A Tale of Two Solitudes:
Comparing Conflict and Development-induced Internal Displacement and Involuntary Resettlement

Robert Muggah*

ABSTRACT

Development projects and war regularly lead to the internal displacement and involuntary resettlement of tens of millions of people each year. Though most "internally displaced people" settle spontaneously, a significant proportion is involuntarily resettled into planned "camps" and "settlements". This article is primarily concerned with a relatively understudied category of forced migration studies: resettlement. It contends that until very recently, the theory, policy, and practice of resettlement for people internally displaced by development and war have been treated as intellectually and practically exclusive. Decision makers and scholars working on the subject are frequently beholden to narrow disciplinary and bureaucratic interests and are unable or unwilling to look across institutional boundaries. As a result, policies and programmes intended to resettle populations have been clustered into two discrete (and disparate) narratives. Each of these draw from distinct normative moorings, government and non-governmental interpretations of "success" and "failure" and a division of labour closely tailored to the disciplines and expertise of those in the development and humanitarian communities. Though arising from separate traditions and conceived exclusively by donors, policy makers, and scholars, this article contends that they actually share many common features.

Drawing on a vast and rapidly growing literature, this article seeks to frame the key debates on development and war-induced internal displacement and resettlement. It begins with an overview of definitional issues – including "internal displacement" and "resettlement" – two concepts that are regularly contested and misunderstood. The article observes that the *Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement* have, to some extent, clarified the rights of development and

---

* GSC Professional Fellow of the Social Science Research Council (USA), Graduate Institute of International Studies, Geneva, Switzerland.

conflict-induced internally displaced people, as well as the responsibilities of
states. It notes that in practice, however, resettlement of both types of populations
is treated separately. The article then turns to a number of seminal theoretical
contributions to the study of development and conflict-induced internal
displacement and involuntary resettlement (DIDR and CIDR, respectively). The
article highlights their separate evolution in theory and practice over time. It
closes with a brief treatment of some of the common features of DIDR and
CIDR, including their political economy, their institutional and bureaucratic logic,
and similar patterns of impoverishment risks.

INTRODUCTION

Development projects and war are conservatively associated with the protracted
internal displacement and involuntary resettlement of more than 130 million people
since 1990, more than six times the number of recognized refugees.[1] The majority
of internally displaced people settle *spontaneously* with a relatively smaller num-
ber *involuntarily* resettled into "camps" and "settlements" administered/managed
by governments and non-governmental organizations (NGOs). This article is
concerned with this complex, if understudied area of forced migration studies –
namely, resettlement of the internally displaced.

Until very recently, the theory, policy, and practice of *resettlement* for people
internally displaced by development and war were treated as intellectually and
practically exclusive. Decision makers and scholars were locked into narrow
bureaucratic interests and unable, or unwilling, to see across institutional bound-
aries. Policies and programmes designed to resettle populations as a result of
development and conflict were clustered into two discrete narratives. Each of these
regimes emerged from distinct normative moorings, governmental and non-
governmental responses and valuations of "success" and "failure" which fit the
existing priorities, structures, and division of labour of the development and
humanitarian communities. Though emerging from separate traditions and treated
differently by donors, policy makers, and scholars, this article argues that they
nevertheless share many common features.

This article is divided into three sections and aims to outline a number of key
debates in the literature. The first section revisits definitional issues of "internal
displacement" and "resettlement", two concepts that are regularly contested and
misunderstood. The second section reviews a number of the theoretical contribu-
tions to the study of development and conflict-induced internal displacement and
involuntary resettlement (DIDR and CIDR, respectively) – highlighting
their separate evolution in theory and practice over time. The third section briefly
discusses some of the common features of DIDR and CIDR, including their polit-
ical economy, their institutional and bureaucratic logic, and similar impoverish-
ment risks.

RECONSIDERING DISPLACEMENT

While it is fashionable to speak about the importance of labels in social relations, there is no more obvious case of the importance of clear definitions than in debates on forced migration. In reviewing the voluminous and disparate literature on internal displacement and resettlement – a literature that draws from academic and practitioner-oriented writings on subjects as diverse as economic and labour migration, refugee protection and assistance, development-induced displacement and resettlement, and disaster-related displacement and relocation – definitions are loose and carelessly applied. The concepts "migrant", "refugee", and "internally displaced person" are often used synonymously. Voutira (1997), for example, has observed that the refugee label is sometimes applied to many categories of migrants. Moreover, despite the restrictive criteria offered by the 1951 Convention, the actual assignment of refugee status is ultimately a function of subjective decisions. In many cases the concept of "refugee" is used broadly to describe populations fleeing exploding volcanoes to those whose land is expropriated for road-building schemes.[2] In some instances, the "displaced person" label is supplanted with the "project affected person", "oustee", "resettler", or "relocatee". Though some taxonomic fluidity may be desirable, a more consistent and careful application of terminology in the forced migration field is required.[3]

So what constitutes displacement and who is a displaced person? Population displacement is an outcome of multiple sets of factors. The many "push factors" leading to internal displacement can be aggregated into a range of overlapping categories: natural and human-made disasters, ethnic or religious persecution, development, and conflict. "Displacement" occurs where coercion is employed, where choices are restricted, and where the affected populations are facing more risks than opportunities by staying in their "place" of residence, which distinguishes it from "voluntary" or "economic" migration. Displacement is, by definition, forced and involuntary and involves some form of de-territorialization (Hyndman, 2000). It is commonly described as taking place within the confines of a state (e.g. internally displaced person) or across an internationally recognized border (e.g. refugee).

This article is concerned exclusively with *development and conflict-induced displacement*. Moreover, its focus is on those populations who *do not* cross an internationally recognized state border, and are therefore not classified as "refugees" with the attendant rights to legal protection and assistance that label confers (Baratuscki, 2000). The international legal and institutional regime created to protect refugees did not include internally displaced people (IDPs) because they were seen as falling under domestic jurisdiction or sovereignty of the states concerned (UNHCR, 2000). According to Lavoyer (1995), they were deliberately excluded because of state concerns with the infringements on sovereignty as outlined in Article 2 of the UN Charter.

IDPs recently emerged as an issue of international concern arising out of the changed political environment from the end of the Cold War and the growing awareness of the consequences of (and potential refugee flows resulting from) internal conflict.[4] A willingness to intervene on behalf of IDPs also emerged from a more expansive interpretation of sovereignty – and the rights for states to provide protection and assistance within the territory of offending states.[5] The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), for example, developed an interest in working with IDPs in the early 1990s in order to ensure "preventive protection" and contain would-be refugees. This has carried a cost. UNHCR has been criticized for straying from its principle objective of ensuring protection for refugees. It is argued that attention to IDPs potentially dilutes the agency's mandate and legitimacy.

But while there is a growing literature on the phenomena of internal displacement resulting from development and conflict, most of it generated in the last decade, it is plagued by a considerable definitional ambiguity and confusion. In addition to the proliferation of labels, it appears that there is persistent confusion, much less consensus over who constitutes an IDP, at what point their displacement ends, and the forms of international or national assistance to which they are entitled (Mooney, 2002). There is, however, general agreement that the "displacement event" in both scenarios constitutes a violation of basic and fundamental human rights. Conflict-induced internal displacement, for example, is considered to be an unquestionable violation of international humanitarian law and human rights[6] (Brookings Institute, 1999; Rutinwa, 1999; Vincent and Sorenson, 1999; Cohen and Deng, 1998a, 1998b). Development-induced internal displacement also represents, in many cases, a violation of human rights, though the overall advantages for the nation have tended to outweigh the rights and entitlements of the minority.[7] The normative bedrock of development-induced displacement rests on a given state's "eminent domain", which consists of the state's right to expropriate property in certain circumstances.

Legal scholars agree, albeit with considerable hand wringing, that there is no binding legal mechanism to respond to those internally displaced as a result of development or war (Baratuscki, 1998, 2000; Cohen and Deng, 1998a). In many cases where widespread internal displacement is occurring, appropriate human rights instruments that might otherwise guarantee the rights and entitlements of displaced people have not been signed or ratified. Thus, any question of legal obligations is in large part a function of soft law and national legislation. Many "displacement-producing" states have simply not signed legally binding international documents that provide specific or comprehensive rights for those internally displaced by development.[8] Even where human rights instruments are codified in national law, these can also be temporarily restricted under the auspices "national security".

A recent effort to wed a definition of conflict-induced IDPs with normative responsibilities is the United Nation's *Guiding Principles on Internal Displace-*

ment (1998) or "Deng Principles".[9] The Deng Principles define as internally displaced those "people who have been forced or obliged to flee or to leave their homes or habitual places of residence in particular as a result of or in order to avoid the effects of armed conflict, situations of generalised violence, violations of human rights or natural or human-made disasters, and who have not crossed an internationally recognised state border".[10] This description itself draws heavily on the definition of a refugee provided by the Organization of African Unity (OAU) Convention. However, as indicated earlier, this definition does *not* include clear provisions for development-induced IDPs. As Baratuscki (1998: 6) argues, "the Guiding Principles contain few provisions that are directly applicable to development displacees and are not legally binding". Instead, it is argued, they are intended to highlight the special *needs* of a particular population.

By way of comparison, *development-induced internal displacement* has been recognized (albeit by a different name) as a regular feature of dam projects, urban renewal programmes, irrigation schemes, infrastructure projects, and the like since the 1950s. Scholars and practitioners have long-recognized that development can embody a set of perverse pathologies – leading to short- and long-term social and economic costs – and that many projects calling for internal displacement are often fully avoidable and should not take place from the beginning. The situation where projects produce gainers (development) and losers (displaced people) is described as an "inescapable dilemma" against which practice and theory must struggle (Cernea, 1999; Parasuraman, 1999). International guidelines to protect the rights and entitlements of development-induced IDPs have emerged in the past two decades – and independently of the processes leading to the development of the Deng Principles.[11] An imperfect but operationally focused description of programmatic rights of development-induced IDPs is found in the World Bank's *Operational Directive 4.30: Involuntary Resettlement* (1980, 1990, and 1994) and the *OECD Guidelines for Aid Agencies on Involuntary Displacement and Resettlement in Development Projects: DAC Guidelines on Environment and Aid* (1991, 1998).

REVIEWING RESETTLEMENT

The resettlement of IDPs has, until recently, been treated as a peripheral issue in the field of forced migration studies. The reasons for this are varied and interconnected, including the absence of international attention, the marginal status of the displaced populations prior to displacement, and the limited attention devoted to the subject by social scientists (Cernea, 1997). It is not surprising, then, that just as there is confusion in the forced migration literature about the distinctions between migration and displacement, there is also uncertainty over the distinctions between "voluntary" and "involuntary" resettlement.

To be sure, all *migration* involves an element of choice, "people frequently have the latitude to decide where to go and … whether to flee at all" (UNHCR, 1997: 35). Similarly, there has been a long-standing agreement that *forced* displacement is distinct from so-called "voluntary" population movements (Zolberg et al., 1989; Vernant, 1953). As Penz (2002: 3) observes, "if it is voluntary it is not displace-ment". Voluntary and economic migration (e.g. including rural-urban and intra-urban movements) is more a reflection of people's deliberate pursuit of new opportunities. Displacement and resettlement become "involuntary" when the choice to remain is *not provided*. The question of "choice to remain" is central to this dichotomy. But, because it is a "choice", it is by definition subjective. What may be treated as "voluntary" in rhetoric can actually be "involuntary" in practice. Not surprisingly, coercion and physical violence can be common to both "volun-tary" and "involuntary" resettlement schemes. On the other hand, what may appear to be an involuntary scheme may also include opportunists, including voluntary resettlers or "squatters".[12]

Whether a function of hydroelectric dams, earthquakes, or war, resettlement schemes are regularly erected to deal with displaced populations. What all these resettlement schemes have in common is the fact that they are designed to *transfer population from one area to another on a planned basis*. As one of the foremost scholars on resettlement noted in the 1960s, resettlement constitutes a form of "planned social change that necessarily entails population movement, population selection and most probably population control" (Chambers, 1969). While there is no "natural category" of resettlement, there are clear boundaries of the debate: there is a movement of population and an element of planning and control, which correspond roughly with the words "settlement" or resettlement and "scheme" respectively.

As discussed above, policies and interventions designed to resettle populations internally displaced as a result of conflict or development projects are clustered into two distinct regimes, with separate theoretical moorings, legal and normative guidelines, and valuations of "success" or "failure". There has been surprisingly little interplay between the two regimes despite repeated pleas by Scudder and Colson (1982), Hansen and Oliver-Smith (1982), and Cernea (1990, 1997, 1999).

Development-induced displacement and involuntary resettlement

The study of DIDR has a comparatively long and readily discernible history in the field of development and forced migration studies. Few scholars loom larger in the early resettlement literature than Elizabeth Colson (1971), Thayer Scudder (1973), and Robert Chambers (1969).[13] There are a number of common features in their research. For example, each has adopted anthropological and sociological approaches to the study of "resettlement". They have all carried out long-term

ethnographic research on resettlement schemes, mostly resulting from dam-related development, in Africa (e.g. Zambia, Kenya, and Ghana). Finally, all three have held essentially common positions, if radical at the time, on the counter-intuitive impacts of planned development. Their research has revealed the unintended and unintentional social costs of economic progress as well as the dynamics of risk adversity and organizational practice.

The dominant *conceptual model of resettlement* to emerge from the period can be traced to Chambers (1969) and Colson (1971) who detected a series of trends and patterns of change (stresses) that characterized resettled communities over time. Colson expanded on Chambers' three-stage approach and described a sequential process that began even before the displacement event, anticipating a degree of risk adversity in the post-displacement period, and then entailing a smooth period of transition from rehabilitation to "handing over".[14] Initially designed to capture processes of "voluntary" resettlement, this conceptual model was later extended to the analysis of "involuntary" resettlement (Scudder and Colson, 1982; Eriksen, 1999). It was found that involuntary resettlement, as with voluntary settlement, left people no better off, and frequently even worse, than people who resettled themselves (Hansen, 1991). Criticism of these linear models emerged in the late 1980s, as it became recognized that "not all projects pass through all stages … a steady movement (through the four stages) is the exception rather than the rule" (Cernea, 1997).

The next generation of resettlement scholars included Barbara Harrell-Bond (1982, 1986) and Michael Cernea (1986, 1990), among others, who held widely divergent perspectives on the causes, consequences, and appropriate operational responses to internal displacement and involuntary resettlement. Though often grouped together, there are clear fault lines dividing scholars and practitioners working on the issue and they are by no means agreed on the imperatives of resettlement. Their competing perspectives have been neatly, if controversially, categorized by Hulme (1988), Mathur (2000), and, more recently, Dwivedi (2002) into two camps: applied and action researchers.

At one end is an *applied category* of scholars who consider displacement an inevitable, if unintended, outcome of development. These scholars-cum-practitioners contend that involuntary resettlement, however unpalatable, is in some cases inevitable and has certain social consequences that with effective planning and micro-management can be avoided.[15] Its proponents focus on technical and managerial approaches to improving the practice of resettlement, particularly as it relates to the well-being of "oustees", as they are often called.[16] "Success" and "failure" are generally defined and measured by the governments and agencies responsible for both forced displacement and resettlement and tend to draw on specific disciplines such as management science, economics, and human geography.[17]

At the other end are *action researchers* who consider displacement as an unacceptable failure of development. They focus on its causes, the dynamics of resistance among IDPs and the individual and community-level social costs of resettlement.[18] Proponents of this stream argue that displacement can and should be avoided and only in unusual cases explore ways of minimizing the costs of involuntary resettlement. While there are some who fall between camps, such as those who reject interventions leading to mass displacement though nevertheless explore the opportunities afforded by resettlement, there are deep, and often unacknowledged, cleavages in their orientation and interests. Indeed, both approaches speak to the differentiated understanding of the fundamental values and principles of development, in terms of its desired objectives, practice, and outcomes.

The most *recent conceptual model* to have emerged is Cernea's "Impoverishment Risk and Livelihood Reconstruction" framework (1990, 1997) which presents a diachronic approach to measuring the risks of impoverishment, and potential responses to involuntary resettlement. It recognizes the broad impoverishment risks associated with DIDR and the fact that resettlement constitutes more than physical movement and loss of land.[19] The model outlines a series of impoverishment risks, including landlessness, joblessness, homelessness, marginalization, increased morbidity and mortality, food insecurity, loss of access to common property, and social disintegration. More recently, issues of access to education, political expression, and violence have also been added (Muggah, 2000a). Its empirical foundations are drawn from a comprehensive World Bank-wide review of its own projects where resettlement took place. The model has been challenged by action researchers for its limited treatment of the causes of displacement, as well as its lack of consideration of the resources and capacities of displaced people themselves. But while its conceptual scaffolding is still in evolution, it nevertheless offers a number of useful entry-points for planning purposes in situations of both development and conflict (Muggah, 2000b).

Conflict-induced displacement and involuntary resettlement: the latecomer

Published literature on the involuntary resettlement of conflict-induced IDPs is not as conceptually rich or theoretically exact as in the development field. With some notable exceptions, one of the reasons why it has been slow to develop is because the humanitarian community attaches more value to aid delivery and implementation than to reflection and research.[20] While there is a growing literature on IDPs, with the exception of the *Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement*, there is very little theoretical work on their spontaneous or involuntary resettlement.[21] The literature on CIDR, such as it is, borrows heavily from a combination of conceptual models in the "refugee" and development fields.

Though policies designed for IDPs are distinct from those designed for refugees, the discourse on internal displacement and resettlement draws heavily from the refugee field (Dubernet, 2001; Kalin, 2000). Attention is devoted primarily to ensuring their "protection and assistance", to their longer-term "care and maintenance", and, in some cases, their rights to a "durable solution". To be sure, much of the literature on "resettlement" and "settlement" policy for IDPs and refugees has emerged from policy makers, researchers, and consultants working in cooperation with, or critical of, the UNHCR. Indeed, the UNHCR has itself recently issued guidelines on internal displacement and "relocation", which suggests a renewed interest in the topic.[22] The UNHCR (2000), while not operationally responsible for IDPs, has taken on the responsibility to advocate on their behalf, to mobilize support for them, to strengthen capacities to respond to their needs, and to take the lead to protect and assist them in certain circumstances. The agency has also recently issued guidelines to this effect (UNHCR, 2003). For this reason, it is important to trace how the "resettlement regime" for conflict-induced IDPs has evolved in relation to UNHCR.

In the first decades of its existence, UNHCR focused primarily on the *third country resettlement* of refugees.[23] The strategy of permanent (and frequently spontaneous) relocation and integration in a refugees' country of first asylum or a third country was the strategy adopted with respect to most of Europe's refugees following World War II.[24] This was also the case for many Latin American and South-East Asian refugees during the Cold War. But during the past few decades, the strategy of "permanent" third country resettlement was substituted with the other two "durable solutions" – repatriation and local settlement.

Over time, because of the low political and economic costs for donor states, local settlement emerged as the preferred "durable solution" for physically relocating refugees. The establishment of refugee "camps", "rural resettlement schemes", and "agricultural settlements" became widespread during and following the civil wars for independence that affected most of Africa in 1960s. Their growth has been attributed to two unrelated factors: (1) the reduced desire of Western states to either accept resettled refugees or press for repatriation, and (2) the prominence of a modernization ideology that called for investments of cheap labour into agricultural development (Jacobsen, 1997; Harrell-Bond, 1998). Because of the sheer scale of population displacement in the region and the expectation of swift repatriation, local (and temporary) solutions were also increasingly preferred by refugees themselves.

Bakhet (1987) has traced the *camp model* to the early 1960s where it was developed in East Africa (Uganda, Tanzania, and Kenya). According to Black (1998: 2), camps are generally "large … crowded sites that are … dependent on assistance". They are described as "holding tanks" and are distinct from "small open settle-

ments where refugees have been able maintain a village atmosphere", which he describes as "settlements" or "village schemes". Key, albeit potentially contradictory, objectives of camps featured the promotion of self-reliance and centralized systems of control. Early approaches to camps shared a number of similarities with Colson's (1971) approach to "resettlement schemes". Both were consciously disaggregated into linear models and included (1) an emergency phase, (2) a self-support phase, and (3) an integrated settlement phase. Camps began to spread, applying assumptions from the African experience to other regions.[25] Because of their apparent negative consequences on refugee well-being, the "camp model" has come under steadily increasing criticism by a host of scholars since the 1960s. (Harrell-Bond, 1986; Van der Borght and Phillips, 1995; Black, 1998).

The rural and *agriculture-oriented settlement* approach also emerged out of recognition of the difficulties of counting and controlling refugees crossing borders and relied heavily on the "hospitality" of host communities. A key distinction from camps is its capitalization on the development of complimentary, rather than parallel, services for displaced and host populations. Furthermore, settlements were characterized by comparatively fewer systems of centralized control than was the case in camps. But as with development-induced resettlement schemes, the primary purpose of these new rural settlement policies for refugees was to ensure self-sufficiency in agriculture, to avoid refugee "dependency", and to ultimately promote their permanent integration. According to Neldner (1979: 303), the objectives of such planned settlement schemes were to bring the refugees to "self-support through agricultural production" (albeit on frequently inhospitable and isolated land), a feature not lost on many refugees.

The evolution of camps, as with more experimental rural and agricultural-oriented settlement strategies, was accompanied by a growing importance attached to "development" in stemming refugee flows. The academic and practitioner community galvanized around the idea of Refugee Aid and Development (RAD), an approach that achieved considerable prominence, albeit short-lived.[26] The interest in developmental approaches – operations that moved beyond emergency aid – to refugee settlement coincided with a growing concern over the "Palestinization" of certain refugee camps and the apparent pervasiveness of "dependency syndrome" (Rogge, 1980: 206-207; Gorman, 1993).

The current focus of donor and multilateral organizations has reluctantly remained on the care and maintenance of planned camps (Crisp, 2002, Jacobsen, 1997; Chimni, 1999; and Rutinwa, 1999). A precedent for IDP camps followed UN Resolution 688, which authorized the establishment of "safe havens" in northern Iraq. Various types of camp-like settlements for IDPs had also quietly been endorsed across a range of cases, from Bosnia and Herzegovina to Somalia, Angola, and Sri Lanka (Hyndman, 2003). Camps persist because they require the expenditure

of limited political and financial capital among donor states. In some cases, they have also been supported by host governments in order to access international aid. Some hosting states have also frequently endorsed camps over other forms of settlement – out of a concern for their own security. Camps can be, to some extent, controlled and monitored. Predictably, concerns for ensuring national security have outweighed concern for the well-being of refugees (Loescher and Milner, 2003; Minear, 1999).

The camp model has been roundly criticized. Objectives such as the promotion of self-sufficiency and self-reliance are usually left unmet. As some early analysts noted, only weaker and more vulnerable displaced people tended to move to camps and settlements (Chambers, 1979; Hansen, 1981).[27] Still more criticism has been directed at the centralized authority structures and systems of control that deprived refugees of their social and economic networks of support and lead to destitution (Harrell-Bond, 1998; Hyndman, 2000). A growing body of evidence also points to the destructive ecological impacts of camps on host communities, particularly those characterized by high population densities, extensive central control, and located on poor quality land. There is a substantial literature documenting how they can undermine existing services, aggravate inter-communal tensions, increase health risks, and contribute to environmental strain and the like (Chambers, 1993; Black, 1998; Harrell-Bond, 1998; and Jacobsen, 1997). [28]

The introduction of the *Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement* in 1998, some six years after the appointment of a UN Special Representative, provided a radical normative and conceptual framework for appraising internal displacement and resettlement arising from conflict. Though drawing from refugee law by analogy, it introduced a research agenda for the social science community. Grounded in human rights and humanitarian law, the Deng Principles make clear that the competent authorities have the responsibility to provide and ensure access to basic assistance, regardless of whether they live in camps or are dispersed in cities. Specifically, Principles 28 to 30 set out standards and benchmarks for return or resettlement and reintegration of IDPs.

COMPARING CIDR AND DIDR

There is little doubt that conflict and development-induced internal displacement and resettlement are different. CIDR movements are to a large extent *spontaneous*, unpredictable, and illegal under international humanitarian and human rights law. Resettlement, where it occurs, is usually uncoordinated and is regarded by many donors and policy makers as *temporary*. By way of contrast, DIDR is *planned*, in some cases with detailed procedures established in law as to how and when assets may be expropriated, as well as obligations on the part of the acquiring agency,

compensation, and the like. It is perceived by many donors and policy makers to be a process leading to *permanent* relocation. Many scholars and practitioners have acknowledged the vast differences between CIDR from DIDR (and vice versa), but few have acknowledged areas where the two bodies of theory and practice converge.

More than a decade ago, Cernea (1990) described the lack of communication and collaboration between proponents of refugee studies and researchers of DIDR as leading to an "unjustified dichotomy" in the social science literature. He found that the resettlement literature separated the study of *refugees* from the study of populations uprooted by development projects and that the "literature on *refugees* co-exists side by side with a literature on development-caused involuntary resettlement" without any interplay between the two.[29] And yet, the case for a comparative analysis of *internally displaced* people from war and development is even more compelling than that of refugees and development-displaced and resettled populations. A starting point for a comparative analysis might include the common political economy underpinning each process, their similar institutional and bureaucratic approaches, and the shared risks and outcomes associated with resettlement.

Political economy of development and conflict

One of the reasons why DIDR and CIDR are treated as distinct regimes is because development and conflict are frequently conceived as two separate and non-contiguous phenomena – the former a linear trajectory of growth and expansion of human capacities and potential and the latter an exogenous "disruption" in the system (Luckham et al., 2001; Duffield, 2001). Recent contributions to the literature on the political economy of development and conflict suggest that this division is not straightforward and that the two phenomena are causally interconnected.[30] Just as it is now widely accepted that conflict contributes to underdevelopment, it is also acknowledged that unevenly distributed development and underdevelopment (e.g. including sharp macro-economic shocks and widespread unemployment, among other factors), are positively correlated with the outbreak of conflict.[31]

There is a tendency to compartmentalize internal displacement and involuntary resettlement into simplistic mono-causal categories, such as "development" and "war". But this perspective may prevent a more dynamic understanding of the complex interrelationships suggested above. Indeed, a small but growing community of scholars have noted that ostensibly "developmental" interventions with resettlement components – including land reform, the exploitation of resources, and even irrigation schemes – frequently invoke "violent" coercion leading to forced internal displacement and (armed) resistance. This has been observed by Oliver-Smith (1996: 79) who noted that "development-induced resettlement is the

ultimate expression of a state with its monopoly on the management of violence … to be resettled is one of the most acute expressions of powerlessness because it constitutes a loss of control over one's physical space".[32] In other words, DIDR can lay the foundations for CIDR, as has been the case, to some extent, in Sri Lanka, Ethiopia, and Latin America (Oliver-Smith, 1996; Laissally-Jacob, 1996; Gray, 1996; Pankhurst, 1992; Martin, 1991). Coercion and (the use and threat of) violence are often common features of both CIDR and DIDR, thus raising questions about the merits of treating the two processes as mutually exclusive.

Bureaucratic logic

Though characterized in this article as distinct regimes, there is a *common bureaucratic logic* applied by institutions involved in DIDR and CIDR. Bureaucratic logic is defined here as the biases and assumptions forwarded by policy makers, planners, and implementers of the *characteristics and perceived agency of IDPs, the "desirable" qualities of settlements and the short and long-term objectives of resettlement policy*. For example, with few exceptions, both regimes envision the IDP as potentially dependent, passive, and vulnerable. This has been observed in refugee situations by Harrell-Bond (1986: 20): "the failures of settlement policy, while evident and largely known, are considered to lie with the displaced" and symptomatic of a dependency syndrome.

Further, at the level of implementation, there is frequently a drive to contribute to the strengthening of "communities", even where social order is fragmented, rights and entitlements stripped or constrained, and geography foreign. In many cases, most prominently in the 1960s and 1970s, there has been an interest in the promotion of "collective" or "cooperative" approaches to involuntary resettlement, though the fashion for individualized approaches has resumed. Moreover, settlements tend to be rural and agrarian-based and constructed with the intention of promoting self-reliance, encouraging local productivity and minimizing out-migration and overt resistance.

Both streams tend to envision a linear sequence or pattern to forced displacement and involuntary resettlement, beginning (where possible) shortly before the "displacement event" and extending to a "hand-over period" (read exit strategy). In both scenarios – the early resettlement period is characterized as a time of extreme vulnerability and, by extension, risk adversity, while the latter period is described as one of local integration and heightened productivity – innovation and creativity are unleashed. In practical terms, both DIDR and CIDR can be characterized as having three phases. They begin with a period of relief assistance and transportation to settlements where houses are built beforehand or, as is often the case, by relocated populations themselves. This is followed by the physical settlement on land, whether purchased, leased, exchanged, or granted, and the establishment of

basic services. Throughout this period, resettled groups are expected to be motivated to work and to resume their livelihoods. Food rations and assistance are ordinarily decreased after the first harvest. In the third stage, external assistance is reduced on the grounds that the resettling population should be "self-sufficient" and "integrated" into the local community.

Impoverishment risks

There are also common patterns of *vulnerability and risk* in each type of involuntary resettlement. Though little comparative empirical analysis has been carried out, each process frequently intensifies impoverishment risks and, in many cases, resistance. While less surprising in the case of CIDR, particularly given the exceptional nature of the displacement event and the conditions characterizing relocation, extreme impoverishment is also regularly reported in situations of development-related resettlement.

A recent study that sought to measure the impoverishment risks of CIDR in Colombia with the use of Cernea's Impoverishment Risks and Livelihood Reconstruction model (Muggah, 2000a, 2000b; see Cernea and McDowell, 2000) found that internally displaced populations exhibited many analogous forms of risk to other developmentally induced displaced groups. It also observed that, as in situations of development-induced displacement, involuntary resettlement schemes – which are primarily the responsibility of the state (distinct from international protection regime offered under refugee law) – do not adequately redress impoverishment.

CONCLUSIONS

As we witness a rapprochement between policy makers, practitioners, and academics working on development and conflict, it is also time for a constructive dialogue between those working on DIDR and CIDR. But it is incumbent on the social science community to ensure the consistency of language and terminology in this dialogue. It is also vital that those working on issues associated with DIDR and CIDR extend their analysis to consider issues beyond their immediate institutional interests. In order to expand our understanding of these two phenomena, there is need for more critical appraisal and research. This should emphasise not just their differences, of which there are many, but also areas of convergence. Donors, policy makers, and researchers would do well to begin a robust exchange of ideas, lessons learned, and appropriate analytical tools to strengthen our awareness of the social and economic costs of internal displacement and involuntary resettlement.

NOTES

1. For a more complete breakdown of figures on internal displacement consult OCHA, 2003 and the IDP Database of the Norwegian Refugee Council.
2. Jeff Crisp (2001: 5) has noted how the word "refugee" is subject to a range of definitions and interpretations. Due to the broadening of the concept in Africa and Central and South America (i.e. Organization of African Unity (OAU) Convention and Cartagena Declaration), an individual counted as a refugee in one part of the world may not qualify for status in another.
3. Martin (2000: 3) cautions against categories that are too exclusive because "drawing careful lines between categories of forced migrants may hinder rather than facilitate the ability of national, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations to offer appropriate assistance and protection".
4. See, for example, the extensive debates offered by Duffield, 1998; Loescher, 1993; Holsti, 1996; UNHCR, 1997, 2000; and Dubernet, 2001.
5. A precedent was set with UN Security Council Resolution 688 (1991) that authorized the establishment of safe havens in northern Iraq, including assistance for internally displaced Kurds.
6. See, for example, the Geneva Conventions 1 and 2 – the deliberate abuse of non-combatant rights – and the International Declaration of Human Rights.
7. The relationship between development-induced internal displacement and minority populations was emphasized by Arundhati Roy, who noted that the ethnic otherness of those who are displaced takes some pressure off the nation builders: "It's like having an expense account. Someone else pays the bills" (see Robinson, 2003: 11).
8. These include the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR), the ILO Convention Concerning Indigenous and Tribal People in Independent Countries, the Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-Making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters, and the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (CERD).
9. In 1998, Deng presented the *Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement* to the UN Commission on Human Rights. They are based on international human rights law, humanitarian law, and refugee law by analogy. They address "grey areas" in the law by also making explicit any provisions that were previously only implicit. They emphasize that forcibly displaced people may not be returned in conditions of danger, and set out protections for women and children, provisions for compensation or reparation for lost property and possessions, and assert the right not to be displaced and conditions under which displacement is unlawful (UNHCR, 2000: 215).
10. See, for example, paragraph 2 of UN Doc E/CN.4/1998753/Add.2.
11. A recent study undertaken by the Brookings-SAIS Project on Internal Displacement notes that "recourse and remedy at the national level are often weak or non existent" and highlights the importance of the Deng Principles as well as policies and guidelines of multilateral development agencies to ensure that appropriate standards are met (see Robinson, 2003).
12. See, for example, the work of Partridge, 1989 and Hansen and Oliver-Smith, 1982.

13. It should also be noted that considerable work on the subject of resettlement was carried out in tandem with Colson, Scudder, and Chambers in the United States. Consult, inter alia, the work of Brokensha and Butcher in the late 1960s and early 1970s.

14. This four-phase process is described in Colson (1971) as "recruitment", "transition", "potential development", and "handing over". Methodologically, much of this research is drawn from qualitative non-random samples, and is not representative, though generalizations are regularly made throughout their texts. See Chambers, 1969.

15. See, for example, the work of Appell and Appell-Warren, 1985; Cernea, 1990; De Wet, 1988; Rew et al., 2000; Rew, 1996; Mathur, 2000; Guggenheim, 1994; McDowell, 1996; and Picciotto et al., 2001.

16. Also included in this camp are many other scholars who have explored development-induced displacement in the 1980s and 1990s. See for example the work on displacement arising from forestry, mining, biosphere reserves, and parks and use conversion, transportation corridors, urban growth, and environmental infrastructure in developing countries, politically mandated mass relocation, and structural adjustment reforms.

17. Kinsey and Binswanger (1993: 2) acknowledge these latent biases in their global review of settlement programmes preferring to measure "success" as a function of "individual researcher or government agency officials judgement … rather than an imposition from a distance of our own interpretations of success or failure". It should also be noted that Michael Cernea has repeatedly decried the absence of theoretical contributions by economists about the study of resettlement (Cernea and Kanbur, 2002).

18. See, for example, the work of Hansen, 1982; Oliver-Smith, 1996; Bartolomé and Barbaras, 1992; and Weist, 1995.

19. The Asian Development Bank (ADB) has also broadened their interpretation of "resettlement" to include "the impacts on land, on income and lost assets ... loss of trees are compensated for, even the loss of fences, walls, parts of structures". Conversation with Ruwani Jayewardene (Social Advisor, ADB), January 2003.

20. The primary source of information on conflict-induced internal displacement is the Norwegian Refugee Council's IDP Database, the Brookings/CUNY Institute Project on Internal Displacement, and the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs IDP desk.

21. With that said, there has been some research carried out on the essential "humanitarian" objectives of resettlement in early Colonial territories. These were distinct from an otherwise "political" settlement (in order to organize a European or entrepreneur settlement or to separate clans, tribes, or ethnic groups) in that they sought to evacuate areas with sleeping sickness (such as Uganda's Lake Victoria in 1906, or in Sudan in the 1920s). This is discussed at length in Chambers (1969: 21-23).

22. See, for example, "Internal flight or relocation alternative within the context of Article 1A(2) of the 1951 Convention and or 1967 Protocol relating to the Status of Refugees". The statement follows from a UNHCR position paper written in 2000 on the subject.

23. Pitterman (1997: 667) has noted that "resettlement may ultimately be considered when a refugee in need of a durable solution for protection or other specific reasons cannot repatriate nor safely remain in the country of asylum. The decision to resettle

is taken only when there is no alternative and no lasting way to guarantee" their legal or physical security. See also Troeller, 1990.

24. This history of "camps" begins in the 1920s, following World War I, the break up of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, and the Russian Revolution, when a primary pre-occupation at the time was resolving the "refugee" issue in the absence of a home-land. The "internment camp" became a preferred solution (Van Damme, 1995; Wigley, 2002). The use of such camps was the exception rather than the rule until the reported success of camps during the dissolution of East Pakistan and the establishment of Bangladesh (UNHCR, 2000).

25. In "what began as an experiment in Africa has subsequently been taken up in Malaysia, Belize, Panama, Costa Rica, Honduras, and Nicaragua" (Bakhet, 1987).

26. See, for example, Betts, 1984; Rogge, 1980; Gorman, 1993; and Kibreab, 1996, 1989, 1983; Demusz, 1998; Waters, 1999; and Crisp, 2001).

27. Those who were stronger, more skilled, and connected, tended to stay out or, having moved in or been moved out, move out again. Another problem, still debated today, related to the role of assistance policy in relation to confinement, and the promotion of dependence (Kibreab, 1989; Voutira and Harrell-Bond, 1995; Hyndman, 2000).

28. A preliminary review of the literature indicates that the predominant disciplinary approaches to the analysis of both "camps" and rural/agricultural settlements for refugees draw from agricultural economics, human geography, and sociology. See, for example, Black, 1998; Kibreab, 1996; Yeld, 1965; Harrell-Bond, 1986; and Zetter, 1991. While there is some overlap between the two regimes, the refugee literature draws to a lesser extent on anthropology and other social sciences as is the case with DIDR.

29. Two conferences were subsequently organized at Oxford's Refugee Studies Centre (1995, 1997) to remedy this situation. Cernea's recent edited volume also attempts to begin a dialogue between these two fields (Cernea and McDowell, 2000).

30. See the work of Duffield, 2001; Kaldor, 1999; and Stewart et al., 2001.

31. See, for example, the work of Collier, 1995; Nafziger and Auvinen, 1997; Anderson and Woodrow, 1998; Berdal and Malone, 2000; and Keen (1997).

32. The fact that the state is in many cases both player and referee, both initiator of displacement and resettlement, and the source of laws and regulations (De Wet, 2000) raises a number of obvious tensions.

REFERENCES

Anderson, M., and P. Woodrow
  1998   *Rising from the Ashes: Development Strategies in Times of Disaster*, Intermediate Technology, London.
Appell G., and L. Appell-Warren
  1985   "Resettlement of peoples in Indonesian Borneo: the social anthropology of administered peoples", *Borneo Research Bulletin*, 17(1): 4-31.
Bakhet, O.
  1987   "UNHCR experiences in implementing rural settlements", *Conference Box RSC Archives*, Refugee Studies Programme, Oxford.

Baratuscki, M.
  1998   "Tensions between the refugee concept and the IDP debate", *Forced Migration Review*, 3.
  2000   *Addressing Legal Constraints and Improving Outcomes in Development-induced Resettlement Projects*, Refugee Studies Centre and the Department for International Development (UK), Oxford.
Bartolomé, M., and A. Barabas
  1992   "Antropología y relocalizaciones", *Alternidades*, 2(4): 5-15.
Berdal, M., and D. Malone (Eds)
  2000   *Greed and Grievance: Economic Agendas in Civil Wars*, Lynne Rienner, London.
Betts, R.
  1984   "Evolution of the promotion of rural integrated development approach to refugee policy in Africa", *Africa Today*, (31)1: 7-24.
Black, R.
  1998   "Putting refugees in camps", *Forced Migration Review*, 2.
Brokensha, D., and T. Scudder
  1968   "Resettlement", in N. Rubin and W. Warren (Eds), *Dams in Africa: An Interdisciplinary Study of Man Made Lakes in Africa*, Frank Cass, London.
Brookings Institute
  1999   *Handbook for Applying the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement*, The Brookings Institute Project on Internal Displacement, Washington, DC.
Butcher, D.
  1971   *An Organization Manual for Resettlement: A Systematic Approach to the Resettlement Problem Created by Man-Made Lakes, with Special Reference for West Africa*, Food and Agricultural Organization, Rome.
Cernea, M.
  1986   *Involuntary Resettlement in Bank-assisted Projects: A Review of the Application of Bank Policies and Procedures in FY 1989-1985 Projects*, Agriculture and Rural Development Department, World Bank, Washington, DC.
  1990   "Internal refugee flows and development induced population displacement", *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 3(4): 320-339.
  1997   "Reconstruction and risk", *World Development*, 25(1).
  1999   *The Economics of Involuntary Resettlement: Questions and Challenges*, World Bank, Washington, DC.
Cernea, M., and R. Kanbur
  2002   *An Exchange on the Compensation Principle in Resettlement*, Cornell University, Department of Applied Economics and Management, Ithaca.
Cernea, M., and C. McDowell (Eds)
  2000   *Risks and Reconstruction: Experiences of Resettlers and Refugees*, World Bank, Washington, DC.
Chalinder, A.
  1998   "Temporary human settlement planning for displaced populations in emergencies", *Good Practice Review*, 6.
Chambers, R.
  1969   *Settlement Schemes in Tropical Africa*, Routledge, London.
  1979   "What the eye does not see", *Disasters*, 3(4): 381-392.

1993   "Hidden losers? The impact of rural refugees and refugee programs on poorer hosts", in R. Gorman (Ed.), *Refugee Aid and Development*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Chimni, B.
1999   "From resettlement to involuntary repatriation: towards a critical history of durable solutions to refugee problems", *New Issues in Refugee Research*, working paper 2, UNHCR, Geneva.

Christensen, H.
1984   "Afghan refugees in Pakistan: from emergency towards self-reliance", *A Report on the Food Relief Situation and Related Socio-Economic Aspects*, United Nations Research Institute for Social Development, Geneva.

Cohen, R., and F. Deng (Eds)
1998a   *Masses in Flight*, Brookings Institution, Washington, DC.
1998b   *The Forsaken People: Case Studies of the Internally Displaced*, Brookings Institution, Washington, DC.

Collier, P.
1995   "Civil wars and the economics of the peace dividend", *Working Paper Series*, 95.8, Centre for the Study of African Economies, Oxford.

Colson, E.
1971   *The Social Consequences of Resettlement: The Impact of the Kariba Resettlement upon the Gwembe Tonga*, Manchester University Press, Manchester.

Crisp, J.
2001   "Mind the gap! UNHCR, humanitarian assistance and the development process", *International Migration Review*, 35(1).
2002   "No solutions in sight: the problem of protracted refugee situations in Africa", *Conference on Forced Migration at the Centre for Comparative Immigration Studies*, San Diego.

De Wet, C.
1988   "Stress and environmental change in the analysis of community relocation", *Human Organization*, 47(2).
2000   *Improving Policy Outcomes and Protecting Human Rights in Resettlement Projects*, RSC and the Department for International Development (UK), Oxford.

Demusz, K.
1998   "From relief to development: negotiating the continuum on the Thai-Burmese border", *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 11(3).

Downing, R.
1995   "Mitigating social impoverishment when people are involuntarily displaced", paper presented at the first International Conference on Development-induced displacement and impoverishment, Refugee Studies Programme, Oxford.

Dubernet, C.
2001   *The International Containment of Displaced Persons: Humanitarian Spaces Without Exit*, Ashgate, Aldershot.

Duffield, M.
1998   "Post-modern conflict: warlords, post-adjustment states and private protection", *Civil Wars*, 1(1): 65-102.
2001   *Global Governance and the New Wars: The Merging of Development and Security*, Zed Books, London.

Dunham, D.
  1982   "Politics and land settlement schemes: the case of Sri Lanka", *Development and Change*, 13: 43-61.
Dwivedi, R.
  2002   "Models and methods in development-induced displacement", *Development and Change*, 33(4): 709-732.
Eriksen, J.
  1999   "Comparing the economic planning for voluntary and involuntary resettlement", in M. Cernea (Ed.), *The Economies of Involuntary Resettlement: Questions and Challenges*, World Bank, Washington, DC.
Gorman, R.
  1993   *Refugee Aid and Development*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
Gray, A.
  1996   "Indigenous resistance to involuntary relocation", in C. McDowell (Ed.), *Understanding Impoverishment: The Consequences of Development-induced Displacement*, Berghahn Books, Oxford.
Guggenheim, S.
  1994   "Involuntary resettlement: an annotated reference bibliography for development research", *Environment Working Paper 64*, The World Bank, Environment Department, Washington, DC.
Hansen, A.
  1981   "Refugee dynamics: Angolans in Zambia 1966 to 1972", *International Migration Review*, 15(1).
  1991   *Dependency and the Dependency Syndrome*, Meeting of the International Research and Advisory Panel on Refugees and Other Displaced Persons, Oxford, 2-6 January.
Hansen, A., and A. Oliver-Smith (Eds)
  1982   *Involuntary Migration and Resettlement*, Westview Press, Boulder.
Harrell-Bond, B.
  1982   "Towards self-sufficiency in planned rural refugee settlements", paper for the Khartoum Refugee Seminar, held 11-14 September, Khartoum, Sudan.
  1986   *Imposing Aid*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
  1995   "Refugees and the international system: the evolution of solutions", *Occasional Paper Series 27*, Refugee Studies Programme, Oxford.
  1998   "Camps: literature review", *Forced Migration Review*, 12.
Holsti, K.J.
  1996   *The State, War, and the State of War*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
Holtzman, S.
  1999   "Rethinking relief and development in transitions from conflict", *An Occasional Paper: Brooking Institution Project on Internal Displacement*, Brookings Institution, Washington, DC.
Hyndman, J.
  2000   "Managing displacement: refugees and the politics of humanitarianism", University of Minnesota, Minnesota.
  2003   *Preventive, Palliative or Punitive: Safe Spaces in Bosnia-Herzegovina, Somalia and Sri Lanka*, paper for the International Association for the Study of Forced Migration (IASFM) conference, 5-9 January 2003, Thailand.

IDP database
  2002   Global IDP project, available at www.db.idpproject.org.

Jacobsen, K.
  1997   "Refugees' environmental impact: the effects of patterns of settlement", *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 10(1): 19-36.

Kaldor, M.
  1999   *New and Old Wars*, Polity Press, Cambridge.

Kalin, W.
  2000   *Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement*, annotations, American Society of International Law and The Brookings Institution Project on Internal Displacement, Brookings Institution, Washington, DC.

Keen, D.
  1997   "A rational kind of madness", *Oxford Development Studies*, (25)1: 67-75.

Kibreab, G.
  1983   "Reflections on the African refugee problem: a critical analysis of some basic assumptions", *Research Report 67*, Scandinavian Institute of African Studies, Uppsala.
  1989   "Local settlement in Africa: a misconceived option? Concepts of local settlement and local integration", *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 2(4).
  1996   *People on the Edge in the Horn*, James Currey, Oxford.

Kinsey, B., and H. Binswanger
  1993   "Characteristics and performance of settlement programmes", *World Bank Working Paper 1207*, World Bank, Washington, DC.

Koenig, D.
  2001   *Toward Local Development and Mitigating Impoverishment in Development-induced Displacement and Resettlement*, final report for ESCOR R7644, Refugee Studies Centre, Oxford.

Lassailly-Jacob, V.
  1996   "Reconstructing livelihood through land settlement schemes in Africa: comparative reflections on refugees and oustees", paper presented to the conference on Reconstructing Livelihoods: Towards New Approaches to Resettlement, University of Oxford, Oxford.

Lavoyer, J.
  1995   "Refugees and internally displaced persons: international humanitarian law and the role of the ICRC", *International Review of the Red Cross*, 305.

Loescher, G.
  1993   *Beyond Charity: International Cooperation and the Global Refugee Crisis*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Loescher, G., and J. Milner
  2003   "Refugee security", paper for the International Association for the Study of Forced Migration (IASFM) conference, 5-9 January 2003, Thailand.

Luckham, R., et al.
  2001   "Conflict and poverty in sub-Saharan Africa: an assessment of the issues and evidence", *IDS Working Paper 128*, Institute for Development Studies, Brighton.

Martin, S.
  1991   "Development and politically generated migration", in S. Diaz-Briquets and S. Weintraub (Eds), *Determinants of Emigration from Mexico, Central America and the Caribbean*, Westview Press, Boulder.

2000   "Forced migration and the evolving humanitarian regime", *New Issues in Refugee Research, Working Paper 20*, UNHCR, Geneva.

Mathur, H.
2000   "Involuntary resettlement and voluntary organizations: a view from India", mimeo.

McDowell, C. (Ed.)
1996   *Understanding Impoverishment: The Consequences of Development-induced Displacement*, Berghahn Books, Oxford.

Minear, L.
1999   "Partnerships in the protection of refugees and other people at risk: emerging issues and work in progress", *New Issues in Refugee Research*, UNHCR, Geneva.

Mooney, E.
2002   "Exploring the issue of when internal displacement ends", discussion paper for CUNY/Brookings, Brookings Institution, Washington, DC.

Muggah, R.
2000a   "Through the developmentalist's looking glass: conflict-induced displacement and involuntary resettlement in Colombia", *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 13(2): 133-164.
2000b   "Conflict-induced displacement and involuntary resettlement in Colombia: putting Cernea's IRLR model to the test", *Disasters*, 24(3): 198-216.

Nafziger, E., and J. Auvinen
1997   "War, hunger and displacement: an econometric investigation into the sources of humanitarian emergencies", *WIDER Working Paper 142*, WIDER, Helsinki.

Neldner, B.
1979   "Settlement of rural refugees in Africa", *Disasters*, 3(4): 393-402.

OCHA
2003   *No Refuge: The Challenge of Internal Displacement*, Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, New York and Geneva.

OECD
1991   *Guidelines for Aid Agencies on Involuntary Displacement and Resettlement in Development Projects: DAC Guidelines on Environment and Aid*, 9/201, OECD, Paris.
1998   *Conflict, Peace and Development Cooperation on the Threshold of the 21st Century*, OECD, Paris.

Oliver-Smith, A.
1996   "Fighting for a place: the policy implications of resistance to development-induced resettlement", in C. McDowell (Ed.), *Understanding Impoverishment: The Consequences of Development-induced Displacement*, Berghahn Books, Oxford.

Pankhurst, A.
1992   *Resettlement and Famine in Ethiopia: The Villager's Experience*, Manchester University Press, Manchester.

Parasuraman, S.
1999   *The Development Dilemma: Displacement in India*, Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke.

Partridge, B.
   1989   "Involuntary resettlement in development projects", *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 2(3): 373-384.
Penz, P.
   2003   "Development, displacement, coercion and harm: a theoretical treatment", paper for the International Association for the Study of Forced Migration (IASFM) conference, 5-9 January 2003, Thailand.
Picciotto, R., et al. (Eds)
   2001   *Involuntary Resettlement: Comparative Perspectives*, Transaction Publishers, New Jersey.
Pitterman, S.
   1997   "Resettlement: an instrument of protection and a durable solution", *International Journal of Refugee Law*, 9(4).
Rew, A.
   1996   "Policy implications of the involuntary ownership of resettlement negotiations", in C. McDowell (Ed.), *Understanding Impoverishment: The Consequences of Development-induced Displacement*, Berghahn Books, Oxford.
Rew, A., et al.
   2000   *Addressing Policy Constraints and Improving Outcomes in Development-induced Displacement and Resettlement Projects*, Refugee Studies Centre and the Department for International Development, Oxford.
Robinson, W.C.
   2003   "Risks and rights: the causes, consequences and challenges of development-induced displacement", occasional paper, Brookings Institution-SAIS Project on Internal Displacement, Washington, DC.
Rogge, J.
   1980   "Africa's resettlement strategies", *International Migration Review*, 15(1).
Rutinwa, B.
   1999   "The end of asylum in Africa?", *Working Paper 5*, UNHCR, Geneva.
Scudder, T.
   1973   "The human ecology of big projects: river basin development and resettlement", *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 2: 45-61.
Scudder, T., and E. Colson
   1982   "From welfare to development: a conceptual framework for the analysis of dislocated people", in A. Hansen and A. Oliver-Smith (Eds), *Involuntary Migration and Resettlement*, Westview Press, Boulder.
Stewart, F., and V. Fitzgerald
   2001   *War and Underdevelopment: The Economic and Social Consequences of Conflict*, volume 1, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
Troeller, G.
   1990   "UNHCR resettlement as an instrument of international protection: constraints and obstacles in the arena of competition for scarce humanitarian resources", *International Journal of Refugee Law*, 3(2).
UNHCR
   1997   *State of the World's Refugees: A Humanitarian Agenda*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
   2000   *State of the World's Refugees: 50 Years of Humanitarian Action*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

2003   *Internal Flight or Relocation Alternative within the Context of Article 1A(2) of the 1951 Convention and or 1967 Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees*, UNHCR, Geneva, www.unhcr.ch.

Van Damme, W.
1995   "Do refugees belong in camps? Experiences from Goma and Guinea", *Lancet*, 346: 360-362.

Van der Borght, S., and M. Phillips
1995   "Do refugees belong in camps?", *Lancet*, 346: 907-908.

Vernant, J.
1953   *The Refugee in the Post-war World*, Allen and Unwin Press, London.

Vincent, M., and B. Sorenson
1999   *Caught between Borders: Response Strategies of the Internally Displaced*, Pluto Press, London.

Voutira, E.
1997   "Refugees, migrants, oustees, displacees and returnees: a conceptual framework for understanding varieties of displacement", paper for the International Workshop on Narrating Mobility, Boundaries and Citizenship, Mangleas, 30 August-1 September.

Voutira, E., and B. Harrell-Bond
1995   "In search of the locus of trust: the social world of the refugee camp", in D. Valentine and J. Knudsen (Eds), *Mistrusting Refugees*, University of California Press, Berkeley.

Waters, A.
1999   "Assessing the impact of the Rwandan refugee crisis on development planning in rural Tanzania: 1994-1996", *Human Organization*, 58(12): 142.

Weist, K.
1995   "Development refugees: Africans, Indians and the big dams", *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 8(2).

Wigley, B.
2002   "Between homes, between paradigms: refugee camp experience and development policy dilemmas", paper for the International Association for the Study of Forced Migration (IASFM) conference, 5-9 January 2003, Thailand.

World Bank
1994   *Resettlement and Development: The Bank-wide Review of Projects Involving Involuntary Resettlement: 1986-1993*, World Bank, Environment Department, Washington, DC.

World Commission on Dams
2000   *Dams and Development: A New Framework for Decision-Making*, Earthscan Publications, London and Virginia.

Yeld, R.
1965   "Implications of experience with refugee settlements", EA Institute of Social Research, conference paper 1965, reproduced by UNHCR (UNHCR/140/76-GE.76-5224), Geneva.

Zetter, R.
1991   "Labelling refugees: forming and transforming an identity", *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 4(1): 39-62.

Zolberg, A., et al.
1989   *Escape from Violence: Conflict and the Refugee Crisis in the Developing World*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

DEUX SOLITUDES D'ORIGINE DIFFERENTE:
CELLE DES DEPLACEMENTS INTERNES INDUITS PAR
LES CONFLITS ET LES PROJETS DE DEVELOPPEMENT,
ET CELLE DES REINSTALLATIONS INVOLONTAIRES

Les projets de développement et les conflits armés conduisent régulièrement à des déplacements internes et à des réinstallations involontaires qui touchent des dizaines de millions de personnes chaque année. Même si la plupart des "déplacés internes" se réinstallent spontanément, une proportion significative d'entre eux sont réinstallés contre leur gré dans des camps ou espaces aménagés à leur intention. Le présent article s'intéresse principalement à une catégorie relativement peu souvent traitée d'études sur les migrations forcées, à savoir celle des réinstallations. Il prétend que, jusqu'à tout récemment, la théorie, la politique et la pratique en matière de réinstallation des déplacés internes chassés de chez eux par les projets de développement et les conflits armés ont été traitées comme des questions inconciliables sur les plans tant intellectuel que pratique. Les décideurs et les chercheurs qui traitent de ces questions sont souvent mus par d'étroits intérêts disciplinaires et bureaucratiques et se révèlent incapables ou non désireux de franchir les limites institutionnelles. De ce fait, les politiques et les programmes conçus pour réinstaller les populations ressortissent à deux discours distincts (et disparates). Chacun de ceux-ci est dicté par une doctrine normative distincte, des interprétations gouvernementales et non gouvernementales différentes des concepts de succès et d'échec, et une division du travail épousant étroitement les disciplines et le savoir-faire de ceux qui opèrent au sein des communautés d'aide humanitaire et d'aide au développement. Cet article, même s'il émane de tenants de traditions distinctes et s'il a été conçu exclusivement par des donateurs, des décideurs et des chercheurs, prétend qu'en réalité, les caractéristiques communes sont nombreuses.

S'appuyant sur une littérature copieuse et en expansion rapide, les auteurs s'efforcent de cadrer les débats clés sur les déplacements et les réinstallations provoqués par les projets de développement et les conflits armés. Ils commencent par donner un aperçu d'ensemble des questions de terminologie – notamment à propos de "déplacement interne" et de "réinstallation" – deux concepts régulièrement contestés et mal compris. Ils font observer que les *Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement* (Principes directeurs sur les déplacements internes) ont dans une certaine mesure clarifié les droits des personnes poussées à se déplacer à l'intérieur des frontières par le développement et les conflits, ainsi que les responsabilités des Etats. Ils notent que, dans la pratique, cependant, la réinstallation de ces deux types de populations fait l'objet d'un traitement séparé. Les auteurs examinent ensuite un certain nombre de contributions théoriques créatives à l'étude des déplacements internes et des réinstallations involontaires induites par le développement et les conflits. Il met en lumière leur évolution séparée en théorie et dans la pratique au fil du temps. L'article s'achève sur un bref examen de certaines

des caractéristiques communes des déplacements internes et des réinstallations involontaires induites respectivement par le développement et par les conflits, notamment leur économie politique, leur logique institutionnelle et bureaucratique, et les schémas similaires en termes de risques d'appauvrissement.

LA HISTORIA DE DOS SOLEDADES: COMPARACIÓN DE LOS DESPLAZAMIENTOS INTERNOS INDUCIDOS POR CONFLICTOS Y POR EL DESARROLLO, Y EL REASENTAMIENTO INVOLUNTARIO

Los proyectos de desarrollo y la guerra conducen regularmente al desplazamiento interno y al reasentamiento involuntario de decenas de millones de personas cada año. Aunque la mayoría de "personas desplazadas internamente" se asientan espontáneamente, una importante proporción se reasienta involuntariamente en "campamentos" y "reasentamientos" planificados. Este artículo se encarga principalmente de abordar la categoría subestudiada de migraciones forzadas – reasentamiento. Arguye que hasta hace muy poco, la teoría, la política y la práctica de reasentamiento para las personas desplazadas internamente por motivos de desarrollo o de guerra fue abordada exclusivamente desde una perspectiva intelectual y pragmática. Los encargados de la toma de decisiones y los académicos que trabajaron sobre este tema se ciñeron generalmente a intereses disciplinarios y burocráticos sumamente estrechos y no pudieron o no desearon mirar desde una perspectiva amplia que trascienda los límites institucionales. Por tanto, las políticas y programas destinados a las poblaciones de reasentamiento se han agrupado en dos narrativas discretas (y divergentes). Cada una de ellas emana de distintas vías normativas, de interpretaciones gubernamentales y no gubernamentales de lo que es "el éxito" y "el fracaso" y una división del trabajo estrechamente adaptada a las disciplinas y pericia de quienes se encuentran en comunidades de desarrollo y humanitarias. A pesar de que vienen de tradiciones diferentes y que han sido concebidas exclusivamente por donantes, formuladores de políticas y académicos, este artículo establece que en realidad tiene muchas características comunes.

Basándose en estudios amplios y prolíficos, este artículo intenta enmarcar los debates clave sobre los desplazamientos y el reasentamiento inducidos por el desarrollo y las guerras. Comienza con un repaso de las definiciones – inclusive de "desplazamiento interno" y "reasentamiento" – dos conceptos que a menudo son objeto de controversia y malentendidos. El artículo observa que los principios rectores del desplazamiento interno han aclarado, en cierta medida, los derechos de las personas desplazadas internamente por motivos de desarrollo o conflictos, así como las responsabilidades de los Estados. Ello no obstante, señala a la atención que en la práctica el reasentamiento de ambos tipos de poblaciones se aborda de manera separada. Seguidamente, este artículo trata de una serie de contribuciones

teóricas seminales para estudiar el desplazamiento interno y el reasentamiento involuntario. Asimismo, pone de relieve que con el transcurrir del tiempo tienen una evolución teórica y práctica separada. Para terminar aborda brevemente algunas de las características comunes de los desplazamientos internos inducidos por el desarrollo y por los conflictos, incluidas su lógica política, económica, institucional y burocrática y patrones similares que traen consigo el riesgo de empobrecimiento.