AND THE OIL PRODUCING COMMUNITIES

The devastating impact of oil spills in Oil Producing Communities is well documented (Ikporukpo, 1983; Okoko, 1998; Aaron, 2006; Ikein, 1991; Worika, 2002; Salau, 1993; Ibaba, 2005; World Bank, 1995; UNDP, 2006; Adeyemo, 2002; HRW, 1999; Ibeanu, 1997; NDES, 1997; Peel, 2005; Clark *et al.*, 1999; ANEEJ, 2004; Naanen, 1995). Oil spills pollute the environment, consequently

destroying vegetation, marine life, mangrove forests, and food/cash crops, reducing nutrient value of the soil, and inducing land fragmentation.

Oil spills impact directly on the productive base of the local economies of the communities. Thus, fishing and farming, the mainstay of the local economies suffer destructions that have set in declining productivity. The World Bank (1995), however contests the linkage between oil pollution and declining productivity when it noted that:

“Oil pollution, contrary to common perception, is only of moderate priority when compared with the full spectrum of environmental problems in the Niger delta... many residents assign a direct cause and effect relationship between oil development and declines in fisheries and agricultural productivity because both phenomenon began at roughly the same time. However, the timing may be largely coincidental...”

However, the fact of the matter is that oil spills have induced environmental degradation. When spills occur, farmlands, forests, and bodies of water are rendered useless (Aaron, 2006:200). Similarly, oil spills have contaminated and destroyed mangrove forests that are important for sustaining local communities (Clark *et al.*, 1999:8). It is instructive to note that total recovery for an oil spill impacted land takes as long as 10 to 15 years (Ekekwe, cited by World Bank, 1995:51; Akpofure *et al.*, 2000:49).

Adeyemo (2002:69) supports the negative impact of oil spills on farmlands by noting that oil spills contaminate the topsoil and destroy its suitability for plant growth. This is attributed to two major effects, listed as:

- (i) Reduced availability of soil nutrients, such as nitrogen; and
- (ii) The introduction of toxic contents into the soil (p.69).

It is imperative to point out that the effects of oil spills on the environment are made worse by delay in clean-up. There are examples of oil spills that were not cleaned for months or years. In Epubu community, an oil spill that occurred in December 1998 was not cleaned until about a year later

(Clark *et al.*, 1999:7). Also, at Aleibiri community, a spill that occurred in March 1997 was not attended to for six months (Aaron, 2006:200). Again, in 1995, a spill that occurred at Akenfa and Ogboloma communities in October was left till December of the same year (Ibaba, 2005:13). Experience has shown that sabotage spills suffer delay in cleanups more than those resulting from operational faults. This is attributable to disagreements that usually occur.

But what is the impact of this on the rural population? The loss of livelihoods has exacerbated poverty and induced population displacement. Forced migration has dislocated families, thus, undermining the social structure of affected communities. Indeed, oil spills have alienated affected individuals from their environment and species being. The enabling laws governing the oil industry define the plight of the communities. The next section examines this issue.

STATE LEGISLATION ON THE OIL INDUSTRY: DEFINING THE PLIGHT OF OIL PRODUCING COMMUNITIES

The Nigerian oil industry is governed by laws that are seen as instruments of disempowerment (Nna, 1998). This section discusses two of these legislations, with a view to situate the context of our thesis clearly. The Petroleum Act and Oil Pipeline Act are explained here.

The Petroleum Act of 1969 (CAP 350)

The Petroleum Act vests the ownership and control of oil resources on the Federal Government. Accordingly, the Federal Government legislates on all matters relating to the oil industry. Section 17 of the Petroleum (drilling and productions) Regulations (LN 69 of 1969) prohibits oil-based activities in the following areas:

- (i) Any area held to be sacred;
- (ii) Any part set apart for, used, appropriated, or dedicated to public purposes;
- (iii) Any part occupied for the purposes of the government of the federation or a state;
- (iv) Any part situated within a township, town, village, market, burial ground, or cemetery;
- (v) Any part consisting of private land*;

* Private land means any land in respect of which a person is entitled to exercise a right of occupancy under the Land Use Act of 1978.

- (vi) Any part which is the site of or within fifty yards of any building, institution, reservoir, dam, public road, tramway, or which is appropriated for, or situated within, fifty yards of any railway; or
- (vii) Any part under cultivation.

It is important to note two observations here. First, the authority to recognize or certify an area to be sacred lays with “state authority” and not the people whose culture defines such areas to be sacred. Secondly, the restrictions (v and vi above) can be set aside by seeking the written consent of the minister of petroleum resources; again, not the consent of the people.

Following the above, operators of the oil industry, practically have no restrictions. Furthermore, the Act provides in section 21, sub-section one, that:

*“The licensee or lessee** shall not cut or take any protected tree except with the consent of the state authority and on payment of the appropriate fees and royalties.”*

Sub-section 2 states that:

“If the licensee or lessee cuts down or takes any other productive tree, he shall pay fair and adequate compensation to the owner thereof.”

The Act explains “other productive tree” as a “tree which has commercial value but which is not protected”, and a “protected tree” as a “tree protected by law, and includes all trees in a forest reserve”. It stands to reason from the above that the law allows oil exploration and exploitation to take place even in forest reserves. Equally of note is the fact that the law makes no mention of the “licensee or lessee” replanting a tree to replace the one that is cut.

Instead, it talks of paying royalties and fees to the government in the case of a “protected tree” and the payment of compensation to the owner in the case of a “productive tree”. Significantly, the

** Licensee or lessee refers to an individual or corporate body granted oil exploration, and prospecting license or oil mining lease.

people are prohibited by law from determining the value of the trees that are cut. Meanwhile, compensation rates fixed by government are inadequate. Furthermore, the petroleum act provides in section 23 that:

“If the licensee or lessee exercises the right conferred by his license or lease in such a manner, as unreasonably to interfere with the exercise of any fishing rights, he shall pay adequate compensation therefore to any person injured...”

Here again, the law only prescribes the payment of compensation without any mention of the remediation of impacted areas. Section 25 of the Petroleum Act (the Petroleum drilling and Production regulation) which deals with the prevention of pollution clearly states that:

“The licensee or lessee shall adopt all practicable precautions including the provision of up-to-date equipment approved by the Director of Petroleum Resources, to prevent the pollution of inland waters, rivers, water courses, the territorial waters of Nigeria or the high seas by oil, mud or other fluids or substances which might contaminate the water, banks or shore line or which might cause harm or destruction of fresh water or marine life, and occurs or has occurred, shall take prompt steps to control and if possible, end it.”

Furthermore, section 36 of the Act requires the licensee or lessee to do the following:

- (i) To control the flow and to prevent the escape or avoidable waste of petroleum discovered in or obtained from the relevant area;
- (ii) To prevent damage to adjoining petroleum bearing strata;
- (iii) Except for the purpose of secondary recovery as authorized by the Director of Petroleum Resources, to prevent the entrance of water through boreholes and wells to petroleum-bearing strata;
- (iv) To prevent the escape of petroleum into any water, well, spring, stream, rivers, lake, reservoir, estuary, or harbor; and
- (v) To cause as little damage as possible to the surface of the relevant area and to the trees, crops, buildings, structures, and other property thereon.

It is instructive to note here that the law is defective, contradictory, and not stringent enough. For example, there is no penalty for violation, while some of the provisions are vague. The requirement to pay adequate compensation for damages is clearly vague and deceptive. We mentioned earlier that the government fixes compensation rates. For this reason, compensations are not adequate, as the rates fail to capture reality. For example, the rates for damaged crops are not the same for young and matured crops. The sum paid for a young crop is much lower. The implication is that victims lose financial benefits that would have accrued to them if the crop had matured (Ikporukpo, 2004:337). Because the Nigerian State is a weak peripheral capitalist state (Ekekwe, 1986; Oyovbaire, 1980; Ake, 2001) that depends on oil rents, taxes, and profits for its survival, it has failed to enforce the law adequately. Following this, the laws have become neglectful and thereby ignored by oil multinationals, leading to environmental problems. The ineffectiveness of the law is evidenced by frequent and avoidable oil spills.

It is discernible here that the Petroleum Act places emphasis on operational issues. The environmental costs of oil exploration and exploitation are not adequately addressed. Worse, it denies the people the right to negotiate the value of their properties destroyed by the oil companies through their operational activities. Communities are, thus, shortchanged despite loss of livelihoods that results from such damages.

THE OIL PIPELINES ACT (CAP 338)

The Oil Pipelines Act governs the laying of oil pipelines. Section 4 (2) of the law provides that a permit should be sought from the Department of Petroleum Resources (DPR) for the purpose of surveying pipeline route and actual laying of oil pipelines. This implies that an oil company can only lay a pipeline after it has been given permission.

Oil Producing communities, whose farmlands and livelihoods are impacted by these oil pipelines have no powers to grant permission or object to the laying of oil pipelines. The communities are only allowed to raise claims and objections on issues that include:

- (i) Any land occupied by any cemetery;

- (ii) Any land containing any grave, tree, or thing held to be sacred or the object of veneration; and
- (iii) Any land under actual cultivation.

Again, the issue of disempowerment is clearly discernible. On compensation, section 115 (c) provides that:

“...the holder of a license shall pay compensation – (i) to any person suffering damage (other than on account of his own default or account of the malicious act of a third person) as a consequence of any breakage from the pipeline or an ancillary installation, for any damage not otherwise made good.”

It is clear that the policy of not paying compensation for damages caused by oil spillages is derived from this provision of the Oil Pipelines Act. The next section discusses the implications of this on the human rights of those who inhabit the Oil Producing Communities.

COMPENSATORY PAYMENTS AND HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATION IN THE NIGER DELTA

Compensatory payments for oil industry related damages in the Niger Delta are an issue of concern to the Niger Delta Oil Producing Communities. Ikporukpo (2004:337) captures these concerns thus:

“Whereas there are no direct compensatory payments for pollution and associated problems, there is payment for loss of use of land and water resources. In other words, individuals/communities are compensated for destroyed crops, productive trees and fish. There is no compensation for loss of land and water bodies... no compensation are paid if damage is caused through the action of a claimant, or third party... The rates paid are usually low because of frequent under valuation.... The issue of self-inflicted and third party damage is one of the most contentious aspects of compensation.”

The point has been made earlier that not all community members take part in sabotage. Thus, not all claimants or victims are saboteurs. The question is, is it just for innocent victims of sabotage-induced oil spillages to suffer losses without compensation? Our answer is no. It is clearly unjust to punish an individual for a crime he did not commit. But how does the compensation policy violate human rights?

Despite claims of sabotage, the oil companies hardly provide evidence to substantiate their claims. Worse, the actual culprits are never identified. Our contention is that in the absence of the establishment of complicity, it is wrong not to pay claimants compensation for their damaged resources. In our opinion, this refusal to pay compensation without the establishment of complicity is a violation of human rights.

Human rights, moral rights belonging to all people by virtue of their humanity (Aaron and Ibaba, 2004:151) are classified as civil and political rights; Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights (ESCR); and the right to development, peace, and humanitarian assistance. The Economic, Social and Cultural Rights guarantee claims to property and use of resources for self-preservation. In our view, the sabotage law on compensation violates this right.

The United Nations High Commission has noted that human rights and the environment are interlinked, and that effective enjoyment of human rights is predicated on environmental protection (*Earthjustice*, 2002:1). Again, Article 21 of the African Charter on Human and People's Rights accepts that "all peoples shall freely dispose of their wealth and natural resources", exercised in the "exclusive interest of the people" (Shelton, 2002). We argue that this include compensatory payments for damages done to such resources. Given that Nigeria is a signatory to the African Charter, the compensation policy on sabotage oil spills is a violation of the relevant section of this Charter, as the law alienates the Oil Producing Communities from their right to "freely dispose of their wealth and natural resources".

Perhaps of more significance is the fact that the oil spills and the resultant environmental degradation and destruction violate the people's right to a healthy environment. The refusal to pay

them compensation, therefore, amounts to double tragedy or loss. This argument does not support or justify the vandalization of oil pipelines; rather, it highlights the plight of innocent victims.

CONCLUSION

The over 40 years of oil exploration and exploitation, the Niger Delta has induced environmental degradation in varying dimensions. Oil spillages, gas flaring, and related activities have undermined environmental quality, destroyed farmlands, and fishing grounds, that has resulted to productivity declines, occupational disorientation, and population displacement.

Human rights violations have also been recorded and these have been linked to environmental degradation, state repression, and state policy. This paper examined the compensatory payment policy for sabotage-induced oil spillages and argued that the policy violates human rights. It demonstrated that the vandalization of oil pipelines is not a community project, but the actions of few individuals who do so for economic reasons.

Given that the complicity of claimants in the acts of sabotage are hardly established, we argue that the refusal to pay compensation for the damaged properties amount to a violation of their economic rights. Oil companies who cannot protect their oil pipelines from vandalization should not turn round to punish innocent victims. Understandably, the policy seeks to discourage sabotage by making it financially unattractive; it is, however, defective. The most likely option to end the menace is to integrate the communities into the oil economy, so that they will have proprietary interest in the protection of oil installations. In addition, oil pipelines should be buried deeper while communities, not individuals, should be contracted to protect oil pipelines and related oil installations.

REFERENCES

Aaron, K. K. (2006). "Human Rights Violation and Environmental Degradation in the Niger Delta Region of Nigeria", in Elizabeth Porter and Baden Offord (eds), *Activating Human Rights*, Peter Long, Oxford, Borne, New York, Pp.193–215.

- Aaron, K. K. and Ibaba, Ibaba S. (2004). "Analyzing the Social Sciences: Some contemporary Themes, in K. K. Aaron (eds), *Science in Social Relation: An Introduction to the Social Science*, Kemuela Publications, Port Harcourt, Pp.142–156.
- Adeyemo, A. M. (2002). "The Oil Industry, Extra-Ministerial Institutions and Sustainable Agricultural Development: A Case Study of Okrika L.G.A. in Rivers State", in *Nigeria Journal of Oil and Politics*, Vol.2, No.1, Pp.60–78.
- African Network for Environment and Economic Justice (2004). *Oil of Poverty in Niger Delta*, Lagos, Nigeria.
- Ake, C. (2001). "The State in Contemporary Africa", in H. E. Alapiki (eds), *The Nigerian Political Process*, Emhai Printing and Publishing Company, Port Harcourt.
- Akporfure, E. A. *et al.* (2000). *Oil Spillage in Nigeria's Niger Delta: Psycho-Morphological and Empirical Overview*, International Association of Impact Assessment (2), Opulence Environmental Services Ltd, Psycho-Morphological Learning Exchange Network.
- Clark, H., *et al.* (1999). *Oil for Nothing: Multinational Corporations, Environmental Destruction, Death and Impunity in the Niger Delta*, A United States, Non-Governmental Delegation Trip Report, 6th – 20th September.
- Da Costa (2001). Oil Pollution in Nigeria, www.greenature.com/articles266.html.
- Earthjustice* (2002). *Human Rights and the Environment: Developments – Issue Paper for the Fifty-Eight Session of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights*, March 18 – April 26.
- Ekekwe, Eme (1986). *Class and State in Nigeria*, Longman, Nigeria.
- Human Rights Watch (1999). *The Price of Oil: Corporate Responsibility and Human Rights Violations in Nigeria's Oil Producing Communities*, Human Rights Watch, New York.
- Ibaba, Ibaba S. (2005). *Understanding the Niger Delta Crisis*, Amethyst and Colleagues Publisher, Port Harcourt.
- Ibeanu, O. (1997). *Oil, Conflict and Security in Rural Nigeria: Issues in the Ogoni Crisis*, African Association of Political Science, Occasion Paper Series I, Harare.
- Ikein, Augustine A. (1991). *The Impact of Oil on a Developing Country: The Case of Nigeria*, Evans Brothers Limited, Ibadan.
- Ikporukpo, C. O. (1983). 'Petroleum Exploitation and the Socio-economic Environment in Nigeria' in *International Journal of Environmental Studies*, No. 21, Pp. 119–206.

- Ikporukpo, C. O. (2004). 'Petroleum, Fiscal Federalism and Environmental Justice in Nigeria', in *Space and Policy*, Vol. 8, No. 3, Pp. 321–354.
- Naanen, B. B. B. (1995). 'Oil Producing Minorities and the Restructuring of Nigerian Federalism: The Case of the Ogoni People', in *Journal of Commonwealth and Comparative Politics*, Vol. 33, No. 1, March, Pp. 46–78.
- NDES (Niger Delta Environmental Survey), Abridged version of phase I Report, vol. 4, September, 1997.
- Nna, N.J (1998). *The Niger Delta: State Legislation and Disempowerment*, Springfield Publishers, Owerri, Nigeria.
- The Oil Pipelines Act, Laws of the Federation of Nigeria, CAP338, 1990.
- Okoko, Kimse (1998). SPDC – Host Communities Relations Survey (Unpublished Report).
- Okowa, W. J. (2007). *Niger Delta in the Economy and Politics of Nigeria*, A lecture delivered at the Convocation Ceremony of Niger Delta University.
- Oyovbaire, S. (1980). "The Nigerian State as a Conceptual Variable", in Cliff Edogun (eds), *Nigeria: Politics, Administration and Development*, The Nigerian Political Science Association, University of Port Harcourt.
- Peel, Michael (2005). *Crisis in the Niger Delta: How Failure of Transparency and Accountability are Destroying the Region*, Chatham House Briefing Paper, July.
- The Petroleum Act, Laws of the Federation of Nigeria, CAP 350, 1990.
- The *Punch*, February 20, 1991.
- Salau, A. T. (1993). *Environmental Crisis and Development in Nigeria*, (University of Port Harcourt Inaugural Lecture), University of Port Harcourt Press, Port Harcourt.
- Shell Petroleum Development Company (1995). *People and the Environment*, Annual Report.
- Shell Petroleum Development Company (2000). *People and the Environment*, Annual Report.
- Shelton, D., (2002). *Human Rights and the Environment: Jurisprudence of Human Rights Bodies*, Background Paper No. 2, Joint UNEP – OHCHR Expert Seminar on Human Rights and the Environment, Geneva, January 14 – 16.
- The *South-South Express*, June 17, 2002.
- The United Nations Development Programme (2006). *Niger Delta Human Development Report*, Lagos, Nigeria.

The Willink Commission Report, 1958 Report of the Commission Appointed to Enquire into the Fears of Minorities and the Means of Allaying Them, Presented to Parliament by the Secretary to State for the Colonies by Command of Her Majesty, Her Majesty's Stationery Office, London.

Worika, I. L. (2002). *Environmental Law and Policy of Petroleum Development: Strategies and Mechanisms for Sustainable Management in Africa*, Anpez Centre for Environment and Development, Port Harcourt, Nigeria.

World Bank (1995). *Defining An Environmental Development Strategy for the Niger Delta*, Volume one and two Report.