**مصر: المرحلة الثالثة من إخلاء الشريط الحدودي بعد رمضان**

**أحمد أبو دراع ، المصري اليوم**

**4/6/2015**

قال عدد من أهالى مدينة رفح بشمال سيناء إن المرحلة الثالثة من إخلاء الشريط الحدودى لمسافة 1000 متر وصل بها قرار إلى مجلس المدينة لإبلاغ الأهالى بإخلاء منازلهم، على أن يتم تنفيذ المرحلة بعد شهر رمضان.

وأضاف الأهالى أنهم تلقوا تعليمات تفيد بتنفيذ المرحلة الثالثة مطلع الشهر المقبل، ليصل إجمالى المساحة التى سوف يتم إخلاؤها إلى نحو 2000 متر.

وأكد مصدر أمنى أن المرحلة الثالثة تضم أحياء «الصفا والأحراش والإمام على»، التى تقدر منازلها بنحو 10000 منزل وشقة سكنية.

وكانت المرحلة الثانية قد شهدت إخلاء 1220 منزلاً متواجدة بتلك المرحلة يقطنها 2050 أسرة، وتم تدمير المنازل عن طريق سلاح المهندسين بالجيش الثانى فور إخلائها وحصول أصحابها على التعويض اللازم المقرر لهم .

[المصدر](http://www.almasryalyoum.com/news/details/747614)

Palestine: Palestinians have No Planning Rights at Area C

Michael Schaeffer Omer-Man

By rejecting a petition by Palestinian residents of Area C, Israel’s High Court of Justice effectively cemented two separate planning regimes on the same plot of land: one for Jews, another for Palestinians.

Israel’s High Court of Justice on Tuesday rejected a petition to grant planning authority to Palestinians in Area C of the West Bank so they can build on their own land. In doing so, Justices Elyakim Rubinstein, Noam Solberg and Neil Hendel solidified the current status quo, in which two separate planning systems exist in the West Bank: one for Jews and another for Palestinians.

While Jewish settlers in the West Bank are represented in local planning committees like every citizen of Israel, the local Palestinian councils were nullified and replaced by military officials who make planning decisions in their stead. Even the regional committees — the highest bodies that oversee planning in Area C — belong to the Israeli army — and while they include settlers, they include no Palestinian representation. This is part and parcel of the legal reality in the West Bank, which places Jews and Palestinians under two different sets of laws.

That system results in a situation in which: less than 1 percent of Area C is zoned for Palestinian use; 94 percent of requests by Palestinians for building permits are rejected; approximately 70 percent of Palestinians in Area C live in unrecognized villages, and thus are not connected to a water supply or have proper sewage infrastructure. This is one of the main reasons why Palestinians who live under full Israeli control suffer from higher rates of poverty and nutrition insecurity than Palestinians under partial Palestinian control in Areas B and A, not to mention hundreds of home demolitions by the Israeli army every year.

These, among other reasons, led the village council of Ad-Dirat- Al-Rfai’ya, Israeli NGO Rabbis for Human Rights and others to petition the High Court in 2011, and demand the re-establishment of the Palestinian planning committees, which existed under Jordanian law until they were revoked by military order in 1971.

In his majority opinion, which had unanimous support, Justice Rubinstein warned that any change in the status quo would have repercussions on larger policy issues, and thus the High Court does not have the authority to change it.

Furthermore, the justices adopted a new planning procedure put together by the state while the High Court deliberated the petition, which for the first time in 50 years would force military planning committees to include the heads of Palestinian villages in everything having to do with planning in their villages. While the procedure will force the committees to update and confer with village heads, it does not resolve the issue of allowing Palestinian representation in bodies that make binding decisions. According to Rabbis for Human Rights, the inclusion of Palestinian leaders took place in the past, but it never did anything to improve the planning situation in the villages.

The ruling shows, once again, that the High Court justices know how to speak the language of democracy even when approving clearly racist and anti-democratic legal realities. “The laws of building and planning are based on several central tenets, including the principle of transparency as well as the principle of including the public in the approval of procedures,” Rubinstein wrote, while emphasizing that the “inclusion of the public in decision making is fundamental to the principle of democracy.”

However, he went on to remark that, “in the current situation… the bigger questions on issues of policy, borders etc., which are generally overseen by the regional committee, ought to remain in the hands of the Civil Administration and the regional military commander, in light of the importance of planning pertaining to lands seized during war.”

In other words: democracy is for Switzerland, we are in a different and delicate situation (which has lasted almost 50 years. Thus it is legitimate for the army to retain control of Palestinian planning needs. Despite the aforementioned statistics, Rubinstein ruled that there is no proof of discrimination against Palestinians when it comes to planning in Area C.

According to Solberg, the state’s plan to include Palestinians in the planning process constitutes a “significant upgrade.” I wonder if Solberg, himself a settler who lives in Area C, or even Rubinstein and Hendel for that matter, would be content with such an “upgrade” if they were living under foreign military rule and did not enjoy representation in planning institutions.

Rabbis for Human Rights responded to the verdict:

In its latest ruling, the High Court of Israel has legitimized a regime of separation and discrimination in planning in Area C of the West Bank. This system of planning, applied in the area under full Israeli control, infringes on the rights of the Palestinians to basic infrastructure, a roof over their heads, and development of their own private land; this despite the Palestinians being a protected population living under an ongoing military occupation of almost fifty years, whose civil life the Israeli authorities are obligated to protect. In a systematic abrogation of international law, settlers are concurrently granted preferential and additional rights in their own planning system. A regime of separation and discrimination is amongst the darkest of possible regimes and the court, in its ruling, missed this opportunity to stop the abuse of government (and military) power.

This ruling has removed the hope of many Palestinian residents and villages and quite a few Israelis that despite the military occupation, the principles of justice are what guide the Israeli court system. More serious than this, the decision justifies and encourages continuing the policy of planning strangulation and home demolitions that will now continue with greater “legitimacy” in the light of the decision – effecting not only this generation but also the coming generations of Palestinians living under Israeli military rule. In this way, the court further validates the belief that the aim of the Israeli military occupation is to reduce, if not to completely negate, Palestinian living space as much as possible.

This article was first published in Hebrew on Local Call. Read it [here](http://mekomit.co.il/%D7%91%D7%92%D7%A5-%D7%AA%D7%9B%D7%A0%D7%95%D7%9F-%D7%A9%D7%98%D7%97%D7%99-%D7%A1%D7%99/).

[Original source](http://972mag.com/high-court-palestinians-have-no-planning-rights/107697/)

Palestine: 10 Families Displaces in Jordan Valley

Natasha Roth

The IDF orders Palestinian residents from the northern Jordan Valley to evacuate their own homes in order to make way for military drills, which have previously damaged farmland and infrastructure.

The Israeli army evacuated 10 families in the community of Khirbet Humsah in the northern Jordan Valley on Wednesday morning, [according to the Israeli human rights NGO B’Tselem](http://www.btselem.org/area_c/20150610_humsah_temp_evacuation). The evacuation was ordered so that the military could conduct training exercises near to the families’ homes, on land owned by the residents of the community.

B’Tselem further reports that the families were requested to leave at 6 a.m., and only allowed to return seven hours later. According to the families involved, upon their return they found some of their land burnt and discovered bullet holes in some of their water tanks. Unexploded ammunition was also found in the area, residents reported.

Of the 10 families ordered to evacuate, B’Tselem reports that eight of them were displaced only a month ago, during [extensive military training drills](http://972mag.com/hundreds-of-palestinians-displaced-in-jordan-valley-by-idf-training-exercises/106611/) that lasted several days and displaced dozens of families. Those affected on Wednesday will once again be required to leave their homes at 6 a.m. on June 16 for the army to conduct further exercises.

Wednesday also saw three other communities in the area served with evacuation orders in order to make way for military drills, B’Tselem’s report continues. The communities’ 180 residents – more than 100 of them children – will have to evacuate between 6:30 a.m. and 12:30 p.m. on June 11 and 17, respectively.

The IDF’s repeated harassment of Palestinian residents of the Jordan Valley for the sake of training exercises is just one of the many challenges they face. The majority of the Jordan Valley (which makes up 30 percent of the occupied territories) is designated Area C, which is under full Israeli military and administrative control. Ninety-five percent of this area is [under the control of Israeli settlements and regional councils](http://www.btselem.org/jordan_valley), in addition to various areas which have been designated either “state lands,” closed [military zones (including firing areas) or nature reserves](http://www.btselem.org/sites/default/files/20110508_jordan_vally_nature_and_fire_zones_map_eng.pdf).

In addition, villages located within the Area C territory of the Jordan Valley are [vulnerable to demolition orders](http://972mag.com/jordan-valley-fence-would-finalize-the-west-banks-complete-enclosure/81323/), and several communities undergo [repeated demolitions](http://www.btselem.org/planning_and_building/20150325_khallet_makhul_demolition).

The issue of planning permission for Palestinians in Area C [made it to the Supreme Court](http://972mag.com/supreme-court-to-state-give-palestinians-a-say-in-planning/90298/) last year. It was hoped that a petition to grant planning authority to Palestinian villages to build on their own land would pass, ending decades of discrimination in this matter. On Tuesday, however, the Court [rejected the appeal](http://elyon1.court.gov.il/files/11/670/056/t24/11056670.t24.htm) [Hebrew], leaving Area C Palestinians with little to no say over development of their land.

Given the Israeli government’s [creeping annexation of the Jordan Valley](http://972mag.com/meretz-we-wont-oppose-annexation-of-jordan-valley/84690/), none of these issues are expected to receive any kind of a just resolution in the foreseeable future. The Israeli army’s training exercises, with [all their attendant ruin](http://jordanvalleysolidarity.org/index.php/home-2/190-english-categories/news-from-the-jordan-valley/2015/830-a-week-military-training-prevents-palestinian-children-from-going-to-school), will also persist and are likely to intensify. In May 2014, Col. Einav Shalev of the Central Command – the section of the Israeli army responsible for units in the West Bank – confirmed to a Knesset committee that such [live fire military drills in Area C are aimed at driving Palestinians out](http://www.haaretz.com/news/diplomacy-defense/.premium-1.591881). Between government policy and military activity, the [ethnic cleansing of the Jordan Valley](http://www.haaretz.com/opinion/cleansing-the-jordan-valley-1.501255) is set to continue.

[Original source](http://972mag.com/idf-displaces-palestinian-families-to-conduct-military-drills/107683/)

Supreme Court Upholds Key Tool for Fighting Housing Bias

Aljazeera America, the Associated Press

The Supreme Court handed a major victory to the Obama administration and civil rights groups on Thursday when it upheld a key tool used for more than four decades to fight [housing](http://america.aljazeera.com/topics/topic/issue/housing.html) discrimination.

The justices ruled 5-4 that federal housing laws prohibit seemingly neutral practices that harm minorities, even without proof of intentional discrimination. The case involved [an appeal from Texas officials accused of violating the Fair Housing Act by awarding federal tax credits](http://america.aljazeera.com/articles/2015/1/21/texas-housing-discriminationsupremecourt.html) in a way that kept low-income housing out of white neighborhoods.

[Justice Anthony Kennedy](http://america.aljazeera.com/topics/topic/people/Anthony-M-Kennedy.html), often a swing vote, joined the court's four liberal members in upholding the use of so-called "disparate impact" cases.

The ruling is a win for housing advocates who argued that the Fair Housing Act allows challenges to race-neutral policies that have a negative impact on minority groups. The Justice Department has used disparate impact lawsuits to win millions of dollars in legal settlements from companies accused of bias against black and Hispanic customers.

In upholding the tactic, [the Supreme Court](http://america.aljazeera.com/topics/topic/issue/supreme-court.html) preserved a legal strategy that has been used for more than 40 years to attack discrimination in zoning laws, occupancy rules, mortgage lending practices and insurance underwriting. Every federal appeals court to consider it has upheld the practice, though the Supreme Court had never previously taken it up.

The ruling is a defeat for banks, insurance companies and other business groups that claimed such lawsuits are not explicitly allowed under the Fair Housing Act, the landmark 1968 law that sought to eliminate segregation that has long existed in residential housing.

Both the Obama administration and civil rights groups have tried for years to keep the issue away from the Supreme Court, fearing that conservative justices wanted to end the use of disparate impact lawsuits in housing cases. In fact, two similar cases out of Minnesota and New Jersey previously had reached the court in recent years, but those cases were settled or strategically withdrawn just weeks before oral argument.

Yet the court took up the Texas case last year despite the fact that there was no split among lower courts over the issue. That led to major worries for the NAACP and other civil rights groups that the court was inclined to end the strategy.

[Original Source](http://america.aljazeera.com/articles/2015/6/25/scotus-upholds-tool-for-fighting-housing-bias2.html)

Myanmar: A New Publication about Land Confiscation

Karen Human Rights Group

Villagers in Karen areas of southeast Myanmar continue to face widespread land confiscation at the hands of a multiplicity of actors. Much of this can be attributed to the rapid expansion of domestic and international commercial interest and investment in southeast Myanmar since the January 2012 preliminary ceasefire between the Karen National Union (KNU) and the Myanmar government. KHRG first documented this in a 2013 report entitled ‘Losing Ground’, which documented cases of land confiscation between January 2011 and November 2012. This report, ‘With only our voices, what can we do?’, is a follow up to that analysis and highlights continued issue areas while identifying newly documented trends. The present analysis assesses land confiscation according to a number of different factors, including: land use type; geographic distribution across KHRG’s seven research areas; perpetrators involved; whether or not compensation and/or consultation occurred; and the effects that confiscation had on local villagers. This report also seeks to highlight local responses to land confiscation, emphasising the agency that individuals and communities in southeast Myanmar already possess and the obstacles that they face when attempting to protect their own human rights. By focusing on local perspectives and giving priority to villagers’ voices, this report aims to provide local, national, and international actors with a resource that will allow them to base policy and programmatic decisions that will impact communities in southeast Myanmar more closely on the experiences and concerns of the people living there. Click here for a copy of the full report in ENGLISH or BURMESE. (right-click the link and choose "Save File As...") Click here to download APPENDIX 1 & 2 in English, which includes the full-text of the 113 raw data reports and 13 Land Grabbing Forms analysed in this report. Click here to download APPENDIX 3 in English/Burmese that provides legal background and contextual information, which allows for an analysis of the testimony in this report within a broader framework. A shorter version of the report, along with maps, can be found in the left-hand panel of this page in English, Burmese and Karen.

I. Introduction “Yes, now look at our ancestors’ land that has been given to us, it is all being destroyed. They do business and get money. For us we have to sacrifice, suffer, and we get nothing out of it. How much can they bully us? What is human? We are equally human, yet they do not know whether other people will be hurt or suffer. They just care about their profits and are satisfied if they get money, not caring about other people’s suffering and destruction. It is not human, it is animal…they can do whatever they want with a package of their money, but for us, with only our voices, what can we do?”Naw T---, (female), D--- village, Kyonedoe Township, Dooplaya District/Southern Kayin State(Interviewed in November 2014)[1].

Since December 2012, villagers in Karen communities across southeast Myanmar have reported widespread land confiscation and its associated impacts. This report is an analysis of 484 pieces of data collected by KHRG researchers between December 2012 and January 2015, which resulted in the identification of 126 reports specifically related to land confiscation and its associated impacts, as well as community responses. These land-related issues are linked to three broad categories of development and business activity: infrastructure projects, natural resource extraction, and commercial agriculture projects. In addition, villager testimony highlighted frequent land confiscation by armed actors occurring for military purposes. Villagers’ perspectives on these projects were frequently excluded from either planning or implementation, and compensation was often nonexistent or insufficient. Villagers reported that land-related abuses have caused livelihood difficulties, displacement, environmental destruction, and other issues. In response, villagers described employing various forms of individual and collective action strategies to prevent abuses, including negotiation, demonstrations, and outreach to both media sources as well as local organisations. Ensuring that such efforts are supported, that such a space for local responses is created and expanded, and that villagers ultimately retain their land use rights without facing displacement or abuse is critical to ensuring that a viable, equitable, and inclusive peace takes root in southeast Myanmar.

This report is a follow up to [*Losing Ground*](http://www.khrg.org/2013/03/losing-ground-land-conflicts-and-collective-action-eastern-myanmar), a KHRG report published in 2013, and is based on an analysis of written and oral testimony from villagers in southeast Myanmar, as well as documentation such as photographs, video, and audio recordings, collected by researchers who have been trained by KHRG to report on local human rights conditions. The documents analysed in this report detail cases of land confiscation and its associated impacts occurring between December 2012 and January 2015 in Karen communities across southeast Myanmar, including all of Kayin State and Tanintharyi Region, as well as parts of eastern Bago Region and northern Mon State.[[2]](http://www.khrg.org/2015/06/with-only-our-voices-what-can-we-do-land-confiscation-and-local-response?utm_source=Karen+Human+Rights+Group+Newsletter&utm_campaign=dca02cd07f-Press_Release_6_30_2015&utm_medium=email&utm_term=0_5f459a564c-dca02cd07f-91913985#ftn2) The objective of this report is to present villagers’ perspectives on land confiscation and related community responses in southeast Myanmar. It aims to highlight the continuation of previously identified trends, as well as introduce new issue areas which have since emerged  in prominence, based on villagers’ testimony since December 2012. The testimony presented in this report is the direct, lived experience of villagers in southeast Myanmar. Its dissemination is therefore crucial for both domestic and international actors to better understand the impacts of land confiscation on the communities in which it occurs. The findings and recommendations are intended to assist all development actors, including the Myanmar government, armed actors, domestic and foreign corporate actors, as well as civil society, to fully understand the concerns of local communities in the context of development and land confiscation, and take appropriate action to ensure land-related abuses are avoided and future development is community driven, inclusive, and sustainable.

*Section I: Introduction* provides an overview of the report in general, and details the methodology of the report. In addition, it includes a current context subsection which reviews recent developments in Myanmar’s laws and politics as they pertain to land issues.

*Section II: Land use types* assesses four primary project types related to land, identified in the analysis of villager testimony. These are infrastructure projects, which include the construction of roads, bridges, dams and other projects; natural resource extraction, which includes mining for gold, stone, and other minerals and metals, as well as logging; commercial agriculture projects, which primarily include rubber, teak, palm, and other plantations; and finally the confiscation of land by armed actors for military purposes. Villager testimony regarding each is presented, with a further focus on consequences and trends.

*Section III: Village agency* provides analysis of the primary agency strategies employed by villagers in response to the abuse types identified. These include outreach to CBOs & NGOs, negotiation, lobbying the Myanmar government and EAG officials, demonstrations, formal registration, and a number of other less cited strategies. The full text of all 126 documents which formed the dataset for this report are available in the [Appendix 1: Raw Data](http://www.khrg.org/sites/default/files/appendices_1_2.pdf), and [Appendix 2: Land Grabbing Forms](http://www.khrg.org/sites/default/files/appendices_1_2.pdf). [Appendix 3: Background Information](http://www.khrg.org/sites/default/files/appendix_3_englishburmese_final.pdf) provides legal background and contextual information, which allows for an analysis of the testimony in this report within a broader framework.

**Rationale for the report**

The objective of this report is to present villagers' perspectives on land confiscation and related community repsonses in southeast Myanmar. It aims to highlight the continuation of previously identified trends, as well as introduce new issue areas which have since emerged in prominence based on villager testimony since December 2012. The testimony presented in this report is the direct, lived experience of villagers in southeast Myanmar. Its dissemination is therefore crucial for both domestic and international actors to better understand the impacts of land confiscation on the communities in which they occur.

Althouth the nature of human rights abuses in southeast Myanmar may have changed since the 2012 preliminary ceasefire, land confiscation has become a primary grievance throughout the conflict period, and will continue to be of importance to the tenability of peace in the region. Ensuring that land tenure rights and land confiscation issues are addressed in an inclusive manner in any future agreement between the Myanmar government and the KNU is therefore crucial to the protection and promotion of human rights in southeast Myanmar.

**Detailed Findings**

**Infrastructure projects**

* The confiscation of land for the construction of roads, including the Asian Highway, was identified in villager testimony as an important emerging issue since December 2012. This was particularly the case in Dooplaya District, where KHRG received a large quantity of reports from December 2012 to January 2015.
* Land confiscation for hydropower dams continues to be a subject of serious concern for villagers in southeast Myanmar. This is compounded by local concerns about the potential for future confiscation or destruction of land through annual flooding for those living near the resevoir catchment areas. This concern was raised particularly by those villagers living near the proposed site of the Hatgyi Dam.
* The main effects of infrastructure projects include the destruction of villager livelihoods and the surrounding environment. On a large scale, farms and plantations have been levelled in order to build roads and flooding from dams has devastated the local environment in Kayin State.
* The lack of compensation and consultation featured as a prominent trend. Where compensation was mentioned, villagers were given a fraction of what they are entitled to or were still awaiting payment. Where consultation occurred, often, even with villager disapproval, infrastructure projects would still go ahead as planned, leading to serious consequences amounting to human rights violations.

**Natural Resource Extraction (NRE)**

* Gold mining was identified as the most common NRE project to result in land confiscation. This was particularly the case in Dwe Lo Township, Hpapun District, where the majority of reports regarding land confiscation related to NRE projects were concentrated.
* Villagers reported that NRE projects, particularly gold mining, resulted in extensive environmental damage, including the release of chemicals into rivers, aswell as soil erosion. As villagers rely heavily on the surrounding natural environment for their livelihoods, environmental damage and livelihood issues often went hand in hand.
* Villagers identified Myanmar private companies and wealthy individuals as the most common perpetrators of land confiscation for NRE projects, often in collusion with armed actors and Myanmar government officials.
* In the majority of cases, villagers reported that little or no compensation was provided for confiscated land, while only a small number involved consultation with villagers prior to land confiscation. In one instance, villagers report being forced into signing agreements to hand over their land.

**Agriculture projects**

* Rubber plantations were identified by villagers as the primary use of land confiscated foragricultural purposes, however, teak, betel nut and cardamom plantations were also cited.
* The primary perpetrators of land confiscation for agricultural projects were the Myanmar government, Karen Border Guard Forces (BGF) and private corporate actors. Collusion between state or state-backed armed actors, as well as other armed actors, and private business interests was identified as a continuing trend in southeast Myanmar.
* Land confiscated was predominantly identified as being either privately held land or communally owned. Communal land, including both land governed according to traditional land tenure systems, as well as protected forest areas, were often reclassified as ‘uncultivated’ prior to confiscation.
* The primary consequence of land confiscation for agricultural projects identified by villagers was livelihood issues. A decrease in access to firewood and building materials, often due to the confiscation of communal land, was identified as an emerging new trend in the current reporting period.

**Militarisation**

* Land confiscation for military purposes included the building of new camps, expanding existing ones, building housing for soldiers’ families, as well as for commerical projects to fund military activities.
* Villagers identified state and state-sponsored armed actors as the perpetrators of land confiscation. This included the Tatmadaw, BGF and Karen Peace Force (KPF).
* In the majority of cases, villagers were not consulted prior to confiscation, and in one case villagers were deliberately misled into signing an agreement which turned over land to an armed actor.
* Throughout the reporting period, KHRG continued to receive reports detailing the negative impacts of cases where land had been confiscated prior to December 2012. This particularly highlighted the ongoing trend of land grabbing by the Tatmadaw over the last several decades.

**Village agency**

* There was a marked increase in the frequency and diversity of village agency responses compared to the prior reporting period of 2011-2012. In particular, reports indicating negotiation and lobbying with armed groups has increased, while formal registration of land and outreach to community-based organisations (CBOs) have emerged as strategies.
* In a small number of cases, negotiation with armed actors was successful in preventing or stopping a project. However, in most cases villagers faced violent threats or even death for speaking out.
* Villagers reported lobbying EAGs, in particular the KNU/Karen National Liberation Army (KNU/KNLA), in order to address abuses in areas projects were prevented following EAG intervention.

**Recommendations**

**Consultation and consent**

* As villagers are best placed to assess their own interests and the impact of development on their livelihoods, development projects should be planned in consultation with local communities, with full disclosure of information relating to how the projects could affect their lands and livelihoods. Communities should be given the opportunity to participate in decisions regarding size, scope, compensation, and means of project implementation, and all development actors should prioritise the perspectives and consent of communities in all decision-making.
* All development actors must carry out environmental, health and human rights impact assessments prior to project implementation. These assessments should be carried out independently of the actor’s interests, in consultation with project-affected communities and made publicly available in all local languages.

**Customary land rights, usage and national land policy**

* The Myanmar government should ensure that the National Land Use Policy (NLUP) and other relevant land laws protect existing land use practices and tenure rights, and acknowledge that local communities may recognise land titles granted by multiple sources, including customary, colonial and local administrations.
* All policy reforms should ascertain and respect the land rights of communities and individuals displaced by conflict, including refugees.
* In cases where villagers wish to secure a land title from the Myanmar government, a transparent and inclusive process should be available for villagers to do so.

**Support for community solutions**

* Development actors should seek out and engage with local, broad-based, independent associations of villagers formed to address land issues, as well as local community-based organisations.
* Domestic civil society should promote knowledge-sharing among and give support to independent associations across the country.
* The media should expand their coverage of land conflicts in southeast Myanmar and sustained pressure should be maintained by the media and civil society on the Myanmar government to ensure that land confiscation issues remain a central component to the current reform process in Myanmar.
* The Myanmar government and civil society should provide communities with training and educational resources about domestic complaint and adjudication bodies.
* All armed actors, including the Tatmadaw, Karen BGFs, KNU/KNLA, Democratic Karen Benevolent Army (DKBA), and others, should support local villagers’ land rights and land tenure systems, and should commit themselves to following all of the measures included in these recommendations in areas under their direct control.
* The Myanmar government should ensure that access to domestic complaint and adjudication bodies is available to all villagers, and that land dispute mechanisms are community based and established according to customary practices.

**Ceasefire context**

* All development actors should ensure that they do not become complicit in human rights abuses by carrying out good faith due diligence to make certain that their partners do not compromise the rights and security of local communities.
* All armed actors should demilitarise former conflict areas and immediately cease the confiscation of land in southeast Myanmar for the purposes of: constructing military facilities, which include camps, barracks, and housing for the families of soldiers; or leasing land in order to generate income.
* The Myanmar government and EAGs in southeast Myanmar should ensure that any future ceasefire agreements include components which ensure that the land rights of all populations, including internally displaced persons (IDPs) and refugees, are protected.

**Footnotes**

[[1]](http://www.khrg.org/2015/06/with-only-our-voices-what-can-we-do-land-confiscation-and-local-response?utm_source=Karen+Human+Rights+Group+Newsletter&utm_campaign=dca02cd07f-Press_Release_6_30_2015&utm_medium=email&utm_term=0_5f459a564c-dca02cd07f-91913985#bd1) See Appendix 1, source #113.

[[2]](http://www.khrg.org/2015/06/with-only-our-voices-what-can-we-do-land-confiscation-and-local-response?utm_source=Karen+Human+Rights+Group+Newsletter&utm_campaign=dca02cd07f-Press_Release_6_30_2015&utm_medium=email&utm_term=0_5f459a564c-dca02cd07f-91913985#bd2) For further details on geographic designations, see the *Methodology* section of the full report.

[Original Source](http://www.khrg.org/2015/06/with-only-our-voices-what-can-we-do-land-confiscation-and-local-response?utm_source=Karen+Human+Rights+Group+Newsletter&utm_campaign=dca02cd07f-Press_Release_6_30_2015&utm_medium=email&utm_term=0_5f459a564c-dca02cd07f-91913985)