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INTRODUCTION

IDPs vs. refugees

Who is an IDP?

- According to the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement, internally displaced people (IDPs) are “persons or groups of persons who have been forced or obliged to flee or to leave their homes or places of habitual residence, in particular as a result of or in order to avoid the effects of armed conflict, situations of generalised violence, violation of human rights or natural or human-made disasters, and who have not crossed an internationally recognised State border”.

Who is a refugee?
What is displacement?

- Formerly, displacement was mainly understood only as physical removal of people from certain territory.
  - People were considered to be displaced only if they have (been) moved away from their former place of residence.

- Recently, economic and socio-cultural factors are included in understanding and defining the concept.

- **Economic displacement**: where people’s livelihood earnings are negatively affected without physical movement from their settlements.

- What is displacement for you?
In 2011, the global number of people internally displaced by armed conflict, violence or human rights violations was 26.4 million.

The number of internally displaced persons (IDPs) in sub-Saharan Africa was 9.7 million (More than 3.5 million people were newly displaced in 2011, representing 20% increase compared to 2010).

The country with the most internally displaced people was Colombia: about 3.9 million people were displaced, according to the government; a non-governmental observer placed the figure closer to 5.3 million.

The other countries with more than a million IDPs, as a year before, were Iraq, Sudan, the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) and Somalia.

At the end of the year, over 2.4 million IDPs had reportedly returned to their areas of origin, including many in Côte d’Ivoire, DRC, Libya and South Sudan.
Forced evictions caused internal displacement in 18 countries monitored by IDMC; they were more often than not carried out against IDPs living in precarious housing situations, resulting in these people’s secondary displacement.

Many governments were still in the process of formulating a plan of action to protect IDPs’ rights.

33 of the 53 African Union (AU) member states had signed the AU’s Convention for the Protection and Assistance of Internally Displaced Persons in Africa, also known as the Kampala Convention, the first legally-binding regional instrument of its kind.

Drought across the Horn of Africa led to famine in southern and central regions, with reports of high rates of malnutrition and severe food insecurity in most IDP settlements.
## Natural Hazards

### Summary of global estimates for new displacement, 2008-2011 (millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF DISASTER</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weather</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geophysical</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Global estimates 2011
People displaced by natural hazard-induced disasters

- **Weather**: Earthquakes, volcanic eruptions, dry mass movements (rockfalls, avalanches, landslides, etc.), wild fire
- **Geophysical**: Floods, Storms, wet mass movements (landslides, avalanches, etc.)
Displacement could result also from human-made crisis, such as violent conflict and war. This could be termed as *conflict-induced displacement*.

Natural hazards, such as flooding, earthquakes, tsunamis and hurricanes are also increasingly displacing people.
Population Relocation

- People may moved from one location to another under either a development (and conservation) rationale or a counter-disaster strategy

- Includes the mostly unstated but pursued political motives of the state, including the intentions of ensuring political control through reconfiguration of people and space, thereby creating new development in the political landscape of a country or a region.

Q: Is population relocation displacement or resettlement?
Development–Induced Displacement

“…displacement because of development interventions—typically related to infrastructure projects such as dams (which flood massive areas), roads, state-owned plantations, mining, pipelines, and urban reconstruction—is estimated to be between 100 and 200 million people since 1980” (Agrawal and Redford 2009: 2).

- As a result of policies that seek to provide an avenue for development ventures
- When the ‘right of way’ for development overrides the ‘right to stay’ of people
  - construction of dams (e.g. the Three Gorges), roads, etc.
  - mining
  - establishment of protected areas
  - establishment of military infrastructure
  - large-scale land deals (“land grabbing”)
  - urban expansion
- As a “perverse effect of development”

**Eminent domain**: gives the state the right to displace some people for the benefit of the general public
Ethiopia: ‘Land to the Grabber’

http://gadaa.com/oduu/?p=1719
DISPLACEMENT RISKS

- **Risk**: uncertain events that can damage well being.
  - **Idiosyncratic risks** – affect individuals or households and
  - **Co-variant risks** – affect groups of households, an entire community or country

- Michael Cernea’s analytical model of impoverishment risks and reconstruction (IRR) was founded on economic and social risks inherent in displacements.

- According to Cernea (2000), nine risks of impoverishment would be caused by displacement in the absence of well-planned resettlement.

- de Wet (2004) suggests “cultural disarticulation” and “political disarticulation” as additional “threats” closely tied to the social disarticulation risk.
## The IRR model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IRR</th>
<th>Empirical Approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landlessness</td>
<td>Land issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joblessness</td>
<td>Employment issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homelessness</td>
<td>Housing issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased morbidity &amp; mortality</td>
<td>Health issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of access to education</td>
<td>Education issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food insecurity</td>
<td>Food security issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of common property</td>
<td>Access to common property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginalization</td>
<td>Marginalization/Integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social disarticulation</td>
<td>Social dis/re-articulation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These risks should be conceived as “systems of impoverishment risks”, not as discrete entities, signifying their interdependence and “compounded” nature.

Impoverishment in this sense is a cumulative outcome of multifaceted deprivation of economic, social, cultural and psychological dimensions.

The displacement risks will likely become real-life experiences in the absence of an inclusive reconstruction plan and implementation.

Resettlement demands a great deal of adaptation and may even involve what Evrard and Goudineau (2004) call “cultural trauma.”
Displacement may render social exclusions in development processes, and resettlement could be undertaken in order to correct the detrimental consequences of development.

Displacement and resettlement always involve a complex socio-cultural, political and economic dynamics and considerable livelihood consequences.

While there seems to be a general agreement on the risks associated with displacement and resettlement, some also envisage that there are situations where there is no other better alternative.

Subject to the philosophical and ethical concerns held on the concept of development, there are competing views on this and will be taken up in the following Section.

Still for others, the changes associated with displacement and the demand for cultural, social and economic adaptation may, under enabling environment, stimulate development.
A general agreement on the risks associated with displacement and resettlement

Subject to the philosophical and ethical positions held on the concept of development, there are competing views on displacement.

Dwivedi (2002) and Morvaridi (2004) on population displacement:

- The “Reformist–Managerial”
- “Radical–Movementist”
The “Reformist–Managerial” View

- Displacement as inevitable and unintended consequence of development
- For development to take place, some people should necessarily be displaced
- No development without displacement
- Focuses on how to mitigate the negative consequences of displacement
- What should be done is minimizing the frequency, the magnitude and the undesirable consequences of displacement
- Principally developmentalist
The “Radical–Movementist” View

- Displacement is neither inevitability nor desirability.
- Development, if it entails population displacement, is unacceptable and should be resisted (and stopped).
- No development if displacement
- The very legitimacy of population displacement is challenged in reference to “fundamental political issues, such as rights and governance” (Morvaridi 2004).
- Their argument in its most radical form contends that large-scale development projects are basically designed to enhance the power of the state and private capital and are incapable of representing or serving the interests of the vast majority of the population” (Oliver-Smith 2001).
- Predominantly populist
Both perspectives revolve around concerns for “social justice and material well-being, but they differ markedly on the deeper philosophical meaning of development as a social goal and the means by which that goal should be achieved” (Oliver-Smith 2001).

“DIDR involves **competing visions of the nature and the process of development**. Outsider government and development agencies usually have a very different view of **what constitutes development**….“ (de Wet 2004: 60).

Q: Which of the two views on displacement makes sense to you, and why?
The categorization into the two perspectives on displacement could be systematized on the basis of:

- Their origin and scholarship
- How displacement is presented in relation to development
- The focus
- The problems
- The solutions
- General orientation
Comparison of the *reformist-managerial* and the *radical-movementist* perspectives on population displacement (conceptualized from Dwivedi 2002: 711-712)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reformist-managerial</th>
<th>Radical-movementist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Origin and scholarship</strong></td>
<td>Applied concerns</td>
<td>Action research and activism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Presents displacement as</strong></td>
<td>Inevitable and unintended consequences of development</td>
<td>A manifestation of a crisis in development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The focus</strong></td>
<td>Consequences of displacement</td>
<td>Causes of displacement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The problem(s)</strong></td>
<td>Mainly economic and technical deficiencies in mainstream development</td>
<td>Mainly the structure of the mainstream development itself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The solution(s)</strong></td>
<td>Properly planned and justly implemented resettlement</td>
<td>Stopping development that displaces and seeking alternative ways of doing development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Orientation</strong></td>
<td>Developmentalist, functionalist</td>
<td>Populist, structuralalist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Two approaches could be identified on why resettlement schemes fall short of expectations or why they miserably fail (de Wet 2004: 52):

- The *inadequate inputs* approach
- The *inherent complexity* approach

Q: Which of these views makes sense to you, and why?
The “Inadequate Inputs” View

- Resettlement fails mainly due to lack of the required inputs:
  - national legal framework and policies, political will
  - funding
  - pre-resettlement surveys, planning, consultation
  - careful implementation, and monitoring

- In the absence of these inputs, *impoverishment risks*.

- The availability and proper utilization of these mostly economic and technical inputs somewhat guarantees success in resettlement undertakings.
The “Inherent Complexity” View

- The combination of many factors makes resettlement an inherently complex venture, for which there is no straightforward remedies.

- de Wet (2004) coined the *inherent complexity* approach on the basis of the salient features of involuntary resettlements, which he lists as follows:
  
  - Involuntary resettlement involves imposed spatial change
  - Spatial change usually involves a change in the pattern of people’s access to resources
  - Resettled people usually find themselves in larger, and more heterogeneous settlements than previously
  - Resettlement involves people in wider structures
  - Resettlement involves accelerated socio-economic change

- The categorization into the two perspectives could be systematized on the basis of:
  
  - views on what constitutes the problem(s) and the solution(s)
  - Conviction on the possibilities of livelihood reconstruction after resettlement
Table 2: Comparison of the *inadequate inputs* and the *inherent complexity* perspectives on resettlement dynamics (conceptualized from de Wet 2004)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Inadequate Inputs</th>
<th>Inherent Complexity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resettlement problem(s)</td>
<td>More of economic and technical</td>
<td>More of social and political</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The solution(s)</td>
<td>Rational planning and appropriate policy measures</td>
<td>Could not be addressed through rational planning and procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livelihood reconstruction</td>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resettlement with development</td>
<td>Optimistic, but with considerable changes in conventional planning</td>
<td>Pessimistic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONCLUSION

Views on population displacement for the sake of development could be placed on a continuum with the reformist-managerial and the radical-movementist extremes.

These perspectives are reflections of both philosophical questions about development and practical problems of displacement and resettlement.
References


