

**Resettlement & Rehabilitation initiatives in the context of Development Induced Displacement (DID): Identifying Pathways & Hindrances**

Wakar Amin<sup>1</sup>  
Aamir Gul<sup>2</sup>  
Gh. Hassan<sup>3</sup>

**Introduction to Development Induced Displacement**

Economic development focuses on the construction of new infrastructure to meet the expanding demands of a growing population. It frequently entails the purchase of land and other assets, which can have a negative impact on people's socioeconomic well-being as well as the communities in which they live. Physical displacement, interruption of livelihood, and the possibility for community dissolution are all effects of development initiatives (World Bank, 2004). The number of individuals displaced by national, regional, and local development programmes and projects is significant, accounting for over 10 million people per year around the world; during the last 20 years, this equates to 200 million people displaced (Cernea 2000).

However, development displaces are defined by researchers and activists in much of the DIDR (Development Induced Displacement and Resettlement) literature as people who are compelled to relocate as a result of development projects displacing them from their homes. Project-impacted persons, according to Scudder (1996), should include not only those who are directly displaced by loss of home, but also the host population that takes in displacees; all others who are neither directly displaced nor hosts, but live in close proximity to the project; and project immigrants. The latter group includes those who are responsible for planning, designing, and implementing the project, as well as those who later relocate to the region to take advantage of project-related opportunities – these, according to Scudder, are often project beneficiaries, whereas the two former groups are frequently negatively impacted by projects (Stanley, J. 2004). Similarly, the World Commission on Dams (WCD, 2000) report mentions livelihood displacement, which deprives people of their means of production and displaces them from their socio-cultural environment. Because state and private-sector land needs occasionally coincided with the area claimed by these tribes for grazing, hunting, migration, and other activities, mobile groups have been prone to relocation (Ibid.).

While there are no statistics on the geographical distribution of development displaces, the WBED's (World Bank economic development) report on the World Bank's (hereinafter referred to as the "World Bank" or "Bank") experience with forcible relocation can provide trends. It's important to remember that displacement caused by Bank-assisted projects makes just a modest percentage of the estimated global total – roughly 3% of global dam displacement and 1% of global displacement caused by urban and transportation projects. However, the situation has drastically changed since then. (WBED, 1996).

The list of possibilities of displacement caused by development is practically unending. The sections below represent a brief picture from many parts of the globe; some regions are

---

<sup>1</sup> Sr. Assistant Professor, Department of Social Work, University of Kashmir.

<sup>2</sup> Research Associate (aamir.m.gul@gmail.com), Department of Social Work, University of Kashmir. (Corresponding Author)

<sup>3</sup> Research Scholar Department of Social Work, University of Kashmir.

overrepresented in the examples. This is due in part to the huge number of displacement-inducing projects in some parts of the world, but it's also attributable to the literature's biases toward specific locations and projects (Stanley, J. 2004). In aggregate terms, DIDR often affects the economically, politically, and socially most vulnerable and marginalized groups in a population. However, at the individual and community levels, impoverishment risks associated with resettlement can be felt more intensely by certain segments of the displaced population (Ibid.).

As per Sims, K. (2021) majority among the displaced people undergo a process of dispossession and disempowerment. As an outcome of the processes of development, displacement has the potential to dismantle and destroy villages as well as socio-economic and cultural structures of the inhabitants. When people are forcibly removed from their habitat, the following situations are likely to occur.

- Production systems get dismantled
- Productive assets and income sources get lost
- People get relocated to environments where their productive skills may be less applicable
- Long established residential groups get disorganised
- Kinship groups get scattered
- Informal social networks and safety nets are broken.

Thus by its very nature, displacement in general and involuntary displacement in particular, is a disruptive and painful process. Economically and culturally, it creates high risks of chronic types of impoverishment among the displaced people.

### **Analyzing Resettlement & Rehabilitation in relation to Development Induced Displacement**

Development-induced displacement is described as the forcible removal of groups and individuals from their homes, and in some cases, their homelands, for the sake of economic development. It is considered a violation of human rights at the international level. The meaning of displacement has become almost universally accepted, especially in academic literature. It is critical to recognise that displacement is a multifaceted phenomenon, with physical relocation being merely one of the most important results. Nevertheless, the focus of the displacement research is on displacements caused by development activities such as natural resource extraction, urban renewal or development programmes, industrial parks, and infrastructure projects (such as highways, bridges, irrigation canals, and dams), all of which require land, often in large quantities, to be realised. As a result, upheaval and displacement of populations is a regular outcome of such initiatives (WCD, 2000).

In the context of South Asia, the non existence of resettlement policies in countries like Pakistan & Nepal has been an important factor in preventing a systematic approach to planning resettlement. In Indian context, many resettlement operations in both non-bank & bank that have failed to restore the living standard of many displaced people (Fernandes, 1993). There is absence of a special federal legislation neither any clear policy statement that will dictate the general resettlement norms of the country. In the Indian case, resettlement is a state, not a federal matter. However, in most of the states of India, there is no state level resettlement policy. They use expropriation laws which offer compensation to the displacement induced displaces not their socio-economic rehabilitations (Cernea, 1996).

Rehabilitation can be seen of as a method of reversing the hazards associated with resettlement. Rehabilitation is only possible in a developing environment. As a result, relocation

must be incorporated into the overall development plan (Jain, 2006). In this view, rehabilitation is a by-product of resettlement, which is conceived as development rather than just physical relocation or income restoration. This takes us to the question of development in the context of resettling and rehabilitating refugees (Research Unit for Livelihoods and Natural Resources, 2009).

DIDR's repercussions are largely determined by how resettlement is planned, negotiated, and implemented. Displacement methods and resettlement plans have ranged from optimistic to pessimistic throughout the history of contemporary dam construction. According to Picciotto, Van Wicklin, and Rice (2001), displaceds' wages and living standards improved as a result of the Shuikou and Yantan dam projects in China, while satisfaction with relocation was (reportedly) high. In contrast, according to a WFP study from 1996 on Guatemala's Chixoy Dam Project in the late 1970s, local civil patrols and the country's Armed Forces massacred hundreds of Maya Achi Indians to make room for the dam's construction. The conditions of displacement and relocation in most projects have been somewhere in between these two extremes, however favourable resettlement experiences are unusual (Stanley, J. 2004). A number of studies have used the IRR model as a framework. Mahapatra (1996) applies the concept to India's experience with involuntary resettlement from 1947 to 1997, focusing on each of the IRR concerns separately.

De Wet's paper (2001) raises some doubt on our ability to ever devise a procedure that ensures that all, or at least a vast majority, of persons touched by a project benefit. Despite the IRR model's thoroughness, he believes that the model's assumption that resettlement difficulties may be eliminated by better planning is unduly optimistic. His study emphasises the need of understanding the intricacies of the resettlement process, such as 'irrational' political reasons and funding and institutional capacity challenges. De Wet advocates for a flexible, open-ended approach to relocation planning, acknowledging that projects rarely go as planned.

### **Hindrances**

The project's affected population is exposed to serious dangers that, if not treated correctly, can lead to poverty. The basic purpose of any forced resettlement programme is to protect resettlers from poverty and enhance their living conditions. Understanding how impoverishment hazards arise and how to avoid them necessitates studying the impoverishment anatomy. This could aid in defining the most important aspects of income rebuilding (Cernea, 1999). Cernea (1990, 2002) defined a set of eight dangers that the affected population faces and built a 'Impoverishment Risks and Reconstruction model' based on their findings. Landlessness, joblessness, homelessness, marginalisation, food insecurity, increased sickness and mortality, loss of access to common properties, and social disarticulation are the eight hazards outlined by Cernea. This model not only highlights dangers and the resulting poverty, but also suggests strategies to reverse these risks and transform them into possibilities for the development and reconstruction of those who have been displaced. These dangers include economic, social, and cultural deprivation.

Resettlement programmes have mostly focused on the physical relocation process rather than the *economic and social development* of those who have been displaced or who have been severely affected. This has severely harmed the development effectiveness of resettlement and rehabilitation programmes, as well as increased the danger of resettlers becoming impoverished. According to Cernea (1998), typical project analysis does not include hazards to adversely impacted persons. The loss of livelihood and income sources such as arable land, common

property resources such as forests, grazing land, ground and surface water, fisheries, and others, as well as modified access to and management of productive resources, are the main economic threats to impacted people. Loss of economic power as a result of the breakdown of complex livelihood networks leads to a temporary or permanent, and sometimes irrevocable, drop in living conditions, which leads to marginalisation. When diversified livelihood sources are gone, higher risks and uncertainties are introduced. Absence of livelihood and interruptions in agricultural activities can have a negative impact on household food security, resulting in malnutrition (WCD, 2000).

Positive resettlement and rehabilitation is not merely, or even principally, a matter of efficient planning and implementation. There is a *power element* inherent in some people having the legal, administrative and military means to oblige other people to move. It is usually the less powerful and less well-off who are resettled and they are very often further prejudiced by the difficulties and complexities of the resettlement and rehabilitation process. (Bartolome et al. 1999).

The establishment or extension of a project may not only have a direct impact on individuals, but it may also deny some people access to *common community resources and public utilities* such as grazing pastures, community wells, government offices, and power. A wide range of community resources, in addition to those owned by the poor, provide some financial support in rural India. For example, the Ramagundam National Thermal Power Corporation's acquisition of grazing pastures has resulted in a reduction in cattle population and, as a result, a drop in the income levels of individuals who rely on the milk business (Prasad & Parasuraman 1997).

Non-agricultural activities that were previously unknown in both project locations have replaced the established traditional agricultural occupations in the new surroundings, according to a study of the Singrauli and Rihand thermal power projects. The majority of people had little choice but to forsake their agricultural activities and pursue *non-land-based employment*. The number of people still working in land-based occupations is a small percentage of the total population (Reddy, 1998).

### Pathways

Some of the issues, delays, and costs that might otherwise arise could be avoided if an efficient R&R programme was planned and implemented to the satisfaction of project involved personnel. When persons who have been displaced refuse to relocate, projects are delayed and benefits are lost, and such demonstrations divert the implementation process off its intended path. Delays reduce the rate of return and distort the project's cost-benefit analysis. Delays are more likely to result in higher investment costs, which are directly proportional to the level of project completion time slippages. There is a growing recognition that doing a poor job of resettlement can be significantly costlier than doing a good job of resettlement.

As previously said, meticulous preparation of resettlement procedures is required for better results in the relocation process of affected areas. According to Chris de Wet, the following are the basic ideas that many people would believe should be included in project planning:

- a) The utilitarian consideration of the greater good of the greater number, implying that some people sacrifice for the sake of majority
- b) Affected parties give their full (informed) consent to the project proposal and design
- c) People should not be forced to move against their will
- d) Allocation of resources should ensure greater equity and transparency among all the affected groups

- e) The rights of indigenous groups should not be infringed upon by the project
- f) Development should be eco-friendly and environmentally sustainable (De Wet, C. J, 2006).

The creator of the IRR model goes on to say that the model is a "self-fulfilling prophecy" because it is a roadmap to dealing with the problems that relocation will cause. As a result, "a risk prediction model becomes maximally effective not when bad occurrences confirm it, but when, as a result of its warnings being taken seriously and acted upon, the risks are prevented from becoming reality, or are mitigated, and the model's projected consequences do not occur." As a result, the model sends out a "policy message," implying that displacement risks can be mitigated through legislation, as well as a "strategy message," implying that specific preparations are required to manage displacement-related risks. All key parties, including the displaced population, the government, and non-governmental groups, should be involved in the policy response and planned strategies. More importantly, according to the IRR model, risk reversal should include the following:

- from landlessness to land-based resettlement,
- from joblessness to reemployment,
- from homelessness to house reconstruction,
- from marginalization to social inclusion,
- from increased morbidity to improved health care,
- from food insecurity to adequate nutrition,
- from loss of access to restoration of community assets and services, and from social disarticulation to rebuilding of networks and communities (Research Unit For Livelihoods and Natural Resources, 2009).

Recently the concept of programming resettlement as a development programme modality is gaining traction. In this regard, good practises include: (i) focusing on means of livelihood rather than assets; (ii) assuming an inclusive relationship between people and assets; and (iii) allowing for a negotiated notion of "fair" remuneration. According to the evidence, when compensation packages were negotiated with PAPs and other stakeholders, the approach resulted in improved overall outcomes for the resettlement process. PAPs tend to feel more happy as a consequence of the negotiating process, even if the agreed type of remuneration does not prove to be the most appropriate or effective alternative for whatever reason, as evidenced by the Zimapan resettlement programme in Mexico (WCD,2000). Indigenous and tribal peoples displaced by big dams appear to have endured greater rates of landlessness, unemployment, indebtedness, and starvation in various nations. The negative effects of displacement on women and children have also been demonstrated in the studies. Women's social and economic worth and respect could only be restored in situations where land and access to natural resources were replaced with sustainable resources (Ibid.).

Overall it has been found that Project affected people do well when they have the choice to return to their old jobs. When it comes to rural people, land-based programmes that move them to agricultural land of equivalent size and quality are frequently successful. The non-land-based resettlement plan that relies on the provision of jobs is more suitable for people from metropolitan regions. However, both land and jobs are in short supply, and projects are finding it increasingly difficult to create effective and broadly accepted occupational options. Self-employment income-generating programmes appear to offer a solution in situations when land

and job opportunities are no longer available, and are currently being sought in several Projects (Mathur, 2006).

Every project that relocates people now includes a built-in method for monitoring and evaluating the resettlement and rehabilitation component. However, most of these systems are problematic because they combine the two monitoring and assessment cells or units. As a result, the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) responsibilities are intended to be performed by the same persons. The final result is frequently the creation of a bureaucratic information system rather than a Management Information System (MIS), which is used to justify even the most ineffective R&R initiatives (Kusek, J. Z, 2010).

### **Conclusion**

Developmental resettlement can only be achieved by actively going for development from the very beginning. Achievement of such developmental outcomes necessitates investment. Only after a careful investigation of the advantages & disadvantages (Costs & benefits) of a developmental project for the society at large we can have a clear perception of the desirability of justifiability of such project. In any case the negative implications upon the affected population whether it is economical, social, environmental or cultural needs to be assessed before hand in a participatory & transparent way. Most importantly a national policy is the need of the hour which must apply to all the projects where involuntary displacement takes place (Amin, Gul & Hassan, 2021). “In relation to development-induced/forced resettlement , it is now widely agreed that anything less than consciously planned and implemented development for the to-be-resettled people will leave them worse off than before” (Cernea 2008; Scudder 2005).

The present research paper has highlighted the preferable pathways that need to be adopted for an effective R&R process viz-a-viz development induced displacement. Development induced Displacement needs to be backed up by a proper resettlement and rehabilitation process, by looking into all the possible consequences. There is also a need to go through a proper monitoring and evaluation process i.e., participatory evaluation and social auditing needs to be incorporated through all the steps of project planning and project implementation, which would eventually lead to a better resettlement and rehabilitation outcome.

### **Acknowledgement**

The present research study is funded and supported by ICSSR (Indian Council of Social Science Research, New Delhi) and Ministry of Education, GoI.

### **References:**

- ❖ Amin, W., Gul, A., & Hassan, G. (2021). Understanding various dimensions of Resettlement and Rehabilitation in the context of development induced displacement: A review study. *Research Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 12(2), 115-119.
- ❖ Bartolome, L. J., De Wet, C., Mander, H., & Nagraj, V. K. (1999). *Displacement, resettlement, rehabilitation, reparation and development*. World Commission on Dams.

- ❖ Cernea, M. M. (1996). *Public policy responses to development-induced population displacements*. Washington, D.C: World Bank.
- ❖ Cernea, M. M. (Ed.). (1999). *The economics of involuntary resettlement: Questions and challenges*. World Bank Publications.
- ❖ Cernea, M. M. (2000). Risks, safeguards, and reconstruction: a model for population displacement and resettlement. In M. M. Cernea & C. McDowell (Eds.), *Risks and Reconstruction: Experiences of Resettlers and Refugees* (pp. 11-55). Washington, DC: The World Bank.
- ❖ De Wet, C. J. (Ed.). (2006). *Development-induced displacement: Problems, policies and people* (Vol. 18). Berghahn Books.
- ❖ De, W. C. (December 01, 2012). The Application of International Resettlement Policy in African Villagization Projects. *Human Organization*, 71, 4, 395-406.
- ❖ Haque, C. E. (July 01, 2004). Resettlement of development-induced displacees: Emerging issues. *Ekistics*, 71, 181-185.
- ❖ Hugo, G., & Edward Elgar Publishing. (2013). *Migration and climate change*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Pub. Ltd.
- ❖ Jain, S. (2006). Public participation in development. *The economics and politics of resettlement in India*, 49-80.
- ❖ Kusek, J. Z. (2010). *Making monitoring and evaluation systems work: A capacity development toolkit*. World Bank Publications.
- ❖ Mahapatra, L.K., 'Testing the Risks and Reconstruction model on India's resettlement experiences', in M. Cernea (ed.), *The Economics of Involuntary Resettlement: Questions and challenges*, pp. 189-230. Washington, D.C.: World Bank, 1996.
- ❖ Mathur, H. M. (Ed.). (2006). *Managing resettlement in India: Approaches, issues, experiences*. Oxford University Press, USA.
- ❖ Picciotto, R., Van Wicklin, W., & Rice, E. (2018). *Involuntary resettlement: Comparative perspectives*. Routledge.
- ❖ Prasad, N. P., & Parasuraman, S. (1997). Differential Distribution of Social Cost: An Electricity Generation Plant in Telengana. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 2218-2222.
- ❖ Reddy, I. U. B. (1998). Involuntary Resettlement and Marginalization of Project-Affected-Persons: A Comparative Analysis of Singrauli and Rihand Power Projects. *Development projects and impoverishment risks: Resettlement project-affected people in India, Delhi: Oxford UP*.
- ❖ Research Unit for Livelihoods and Natural Resources. (2009). *Dam and Displacement: A Review*. Centre for Economic and Social Studies Begumpet, Hyderabad.
- ❖ Rew, A (1996). *Understanding Impoverishment: The Consequences of Development Induced Displacement*, Berghahn Books, Oxford.
- ❖ Robert, C. (1970). *The Volta resettlement experience*. London: Pall Mall Press
- ❖ Scott, J. C. (1999). *Seeing like a state: How certain schemes to improve the human condition have failed*. New Haven: Yale University Press

- ❖ Scudder, T., (1996) ‘*Development-induced impoverishment, resistance and river-basin development*’, in C. McDowell (ed.), *Understanding Impoverishment: The consequences of development-induced displacement*, pp. 49-74. Oxford: Berghahn Books.
- ❖ Stanley, J. (2004). *Development-induced displacement and resettlement. Forced Migration Online.*
- ❖ World Bank. (1993) “Early Experiences with Involuntary Resettlement: Impact Evaluation on India- Maharashtra Irrigation II project”. OED.
- ❖ World Bank (1994). *Resettlement and Development: The Bankwide Review of Projects Involving Involuntary Resettlement 1986-1993*, The World Bank Environment Department, Washington, DC.
- ❖ World Bank (1998) *Recent Experience with Involuntary Resettlement Overview*. Report No. 17538. Washington, D.C., World Bank.
- ❖ World Bank (2001) *Operational Policies 4.12: Involuntary Resettlement* (Washington, D.C., World Bank).
- ❖ WB (World Bank) (2004) *Involuntary Resettlement Sourcebook – Planning and Implementation in Development Projects*, Washington: printed by the World Bank.
- ❖ World Bank Environment Department (WBED,1996), *Resettlement and Development: The Bankwide Review of Projects Involving Involuntary Resettlement*, 1986-1993.
- ❖ Environment Department Paper No. 032, Resettlement Series. Washington, D.C.
- ❖ World Commission on Dams. (2000). *Dams and development: A new framework for decision-making: The report of the world commission on dams*. Earthscan.