

NEW ISSUES IN REFUGEE RESEARCH

Research Paper No. 262

Moving together: Involuntary movement and the universal dynamics of moving, meeting and mixing

Christine Goodall

Email: christine.goodall@yahoo.com

August 2013



UNHCR
The UN Refugee Agency

Policy Development and Evaluation Service

**Policy Development and Evaluation Service
United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
P.O. Box 2500, 1211 Geneva 2
Switzerland**

**E-mail: hqpd00@unhcr.org
Web Site: www.unhcr.org**

These papers provide a means for UNHCR staff, consultants, interns and associates, as well as external researchers, to publish the preliminary results of their research on refugee-related issues. The papers do not represent the official views of UNHCR. They are also available online under 'publications' at <www.unhcr.org>.

ISSN 1020-7473

Introduction

“Many people displaced by Katrina, especially the most vulnerable, the poor, elderly and female-headed families who had no place to go, had little choice as to where they were taken. They were airlifted or bussed out of the drowned city, not even informed of their destination....although grateful to be out of the flooded hell that was post Katrina New Orleans, evacuees quickly realised that the places to where they were, in their words, ‘shipped’, all too often did not have the...social or cultural environment or necessary resources that displaced people often wanted or desperately needed”

(Miller, 2012a-Section Introduction on Receiving Communities)

The above quotation provides an indication of some of the facets of the forced displacement faced by thousands of people in the aftermath of hurricane Katrina in New Orleans in the United States in 2005. People, often the most vulnerable, leaving with nothing, not knowing to where they were being taken, and arriving in a place very far from home where circumstances and people were different from what they had always known, and where resources were severely stretched.

Miller goes on to talk about people having no identification papers or documentation, the huge strain on local services and infrastructure, lack of employment and means for livelihood, lack of affordable housing, poor transport, and a completely different socio-economic environment and racial make-up to their adopted home. In the same publication, Weber and Peek (2012a) talk about ‘government induced separation of families’, with no database of where people were sent in order to be able to reunite these families. Some people were forced to leave their homes at gunpoint. In fact, the authorities were criticised for not adhering to the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement (Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs; Weber and Peake, 2012a).

Anyone who has made any study at all of internal displacement, or indeed of forced migration more widely, will recognise only too well many or all of these problems, which are common to involuntary displacement situations worldwide. Yet the involuntary displacement of people in developed countries such as the United States is rarely discussed in forced migration research. However, despite an often narrow interpretation in forced migration literature, internal displacement can take many forms, and be caused by a multiplicity of factors. This paper is about all forms of involuntary movement of people within their own national borders, and the factors that impact on how they are received by, and coexist with, those whom they meet and mix with as a result of that involuntary movement.

The paper seeks to identify common factors across a very broad range of national contexts and causes for involuntary movement. By doing this the author hopes to show that the issues are common across the most diverse set of circumstances, and thus help to identify ways in which such meeting and mixing can be made more positive for all concerned, both displaced and receiving communities.

Whilst focusing on involuntary movement inside national borders, the paper will demonstrate that the factors relevant to good relations between those forced to move, and those whom they meet on their arrival, are universal, and not dependent on whether the context is internal displacement or a refugee situation, or on the country context, time in history or cause of the involuntary movement. Instead it hopes to demonstrate that the issues of moving, meeting and mixing are surprisingly similar, and therefore may have some common solutions.

The approach of this paper to focus and analysis is informed by an article by Bakewell (2008), which seeks to move research on forced migration away from the utilisation of narrow policy-defined categories, practitioner priorities and legal definitions, which Bakewell argues constrain the questions that researchers ask, and the frameworks of analysis they adopt. Breaking away from this, Bakewell contends, helps to bridge the gap between forced migration research and much wider social science concepts and theories, important in explaining universal human behaviour.

This paper's aim is precisely to show the commonalities of human interaction between people who are different from each other, whatever that difference might be, and what might either promote or inhibit hospitality and welcome. As Bakewell points out, if this broader approach is adopted, this increases the ability of forced migration research to contribute to wider fields of knowledge such as sociology and political science. This view is supported by Turton (2003), who argues that narrow distinctions and categories in the sphere of forced migration are 'downright unhelpful' in the pursuit of scientific understanding. If the term 'forced migration' is to be used, Turton argues, then why not include everyone who is forced to move, whatever the cause?

The author also notes the point made by Schrover and Schinkel (2013), who comment that many writers on forced migration seek to problematise a particular facet or issue, claiming in their research to have identified some new category or set of circumstances, in order to lay claim to it through their own research. This paper rather seeks to do the opposite, by bringing together a wide range of existing and already identified issues in one place, and demonstrating the commonalities between them that are often missed.

The author was inspired to attempt to try to reveal some of these similarities, when herself noting striking commonalities, when studying the internal displacement literature, between that context and that of the reception of asylum seekers in the United Kingdom,

which was the subject of the author's doctoral research and thesis (Goodall, 2007). Why were reactions to people arriving involuntarily in a community from elsewhere so similar in 1930s California, in a small post-industrial city in the midlands of England, in the massive urban sprawl of Bogota, in conflict torn Azerbaijan and many countries in Africa? What could be learned from these commonalities? That is the question that this paper seeks to answer.

People are forced to move within their own national borders for a very wide variety of reasons. This paper will not confine its discussion to internal displacement as a result of conflict, civil war and violence, although of course this is a very important aspect of forced migration. It will also examine the involuntary movement of people because of drought and famine, natural disasters such as hurricanes, floods and earthquakes, displacement due to development and industrial projects such as dam construction and mining, and forced migration due to discrimination and the oppression of indigenous peoples.

From this list we can see that causes for internal involuntary movement are extremely varied, but the author will seek to demonstrate that the issues and problems facing those who move in these circumstances are surprisingly similar. As Cernea (2000) points out, loss of social capital, landlessness, homelessness, food insecurity and morbidity are issues faced by all who are forced to move, whatever the cause or wherever they move to. The issue under discussion is not the reasons why people move, but the even more vital issue of what happens to them when they arrive.

In addition to considering involuntary movement due to a range of causes, the author will examine the issues in both developing countries and developed ones such as the United States, and will include Europe, the American continent, Asia and Africa. Developed countries are not immune from involuntary displacement due to a variety of causes. For example it is estimated that there are currently nearly three million internally displaced persons in Council of Europe member states, with about 15% living in camps (Human Rights Comment, 2012).

The paper will demonstrate that, although people may move within their own national borders, this does not mean that they are the same as the people who live in their place of arrival. Differences may be obvious or much more subtle and difficult to immediately identify, but the differences are very real nevertheless. It is these differences that impact on the experience of displaced people in their new communities, and as such are a major focus of this paper.

Leaving home: so many people-so many reasons

As outlined in the above introduction, there are a multiplicity of reasons why people are forced to leave their homes and move to seek new ones within their own national borders, either temporarily or more permanently.

Of course displacement because of armed conflict is perhaps the most obvious cause for people being forced to move, and although many are forced to flee to neighbouring countries, or even further afield, to seek refuge, many stay within their own national borders, for example in Colombia (Lopez, Arredondo and Salcedo, 2011). They may prefer to do so if a safe place can be found, keeping more alive the possibility of being able to return to their homes once the fighting has lessened. They may be able to seek shelter with family or friends in the cities, and prefer to try and make it to a large urban centre in their own country rather than risk crossing borders, travelling even longer distances, and ending up living in camps rather than within a community where they may be less visible and feel less vulnerable.

In developed countries forced displacement due to natural disasters is a major cause of such displacement, a fact recently highlighted by Chiloka Beyani, Special Rapporteur on the Rights of Displaced Persons (United Nations Human Rights Council, 2011). For example, in 2011 206 million people were displaced by natural disasters, including floods in Australia, earthquakes in New Zealand, earthquake and tsunami in Japan, and floods, wildfires, hurricanes and tornados in the United States. In recent years there have also been a disastrous heatwave in Russia, earthquakes in Chile, Turkey and Haiti, floods in Pakistan, Cambodia, Colombia and Thailand, landslides in Brazil and Sri Lanka, violent storms in the Philippines, and drought in Somalia (Ferris and Petz, 2012).

According to McAdam (2012) natural disasters, particularly those related to climatic change, are likely to increase, including those with slower effects such as soil erosion, and it is estimated that the majority of the displacement caused will be internal, although this may in some countries involve people being forced to move many hundreds of miles (Nigg, Barnshaw and Toerres, 2006).

Industrial development and expansion is another major cause of displacement. Hoshour (2012) estimates that in the past twenty years, around 250 million people worldwide have been displaced in this way. Such projects include hydro electric dams, building of infrastructure such as new roads and railways, large scale logging and agricultural development, the formation of new national parks and conservation areas, and mining (Terminski, 2012).

The projects themselves may be beneficial in many ways, but the way in which they are implemented can bring lasting damage to communities, who may be forced to move by the land clearance itself, or by side effects such as pollution. For example, in Bangladesh,

a large government backed mining project threatens the homes of more than 200,000 people (Hoshour, 2012), and other mining projects have displaced communities across all continents, including in Ghana, Indonesia, China, India and European countries including Poland (Terminski, 2012).

The forced movement of aboriginal peoples as a result of state action is another cause of involuntary displacement often ignored, and often taking place in developed countries not regularly associated with forced migration issues, including the United States, Canada, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa (Finn, 2011). For example, the Innu nation of Labrador in Canada were forcibly moved to a settled location by the Canadian government after the Second World War, after living as hunting nomads for 2000 years (Denov and Campbell, 2002). They moved back to their hunting grounds, only to be forcibly relocated to a fixed reservation not of their choosing in 1967, where they still remain in poor quality accommodation with sub-standard sanitation and water supplies and few services (Denov and Campbell, 2002).

In the United States thousands of native Americans, many from the Cherokee tribe, were forcibly relocated to reservations after the Indian Removal Act (1830). Their journey became known as the ‘trail of tears’, and they suffered many of the terrible ordeals that we still associate with forced displacement today, including exposure, hunger, disease and violence, and many thousands died before reaching their destination (Wilson, 1998).

Competing to survive

Having briefly outlined the very broad range of reasons why people are forced to move within their own borders, we will now begin to consider the main focus of this paper, the relationship between those forced to relocate and those whom they meet on arrival. A central theme one can identify in almost every situation of this kind is that of competition for resources, and the conflict that this can bring to the relationship.

The term ‘host communities’ is often used when describing the community or population amongst whom those who are forced to move find themselves on their arrival. However this term could be construed to imply at least some willingness on the part of the ‘receivers’, aspects of hospitality and welcome. Of course this might indeed be the case, but it is important to remember that the locations where the displaced arrive at the end of their journey may themselves be sites of conflict, hostile community relations or extreme poverty and deprivation (Bradley, 2012, and see also Malischewski, 2013, for a discussion on fractured community relations in the context of refugee reception in Northern Ireland).

There may already be competition for scarce resources, lack of housing and basic amenities, or over-subscribed and poor quality public services. When resources and

infrastructure are even more strained by the arrival of hundreds, perhaps thousands, of displaced people, this can result in the marginalisation of new arrivals, discrimination, and harsh and exclusionary public policies (Bradley, 2012). The newcomers can be seen as competing against the local population, who in some cases may be even more in need than those newly arrived (Hutton, 2013). In Sri Lanka, Brown and Mansfield (2009) report that local people were at first very willing to welcome displaced people, but this hospitality did not last once they saw the living conditions of the displaced improving whilst their own situations did not:

“They come with nothing and then after a year or two they have money, land and even build houses and they still receive rations, we don’t get anything even though we are still poor”

Such conflicts may then result in people being forced to move again, resulting in a cycle of displacement (Bradley, 2012). Sometimes secondary displacement may occur because family and friends who have been housing displaced people are so stretched by the protracted nature of the stay that they have to ask people to leave (United Nations Human Rights Council, 2011).

In developing countries this competition for resources can involve the most basic of necessities, and can also lead to the degradation of the natural environment. For example fierce competition for timber for use as firewood, fencing and building materials can lead to deforestation and soil erosion due to excessive felling of trees. People may bring livestock with them when they move as a valuable source of food and currency, but this may cause competition for scarce grazing land and spread disease to the livestock of the receiving community. Increased numbers of animals may also bring down the price of livestock at market, increasing poverty for all, and displaced communities may, out of desperation, graze animals in fields sown with crops, which get eaten and so reduce food supplies and increase hardship (Hutton, 2013).

In Kenya there were reports of roads being damaged by over-use by aid vehicles, and again loss of trees due to excessive felling for shelters, fencing and fuel (Brown and Mansfield, 2009). All these issues can increase violence and conflict, and the implementation of new laws and policies directed at the newcomers. For example in Maben County, South Sudan, laws were passed to ban the felling of trees after requests to only cut branches, rather than entire trees, were ignored. Violence also resulted from competition over catches of fish, with migrants being attacked by local people concerned about depletion of fish stocks. There was also violence when locals attacked those cutting down grass to use to make shelters (Hutton, 2013).

United Nations visits to Chad and Cote d’Ivoire also identified the lack of natural resources in the host population, and the difficulty of these being stretched to

accommodate displaced people (United Nations, 2009; 2012). In Guinea, it was reported that the stretching of resources between thousands of internally displaced persons and the already disadvantaged host communities was made even more difficult by the presence of refugees from Liberia, Sierra Leone and Cote d'Ivoire (Global IDP Project, 2005a), with claims of the situation resulting in malnutrition amongst the local population in areas where malnutrition had previously not been a problem. Serious deforestation resulted from displaced people cutting trees for firewood and building shelters, and to clear land in order to be able to grow food.

In the Democratic Republic of Congo violence often erupted in food markets in conflicts over food supplies, particularly when those displaced had been forced to sell their livestock to buy other things such as medicines (Haver, 2008). Calvi-Parisetti (2013) reports that after the recent floods in Pakistan some displaced people were so severely strained for resources that they abandoned their elderly relatives to reduce the burden on their families.

Apart from wider community issues of competition for resources, helping a displaced person or family can put a severe burden on individual households. Many people displaced by conflict actually live in the homes of host community families, and receive a great deal of support from them, and there is a growing move away from the use of camps. In fact some argue that being housed in camps makes internally displaced people more subject to discrimination and scapegoating, as they are automatically more visible when grouped together in a camp setting (Kalin, 2007). In 2010 more than 50% of internally displaced persons receiving support from UNHCR were housed in families, and of the 54 countries where such persons were documented, fewer than half had any camps, or very few camps (Davies, 2012).

Even when host families are very willing to provide support for those who have moved to their community involuntarily, the burden on them may be immense. Haver (2008) reported that in some parts of the Democratic Republic of Congo around 80% of households were acting as hosts of displaced families. Haver reports that in many cases informal arrangements arose where the guests would work in the fields of their hosts, collect wood or fetch water, or do domestic tasks in order to contribute to the household. Although in many cases such arrangements can be mutually beneficial and supportive, Haver reports on the potential for abuse of the situation on the part of the hosts, with some displaced people being exploited as virtual slaves, or exposed to unwanted sexual attention or domestic violence.

Unfairness

In addition to competition for scarce resources, receiving communities may be hostile towards their displaced countrymen due to a perception that the authorities, or in some cases aid and support agencies, are treating new arrivals more favourably (see for example Brookings Institution/CUNY Project on Internal Displacement, 2001). This hostility can be heightened when the displaced have moved because of violent conflict and civil war, as they may include former combatants, and both local communities and other displaced people may feel that providing support to those who have been involved in violence, at the perceived or indeed actual detriment of the rest of the community, is unjust.

This situation has been documented in the case of Colombia (see Vidal-Lopez, 2011 and Ferris, 2009a). In Bogota it was reported that the government was spending more than seven million pesos on support for each former combatant, compared with less than 700,000 pesos each on other displaced people. This perception of injustice may be exacerbated by the fact that host communities may also fear that displaced people from conflict zones might in some way bring the violence of war with them, as is noted in the case of Muslims fleeing from Tamil Tiger violence in Sri Lanka in the 1990s (Brun, 2010), or simply bring ‘bad company’ (Lopez, Arredondo and Salcedo, 2011).

In the Democratic Republic of the Congo many were hostile towards people displaced by internal conflict, as they were suspected of being informants for militia groups (Haver, 2008), or smuggling in weapons (Beytrison and Calis, 2013), and in Afghanistan displaced people are finding it hard to obtain work as they may be associated with insurgency (Pavanello, Metcalfe and Martin, 2012). In Somalia, which has a very high proportion of internally displaced persons, communities are wary of providing support for the same reason (Lindley and Haslie, 2011). Such attitudes may also be compounded by differences in ethnicity. For example in Iraq displaced people of Pakistani origin were reported to have had their residency revoked on the grounds that they may be terrorists (Ali, 2013).

Perceived unfairness on the part of the receiving community may also be related to how they view the situations that the displaced come from, however irrationally this may be framed. For example, after the involuntary displacement of people from New Orleans in the wake of hurricane Katrina, some residents of Columbia, South Carolina, one of the cities to which evacuees were taken, displayed hostility based on their perception that New Orleans residents had a ‘soft’ life due to a more generous and flexible welfare system, as contrasted with the more punitive regime and public spending cuts in Columbia (Weber, 2012b).

These attitudes were not confined to the general population, but were also displayed by professionals working with the displaced, and this despite the forced nature of their removal from New Orleans and the terrible ordeals many had faced (Quigley, 2011, 2010; Cole, 2009). Weber reports one professional worker as commenting:

“We are not so forthcoming here (as in New Orleans)...the amounts (of benefits) were ridiculous”

The above demonstrates the power of perceptions of unfairness; it appears almost irrelevant to the host population that their newly arrived countrymen had been through a traumatic experience, had arrived in another city 700 miles from home, not even knowing where they were, often separated from family and friends, ill due to lack of food, clean water and medicines (Weber, 2012b). This did not prevent a lot of resentment due to perceptions that prior to the hurricane people in New Orleans had ‘had it easy’.

Similar dynamics are reported by Gurieyva-Aleyva and Huseynov (2011) in Azerbaijan; media portrayals of internally displaced people characterised them as ‘pathetic victims’ in extreme poverty and in need of charity, and if any individual the host community encountered was not like this, for example their clothes were not in rags, they were greeted with the utmost suspicion. Similarly the authors report resentment of displaced people having basic amenities in their homes. Such attitudes are strengthened by the knowledge that the government in Azerbaijan spends more per capita on support for internally displaced persons than any other national government, with an estimated 7% of the population being internally displaced (Gurieyva-Aleyva and Huseynov, 2011).

Additionally, displaced people are reported to sometimes appropriate land or houses belonging to the host community, and under Azerbaijan law cannot be evicted. Displaced people also receive reductions on utility bills, subsidised food, free health care and a reduced rate of income tax, which can fuel resentment if the host community are living in poor conditions themselves. However, displaced people in Azerbaijan are still significantly worse off than host communities in respect of housing, with 42% of families living in one room, compared with 9% of the host population (Gurieyva-Aleyva and Huseynov, 2011).

Similarly, in Guinea, resentment of the host community towards displaced people was reported to be made worse by perceived unfairness regarding exemptions from taxes, with those identified as internally displaced receiving services without being seen by the host community to contribute

(Global IDP Project, 2005a).

Some of the attitudes identified in the above studies are remarkably similar to those expressed in the UK towards asylum seekers dispersed to towns and cities whilst awaiting

determination of their claims, and towards migrants to Britain from Eastern Europe (Goodall, 2007). For example displaced people are suspected of spending the money saved through government subsidies on cars and other luxuries, and resented because 'they are taking our jobs', and are claimed to be preferred by employers because they are 'more industrious'. In the UK asylum seekers have often been accused of having been provided with free cars, mobile phones and other items and of living in luxury whilst members of the host community live in hardship, despite attempts to dispel such myths on the part of some local leaders (Goodall, 2007).

Some authors also note demonisation of displaced people which is again extremely similar to that related to asylum seekers and migrants in the UK. For example it is reported that some parents threatened their naughty children that 'refugees' would 'get them' if they did not behave (Gurieyva-Aleyva and Huseynov, 2011).

Residents of Bogota, Colombia, are also documented as displaying similar attitudes in respect of unfairness, perceiving that displaced people 'have it easy' not having to work, and only needing to turn up at a soup kitchen to be provided with food. Again the displaced are the subject of demonisation, being blamed for high crime rates, and the subject of myth building, for example that they are given farms and other privileges (Lopez, Arredondo and Salcedo, 2011). In Guinea, displaced people were blamed for the increase in incidence of HIV infection, although there appears to be no evidence for this (Global IDP Project, 2005a).

Displaced people themselves are not immune from displaying hostile attitudes based in perceptions of unfairness, either towards their hosts or members of their own community. The latter may be based on the perception that one section of their group is receiving better treatment or more support than themselves. For example Seelinger and Freccero (2013) report that victims of sexual violence are sometimes discouraged or prevented from going to shelters to seek help because they are seen as breaking up their families and the community, and that by going to a shelter they would receive more support than other displaced people.

Power and Control

In addition to perceived unfairness on the part of the host community, the degree to which the hosts feel that they are in control of their own situation and their relations with new arrivals, and to what degree they feel 'masters of their own homes', has also been shown to be a factor in how well disposed they feel towards their guests. Brun (2010) reports that in Sri Lanka Muslim hosts were initially very welcoming of fellow Muslims displaced by violence in Tamil Tiger controlled areas, inviting them into their homes and sharing food and other necessities.

However, their feelings of control and ownership of the situation were diminished by insufficient recognition of their situation by state and humanitarian agencies. Some felt wary of having displaced people living with them because their homes were on state owned land and they were not sure of their position, and when some displaced people were provided with state owned land themselves, this helped to make the local population feel even more insecure. These feelings were heightened by being placed in competition with the newly arrived for health services and education, and when the children of displaced families began to compete with local children for university places.

The reaction, as Brun reports, was to try to take back some control by placing certain conditions and restrictions on the activities of displaced people. For example, fishing rights were restricted, and there was a ban on displaced people being trustees of local mosques. This in turn led to further polarisation, as displaced people started their own mosques, rather than being able to mix naturally in places of worship with their hosts.

Additionally host communities may be willing in principle to welcome a displaced person or family into their home or community, but they don't necessarily have the opportunity to choose who that person or people are, again contributing to feelings of lack of control. The Brookings Institution/LSE Project on Internal Displacement paper 'Limits of Hospitality' (2012) reminds us that normally one would expect complete control of who one has in one's home, and in the situation many find themselves in, this is not always the case. Even when the 'guests' are family members, the hosts may feel that they have no choice as to whether they allow them to stay, contributing to feelings of lack of control and autonomy. Norms of hospitality bound up in religious ethics may contribute to such feelings of compulsion (Brun, 2010).

Host communities may feel even more powerless if they are faced with a situation of rapid change, that brings a feeling that they have no control. If displaced people arrive suddenly, and in addition are very different from themselves, then these feelings are extremely likely. For example, one small community in rural Arkansas, in the United States, had fewer than 1000 residents in total, and only one black resident. Overnight, with the arrival of evacuees after hurricane Katrina, they found themselves hosting 350 displaced people from New Orleans, almost all of whom were black (Hopkins, 2011a; 2011c).

In such circumstances of rapid change, the media and the prominent political discourse are very important in framing situations in a particular way. People make use of these frames to help them make sense of what is going on, and to feel more in control and less powerless. Dominant frames around Katrina victims in some areas were that they were associated with increases in crime and causing high public spending through welfare dependency, although there was never any real evidence to indicate any relationship with increased crime (Varano et al, 2011). Although people were ready initially to be

hospitable, such discourses soon had a negative effect, with people ready to listen because they were alarmed by such sudden changes to their living space (Hopkins, 2011a; 2011c).

Hopkins (2011b) widens this issue out to the UK asylum context, again showing that framing of the discourse by media and politicians can exacerbate community opposition in a climate of rapid change and uncertainty. Whitakre (1999) also highlights the issue of host communities in Tanzania adapting to change when facing the arrival of large numbers of refugees from Burundi.

It is also a common theme in writing on internal displacement that host communities may be very willing to help and support displaced people at first, but patience can run out after only quite a short period of time, particularly in situations of scarce resources, as outlined above (Agblorti, 2011). However even when there is not such a strain on resources, communities may have what Miller (2012b) describes as 'time bound empathy'. Displaced people are presumed to be able to transform from victims, in need of a great deal of assistance, into resilient people who can support themselves and their families in a place where they know nobody, and have little access to means of making a living (Peek, 2012). This can also be explained in terms of control; the longer the situation goes on the less in control the host feels.

Displaced people themselves are also likely to be experiencing an extreme lack of control, given that they were forced to move from their homes for whatever reason, and may not have had any choice about where they move to. They might also wish to return home, but not be able to do so due to continuing conflict in their home area, or there might be risk of attack on the journey, homes may have been destroyed or land devastated or seized. Old age, infirmity or disability might also be factors (Ferris, 2011c; Berg, 2011; Sluga, 2011; Ferris and Birkeland, 2011). Whatever the circumstances, they might be experiencing extreme feelings of powerlessness about their situation.

The experience of displaced people prior to moving can also be instrumental in how well they can cope with the stresses of involuntary movement, and how successfully they coexist with the receiving community when they arrive. An example of this is provided by Hutton (2013) when discussing the forced movement of people from Sudan to South Sudan. The experience of the Uduk and Ingassana people when moving to South Sudan was very different due to their previous history and culture. Their experiences are a good example of how the degree of power and control an individual or group has can strongly impact on how they cope with moving.

Hutton (2013) tells us that the Ingassana are characterised by strong, trusted leaders and supportive extended families that cooperate and share resources. Hutton argues that this high degree of social capital results in people feeling less powerless in their situation, and gives them a stronger sense of agency and control. However, such close knit communities

can possess what has been called ‘bonding’ social capital, which can result in polarisation and a lack of mixing with the host community, what could be called a ‘them and us’ environment, which is not conducive to good relations.

In contrast, the Uduk people who moved to the same location are in a very different situation and are characterised by feelings of powerlessness and helplessness. They have been forced to move, both externally to camps in Ethiopia, and internally in Sudan, many times over a number of years. Some of the young people have known nothing but a life of displacement. They do not have livestock and are almost entirely dependent on aid to survive. Some may be forced to steal food, resulting in further conflict, and characterisation of their community as dishonest trouble makers. Consequently they are less well placed to cope with the ordeal of displacement (Hutton, 2013).

Strangers in their own land

Solidarity and hospitality are key to successful outcomes for displaced persons at their point of arrival. However, it is very important to remember when considering relations between internally displaced persons and the communities into which they arrive, that even when people are displaced within their own borders, they may be very different from their hosts in ethnicity, religion, economic or social status or in some other way (Brun, 2005). These are not people from another country, but fellow countrymen, but if they are very different and appear suddenly, for example as in the case of a natural or other disaster, there may be many hostile attitudes to overcome in order for effective community based support for those displaced to be mobilised. How is solidarity built then? This section of the paper will examine some of the ways in which displaced people are marked out as different.

The power of the label

Even where displaced people are essentially the same in most ways as their hosts, the simple fact of being formally labelled as ‘internally displaced’ or ‘IDPs’ for the purpose of provision of services and so on, can itself demarcate people and frame them as ‘different’. Brun (2010) notes that this was the case in Sri Lanka in the 1990s, where the IDP label marked out the difference between Muslim displaced people and their Muslim hosts. Brun argues that although the category of IDP enables people to gain access to support and services, it also indicates that they ‘don’t belong’.

A similar case was noted in Nepal, where a survey of internally displaced persons found that more than 50% considered that once they were labelled as ‘IDP’ and this was known in the community, they were considered as undesirable. They reported facing stigma and discrimination, resulting in finding it very difficult to integrate into the local community.

28% reported that they were socially isolated by their IDP status (Nepal IDP Working Group, 2009). Albuja and Ceballos (2010) identify the same issue in Columbia, with displaced people reported as preferring to 'melt away' rather than be singled out and face discrimination due to their labelling as a displaced person.

De Genova (2013) observes the power of what he terms the 'spectacle' of illegality illustrated by the paraphernalia of border controls, detentions etc, which reinforces exclusion; although very different in some ways, the IDP label and the attendant bureaucracy that goes with it might be argued to be a similar 'spectacle' of exclusion, illustrating the difference of people who are in fact themselves citizens.

Obviously being labelled as an 'IDP' can in some circumstances be a passport to aid and services, and so can be seen as beneficial labelling. However, the host community may resent the benefits of this label, a label that they do not themselves possess, despite perhaps being in great need themselves. Haver (2008) reports that in the Democratic Republic of Congo this has led to 'fake' or phantom IDP camps being constructed to enable the obtaining of food aid, or members of the host community registering as being internally displaced in order to obtain food aid. This same situation is also reported in a more recent article on the same area (Ryan, 2013).

Internally displaced persons may also find themselves labelled as 'refugees' by the media and support agencies, as well as by the local population. Although in some cases this can be seen as beneficial, as it may invoke more sympathy, or simply be easy and make better headlines, in fact it is dangerous because it obscures the fact that they are citizens of the country and as such have rights. A discourse of lack of rights and citizenship makes it easier for them to be marginalised and discriminated against (Ferris, 2009b).

Labels can also be de-humanising in themselves, particularly when they are reduced to acronyms. For example, it is easy to see an 'IDP' as simply a number, administrative unit or problem, rather than a real person with their own unique experience. This point is made by Turton (2003), who suggests that such use of acronyms should be avoided for precisely this reason. The author agrees with this position and has tried to avoid using such terms in this paper unless absolutely necessary.

Race and colour, clans and tribes

Even where people are strongly motivated to help displaced people, there may be underlying dynamics and assumptions that can impact on the relationship and lead to discrimination, even on the part of those providing assistance. This problem is well documented in the hurricane Katrina aftermath in New Orleans, where many of the volunteers providing assistance to those displaced within the city were young white middle class volunteers, who arrived from all corners of the United States. Those they

came to assist were mostly poor working class black people, and the volunteers were faced with challenges to their views and perceptions.

Many displayed paternalistic and at heart racist attitudes that assumed that poor black people could not organise themselves or be politically conscious, and should instead be passive recipients with no input of their own (McClure, 2005; Chapman, 2007; Luft, 2007). Luft identifies an ability in the United States, which she says is also a generic global trait, for white people to be able to rationalise essentially racist views, involving control and regulation on one hand, and on the other the desire to provide humanitarian and development aid and relief (Luft, 2008). In the post-Katrina period white anti-racist organisers in New Orleans closely examined and dissected their values and attitudes in the light of this, realising that the reality of extreme situations could bring out behaviours that they themselves as self-identified anti-racists would not have wished to display.

Luft cites one example where white female relief volunteers working to support evacuees, were being sexually attacked on their way home at night, which was blamed on the black local male population they had come to support, serving to demonise them amongst the volunteers generally, whereas it was later discovered that the perpetrators were in fact white male fellow volunteers (Luft, 2008; Anti-Racist Working Group/Common Ground, 2007).

Ethnic background was also shown in an experiment to have an effect on the likelihood of people in the United States to give financial support to those displaced by hurricane Katrina when the giver strongly identified with their own racial group, i.e. those who strongly identified as of a particular racial group were less likely to give to disaster victims of another racial group (Fong and Luttmmer, 2009). However it is important to recall that the research was based on a laboratory experiment and not actual observed behaviour in the field.

In Somalia clan groupings have been identified as important in attitudes towards the internally displaced. Bader and Rawlence (2013) state that people in Mogadishu had a strong sense of hospitality towards displaced people of their own clan, but felt no obligation or concern at all for their own countrymen of other clans. This is supported by Lindley and Haslie (2011), who report that displaced people who do not have the support of powerful clans are at risk of eviction from their homes, rape, extortion, forced labour or even deportation by government agencies, with reports of young men having their heads shaved to mark them out for such treatment.

Similar issues have been identified in Sudan (International Refugee Rights Initiative, 2013), where professionals from particular tribes, who have been forced to move, find it impossible to find jobs, and discrimination can be based solely on having the wrong surname. Additionally politicians and the media have sought to characterise the country

as ‘Arab’ and this has led to the marginalisation of black displaced people, fuelled by rhetoric from politicians and supported by the media.

The report by the International Refugee Rights Initiative (2013) cites an announcement on national radio where the President declared that the government would ‘clean the streets of the black plastic bags’, interpreted as black displaced persons, who are clearly seen from this statement as ‘rubbish’. There are reports of black people having identity cards removed, being refused access to education and even having water supplies in their buildings turned off by local authorities (International Refugee Rights Initiative, 2013).

Internally displaced people may be additionally disadvantaged by already being part of an additionally marginalised group. Roma people are a particular example of this, as in the case of Serbia and Montenegro, where Roma displaced by conflict often have no identification papers, few rights and little access to any services (Global IDP Project, 2005b; Reliefweb, 2013)

Rural and urban

One way in which people involuntarily displaced within their own borders may differ significantly from their hosts in their new location is where people are forced to move from rural to urban locations, for example to large cities (see Girard, 2012). 62% of the millions of people internally displaced through conflict in Colombia over the past 20 years have moved from rural areas to large cities, mainly the capital Bogota (Lopez, Arredondo and Salcedo, 2011). This is becoming an ever more frequent problem, with numbers of internally displaced people arriving in poorly prepared urban settings increasing, bringing difficulties for aid agencies particularly when it is often very difficult to distinguish displaced people from the poor and deprived in the existing community, and presenting many protection challenges (Lyytinen, 2009; Zetter and Deikun, 2010; Ferris, 2011b).

Internal displacement is strongly contributing to the very rapid growth of city populations in recent times, particularly in developing countries, with for example the population of Nairobi increasing tenfold since 1960. It is estimated that by 2030 cities in developing countries will have approximately 80% of the total world population (Pavanello, Metcalfe and Martin, 2012). Overcrowding can lead to the spread of disease, and displaced people may be forced to build shelters on unsuitable land, such as on mud or refuse sites. In Baghdad thousands of internally displaced people were reported to be living in slum districts with almost no sanitation or refuse collection and inadequate water supplies (United Nations Human Rights Council, 2011).

Young people are particularly vulnerable in cities, and areas may be controlled by gangs, as was the case in Haiti in the aftermath of the earthquake (Ferris and Ferro-Ribeiro, 2012

and see International Organisation for Migration, 2011). Young displaced people may be particularly vulnerable to becoming involved in such gangs, as it could be a means of replacing the support networks of family and friends they may have lost in the course of displacement (Pavanello, Metcalfe and Martin, 2012).

Displaced people in cities may deliberately try to blend in with the settled population to avoid becoming targets for discrimination and hostility (Montemurro and Walicki (2010; Guterres, 2010), or may not be distinguishable from other migrants (Albuja and Ceballos, 2010). It is also important to remember that so-called 'host' communities in cities may consist of large numbers of people who were themselves displaced previously (Ferris, 2011c; Brookings Institution/LSE Project on Internal Displacement, 2012).

Cities are often ill-prepared for the arrival of large numbers of people from the countryside, all in need of food, shelter and some means of sustaining themselves. The parts of cities displaced people arrive in are often sprawling, ill-planned and chaotic districts where the most deprived of the host community live (Tibaijuka, 2010; Lopez, Arredondo and Salcedo, 2011). This lack of planning and preparedness will in itself help to breed resentment on the part of the host community, and again mirrors similar situations in the UK in relation to the dispersal of asylum seekers, where a lack of preparedness in English cities was identified as a major cause of community hostility.

Ray (2012) argues that when already disadvantaged people are forced to become unwilling hosts to new arrivals without consultation, or any of their views and concerns being taken into account, and in some cases these views being dismissed as the product of 'tabloid journalism' and sensationalism, then the likelihood of good community relations is small. The better off and middle classes in the wealthier sections of a city may benefit from a perceived 'cosmopolitan' atmosphere, whilst the most deprived are forced to share their scant resources.

The fact that people were previously living a rural way of life has been shown to be a cause of resentment amongst the host community in and of itself. For example, Gurieyva-Aleyva and Huseynov (2011) report that city dwellers in Azerbaijan complained about 'noisy, messy, unsanitary' villagers whom they considered backward and uncivilized, and not suited to life in the city, a point repeated by Gulyeva and Yazdani (2009) in the same context. In Bogota, Colombia, Lopez, Arredondo and Salcedo (2011) note hostility towards displaced people from the countryside, who are characterised as noisy (disturbing the neighbourhood by playing loud music), lazy and workshy, and having large families that are a drain on resources.

However, ironically, Evans (2007) notes the situation of rural displaced persons in Senegal who move to urban areas and have lost all their lands, with no ability to return, whereas the urban dwellers amongst whom they live may often have access to land

outside the city where they can grow food and graze animals, and are therefore more 'rural; than the displaced population.

It is worth noting that it is not always people from rural locations that are displaced to cities, but city dwellers may find themselves forced to live in rural areas, which can bring its own sources of conflict. Some of the people displaced by hurricane Katrina went from the city of New Orleans to small rural farming areas. Most of the displaced were black, and the populations of the small farming communities almost all white. The combination of city dwellers finding themselves in a rural community and the added factor of racial difference was bound to breed tensions (Miller, 2012b).

The American Dust Bowl: a case study

The forced migration of thousands of Americans due to the dustbowl disaster of the 1930s provides a useful case study illustrating many of the points already covered in this paper. It shows that problems between people forced to move within their own borders and the receiving communities are broadly the same whatever the country context, state of development, time in history, or reason for moving. This also makes a good case study because of the unusually extensive contemporaneous and detailed records that exist documenting the migrants and receiving communities experiences (the information below from Voices from the Dustbowl, 1940; Fanslo, 1998).

Many thousands of people, mainly farmers and their families, were forced to move to California in the 1930s as a result of a combination of extreme circumstances that threatened their very survival. The recession in the United States that followed the First World War caused a fall in the price of crops. At the same time there was a drive to increasing mechanisation of farming methods, which caused many farmers to become financially over-extended. These factors, followed by the stock market crash of 1929, meant that many people lost their farms.

In a bid to increase production of existing farms, natural grasslands were turned into fields for intensive crop cultivation, resulting in extreme erosion of the soil, because the soil was unable to retain moisture. This was exacerbated by a severe drought which began in 1931 and lasted for seven years. The soil was so dry and fragile that much of it over thousands of acres actually blew away. Choking dust storms killed livestock. The communities had lost everything, and often descended into violence and vigilantism. Around half a million people were made homeless.

As a result many thousands of people were forced to move in order to be able to sustain themselves and their families. Most of the displaced people came from the states of Oklahoma, Texas, Arkansas and Missouri, and their destination was California. California had a mild climate and was a good farming area where people thought they would be able

to find work on the farms. In addition a major highway, Route 66, formed a natural ready-made route for the migrants.

Of interest for this paper is what happened to them when they arrived and how they were received. There are good records made at the time that indicate the new arrivals met a good deal of hostility from the Californian society into which they moved. We already identified many country situations where displaced people from rural areas were regarded as 'uncivilized' or uncouth by those whom they met on arrival. This was also the case in California; although people were moving to another farming community, it was a very different one from that which they left.

Many had lived in simple shacks and in some cases were not used to indoor plumbing or electricity. Many of their hosts regarded them as backward for this reason. Additionally the new arrivals tended to be very conservative in their views and strongly religious. They were not generally used to diversity or to encountering people unlike themselves, and in California they found that there were already a large number of migrants from Mexico and South East Asia, who had themselves come to find work, but nevertheless now regarded themselves as part of the settled community, and the newly arrived white Americans as outsiders. There were a lot of tensions between the different groups, with evidence that the displaced arrivals displayed a good deal of hostility to the Latino and Asian workers, including racist and derogatory language.

Many Californian farmers did not want to employ the newcomers, irrespective of how good their work was likely to be, or employed them on greatly reduced wages. The over-supply of labour resulted in reduced wages in the community generally, which was not good for the local economy. Many of the displaced were forced to live in camps with poor services and public health risks. Infrastructure and public services were over-stretched and there was a lot of competition for scarce resources.

We can see from this brief outline that this case encompasses many of the issues identified in this paper, all in one situation. We find people moving long distances, yet within their own country, to a location where they find hostility and difference. Both hosts and displaced communities have difficulty in adapting to change and experience a loss of control over their situation, both feeling threatened for different reasons. We will not go on to consider how the different facets of the discussion so far can be usefully drawn together.

The building blocks of trust

In this paper we have identified a number of key factors that appear to be universal in respect of the relationship between host communities and new arrivals, in situations where people are forced to move involuntarily within their own borders. We have

identified that these apply across time, country context and reason for moving. We have also identified commonalities with other situations of forced displacement such as refugee contexts and in particular the reception of asylum seekers in the UK. We have seen that it is not possible to assume that, just because people are moving within their own national borders, that they will be the same as those whom they meet on arrival, or will necessarily be welcomed by them or be able to move, meet and mix without considerable tensions.

The main issues identified could be summarised as follows: competition for scarce resources; perceptions of unfairness and injustice; difficulty with adapting to change; loss of power and control and feelings of helplessness. These interact with the differences that exist between people, even when they move within their own country, for example differences in ethnicity, religion, clan and tribe alliances, rural and urban cultures and experiences, differences in political views and class, differences in such things as administration of public services and welfare regimes. The paper has also identified the importance of how the media frame perceptions of the new arrivals, and how local and national leaders can foster either hostility or hospitality towards the new arrivals.

Why are these factors important? This final section of this paper will argue that they can provide us with some ideas about how to go about improving relationships between dispersed people and their hosts and encourage hospitality. In a 1991 lecture, Colson made one of the few references to generalised trust in the context of forced migration. Colson argued in the lecture that the sense of loss and bereavement, anger and resentment that exists in situations of forced migration can lead to a loss of generalised trust and loss of trust in institutions. In the lecture this was primarily related to those forced to move, but above we have identified the same issues in respect of host communities. Why is this relevant?

Generalised trust has been shown to be extremely important in determining how people interact with people who are very different from themselves, who they perceive as strangers or 'other'. Eric Uslaner (2002) developed a theory of trust that explains this:

“Trust is a blessing; as an ideal that leads us to believe that people who are different from us are part of our moral community, trust makes us more willing to deal with people different from ourselves”

(Uslaner and Badescu, 2002 p1)

Uslaner's model of generalised trust is built upon personal autonomy and a sense of control over one's own life and situation, optimism and a sense of equality and fairness. Uslaner claims that in order for us to be able to reach out to others who are unlike ourselves, in whatever way that may be, we first need to believe that the future will be better, and that we have the ability to make it so. We need some control over our own lives and situation, and a sense of fairness and justice. Uslaner argues that people who

possess this ability to reach out to others do not feel that things ‘just happen to them’’, rather that they have the ability to control things. A sense of fairness helps people to feel that they have a shared fate with others, rather than being divided and at odds with them (Uslaner, 2002).

Gorodzeisky (2013) provides an interesting insight into how competition for scarce resources can lead eventually to a desire on the part of the dominant group in the population to deny the social rights of less powerful groups, such as displaced persons. This supports Uslaner’s theory by showing the danger of social distance, i.e. the opposite of Uslaner’s ‘shared fate’.

According to Gorodzeisky, the threat from competition for resources can combine with a perceived threat to values, to lead the dominant group to form negative stereotypes in respect of their competitors. Then there will arise a wish to show that ‘we are not like them’, i.e. to distance themselves from those who are perceived negatively. Gorodzeisky argues that in fact the more alike the two groups, the harder they will try to demonstrate difference. Once the other group is firmly labelled as ‘different’ and ‘not like us’, it is then, Gorodzeisky argues, an easy step to justifying the denial of social rights, marginalisation and discrimination.

There is much support for Uslaner’s model from other authors, including the model of cosmopolitan social trust developed by Cvetkovich and Earle (1995), and this author tested the theory as part of a doctoral research thesis (Goodall, 2007) in the context of asylum seeker dispersal in the UK (Goodall, 2007).

We can immediately see from the above why the common factors identified in this paper are so important. The issues of power and control (which include the ability to adapt to change), injustice and unfairness, and constant competition, with a feeling of being in a hopeless situation, all inhibit generalised trust as outlined by Uslaner and others.

Therefore it is the proposition of this paper that practices, policies and interventions that can encourage the positive factors needed to build trust, are extremely important in promoting good relations between communities in situations of involuntary internal displacement. Consulting people as much as practicably possible, giving support to host communities and households, explaining and providing information, working to eliminate unfair or seemingly unjust policies, these must be the central framework in order to encourage an improved relationship.

The role of leaders is also crucial in building up social trust and the individual components of autonomy, fairness and hope identified here. We have already seen how negative framing of the discourse around displacement can promote hostility on the part of host communities. Leaders can also be instrumental in creating positive frames and

helping those they lead to navigate change and uncertainty. The effect of this uncertainty is well summarised by Heisler:

“When people who seem very different appear in one’s accustomed spaces they are readily associated with differences in established ways of life; what used to be taken for granted can no longer be navigated on culturally ingrained auto pilot”

(Heisler, 2000 p226)

Finally, one practical way in which conflict between host communities and displaced people can be addressed is through the provision of additional resources and services which aim to benefit everyone and minimise competition and perceptions of unfairness. For example In South Sudan local authorities have begun to improve roads and other infrastructure, introduce vaccination and anti-malaria programmes, build new schools, improve sanitation, distribute seeds and tools and provide training programmes and employment creation schemes (Hutton, 2013). In Somaliland, where many people were forced to move involuntarily due to internal conflict and drought, a free legal clinic was set up to provide legal support to the whole community, and the University of Hargeisa has worked with UNHCR and local non-governmental agencies to provide outreach services around gender based and domestic violence, and safe houses for women (Davies, 2012).

Davies also documents a number of other successful programmes aimed at redressing the difficulties of host communities seeking to extend hospitality, and foster better relations between communities. The key to many of these was the involvement of the host community in identifying what they needed and what their own priorities were. In Lebanon grants were provided to community centres to provide services for both the displaced population and settled community; in Yemen UNHCR worked with local agencies to provide a programme of support to the whole community, which included improving water supplies and sanitation and building a new hospital, from where mobile clinics could go out to support host families. Tensions were reduced between various groups by involving the community in the identification of beneficiaries.

In Serbia, improvements were made to community buildings and new equipment provided for schools. After the tsunami in Indonesia in 2004 80% of the displaced were housed with host families, putting a great strain on resources. A Swiss NGO organised a scheme of cash help for host families. The key to this was providing very clear information so that everyone understood the scheme. The cash boosted the local economy as it was spent primarily on food, but was quite bureaucratic so could have been seen as too slow. Davies also provides examples from Kenya and the Democratic Republic of Congo. In fact, the Kenyan Government introduced legislation in 2012 which formally recognised the

importance of supporting host communities and internally displaced people alike (Republic of Kenya, 2012).

It is of course vital to remember that in most of the displacement scenarios dealt with here, emergency situations need speedy responses, which may not always be amenable to some of the approaches outlined here. However, if responses and interventions by governments, local authorities, aid agencies and communities themselves can take into account the ideas raised in this paper, it may go some way to improving the ability of communities to successfully offer welcome to their fellow citizens in need.

This may be even more vital in the near future, in situations where we might not have thought it relevant. In Western Europe many countries are encountering the most severe economic circumstances, with homelessness, hunger and lack of medical treatment becoming realities for people who may not have thought these things would touch them. This is forcing people in these countries to move in order to provide homes and livelihoods for their families. For example in the UK housing and welfare policies are forcing many to move to other parts of the country simply to keep a roof over their heads. Again they often find a very different community than that which they left. Understanding the issues raised in this paper may become even more important in the future.

“We can’t imagine a past different to the one we made so we cling to that past and we die there; we can’t imagine a future different to the past so we cling to what was and we die there...our best hope for life is a new future free from the past, a cosmopolitan society, free, flourishing, multiple, embracing the new and continually changing into the unknown”,

(Cvetkovich and Earle, 1995, p156)

Bibliography

Agblorti, S. (2011) Refugee Integration in Ghana: the Host Community's Perspective, New Issues in Refugee Research, Research Paper 203, UNHCR

Albuja, S. and Ceballos, M. (2010) Urban Displacement and Migration in Colombia, Forced Migration Review no. 34 issue on Urban Displacement, Refugee Studies Centre, University of Oxford

Ali, A. (2013) Displacement in a Fragile Iraq, Forced Migration Review 43 (Special Edition on Fragile States), Refugee Studies Centre, Oxford University

Amnesty International (2007) Azerbaijan, Displaced and Now Discriminated Against: the Plight of the Internally Displaced, EUR 55/010/2007, London, Amnesty International

Anti Racist Working Group/Common Ground (2007) Striving for Solidarity: Lessons in Anti Racism Organising, www.katrinareader.org

Bader, L. and Rawlence, B. (2013) Hostages of the Gatekeepers: Abuses against Internally Displaced in Mogadishu, Somalia, Human Rights Watch, March 2013, www.hrw.org

Bakewell, O. (2008) Research Beyond the Categories: the Importance of Policy Irrelevant Research into Forced Migration, Journal of Refugee Studies 21(4)

Berg, M. (2011) A Sort of Homecoming: Local Integration in Northern Uganda, in Ferris, E. (ed) Resolving Internal Displacement: Prospects for Local Integration, Brookings Institution and LSE Project on Internal Displacement, June 2011

Beytrison, F. and Kalis, O. (2013) Repeated Displacement in Eastern DRC, Forced Migration Review 43 (Special Edition on Fragile States), Refugee Studies Centre, Oxford University

Bradley, M. (2012) Displacement, Transitional Justice and Reconciliation: Assumptions, Challenges and Lessons, Refugee Studies Centre, Oxford University, Policy Briefing 9, April 2012

Brookings Institution/LSE Project on Internal Displacement (2012) Proceedings of Conference 'Internally Displaced Persons and Host Communities: the Limits of Hospitality, Washington DC, 22nd March 2012

Brookings Institution/CUNY Project on Internal Displacement (2001) Report of Seminar on Internal Displacement in Indonesia: Towards an Integrated Approach, Jakarta, 26 and 27 June, 2001

Brown, D. and Mansfield, K. (2009) Listening to the Experiences of the Long-Term Displaced, FMR 33 (2009), Refugee Studies Centre, Oxford University

Brun, C. (2005) Research Guide on Internal Displacement, Research Group on Forced Migration, Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Forced Migration Online, www.forcedmigration.org

Brun, C. (2010) Hospitality: Becoming 'IDPs' and 'Hosts' in Protracted Displacement, *Journal of Refugee Studies* 23(3)

Calvi-Parisetti, P. (2013) Older People and Displacement, *Forced Migration Review* 43, Refugee Studies Centre, Oxford University

Cernea, M. (2000) Risks, Safeguards and Reconstruction: a Model for Population Displacement and Resettlement, in Cernea, M. and McDowell, C. (eds) *Risks and Reconstruction: Experiences of Resettlers and Refugees*, Washington DC, the World Bank

Chapman, I. (2007) Hearts on Fire: the Struggle for Justice in New Orleans, ZNet, www.zcommunications.org

Cole, M. (2009) Remembering and Forgetting: Socialising Space in Hurricane Katrina and Global Warming, University of California (San Diego) at www.merylmohan.tumblr.com

Colson, E. (1991) Coping in Adversity, paper presented at Gwendolen Carter Lectures, Conference on Involuntary Migration and Resettlement in Africa, University of Florida, 21st-23rd March 1991

Cvetkovich, G. and Earle, T. (1995) *Social Trust: Toward a Cosmopolitan Society*, Westport, Praeger Press

Davies, A. (2012) IDPs in Host Families and Host Communities: Assistance for Hosting Arrangements, UNHCR Division of International Protection, April 2012

De Genova, N. (2013) Spectacles of Migrant Illegality: the Scene of Exclusion, the Obscene of Inclusion, *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 36(7), June 2013

Denov, M. and Campbell, K. (2002) Casualties of Aboriginal Displacement in Canada: Children at Risk Among the Innu of Labrador, *Refuge* vol.20, no.2, 2002

Evans, M. (2007) The Suffering is Too Great: Urban Internally Displaced Persons in the Casamance Conflict in Senegal, *Journal of Refugee Studies* 20(1)

Fanslow, R. (1998) 'The Migrant Experience': Commentary on Voices from the Dustbowl, the Charles L Todd and Robert Sonkin Collection, American Folklife Centre, US National Library of Congress

Ferris, E. (2011a) Ten Observations on the Challenges of Humanitarian Work in Urban Settings, Brookings Institution, June 30th 2011

Ferris, E. (2011b) Haiti and Future Humanitarian Disasters, Brookings Institution, 12th January 2011

Ferris, E. (2011c)(ed) Resolving Internal Displacement: Prospects for Local Integration, Brookings Institution and LSE Project on Internal Displacement, June 2011

Ferris, E. (2009a) Summary Report of the Seminar on Internally Displaced Persons and Peace Building in Colombia, Brookings Institution/University of Bern Project on Internal Displacement, Bogota, February 2009

Ferris, E. (2009b) Pakistani Displacement: Lessons Learned from Other Mass Displacement Situations, presentation at meeting of the US Institute of Peace on "Addressing Displacement in Pakistan", 11th June 2009

Ferris, E. and Birkeland, N. (2011) Local Integration of Internally Displaced Persons in Protracted Displacement: Some Observations, in Ferris, E. (ed) Resolving Internal Displacement: Prospects for Local Integration, Brookings Institution and LSE Project on Internal Displacement, June 2011

Ferris, E. and Ferro-Ribeiro, S. (2012) Protecting People in Cities: the Disturbing Case of Haiti, Brookings Institution, March 2012

Ferris, E. and Petz, D. (2012) The Year that Shook the Rich: a Review of Natural Disasters in 2011, Brookings Institution and London School of Economics Project on Internal Displacement, March 2012

Finn, V. (2011) On the Fringes of Internal Displacement, Journal of Internal Displacement vol.1(1), 2011

Fong, C. and Luttmer, E. (2009) What Determines Giving to Hurricane Katrina Victims? Experimental Evidence on Racial Group Loyalty, American Economic Journal: Applied Economics 2009 1: 2

Girard, L. (2012) Natural Disasters and Indigenous Displacement in Bolivia, Forced Migration Review 41, December 2012

Global IDP Project (2005a) Guinea's Forgotten Internal Displacement Crisis, Global IDP Project/Norwegian Refugee Council, Geneva, 17 February 2005, www.internal-displacement.org

Global IDP Project (2005b) Profile of Internal Displacement: Serbia and Montenegro, Global IDP Project/Norwegian Refugee Council, Geneva, 27th September 2005, www.internal-displacement.org

Goodall, C. (2007) The Society of Others: a Society Dealing with Difference, PhD thesis, Staffordshire University, February 2007

Gorodzeisky, A. (2013) Mechanisms of Exclusion: Attitudes Toward the Allocation of Social Rights to Out Group Populations, *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 36(5)

Gulyeva, G. and Yazdani, J. (2009) IDPs in Azerbaijan, Osservatorio Balcani e Caucaso (OBC), available at www.balcanicaucaso.org

Gurievva-Aleyva, Y. and Huseynov, T. (2011) Can You be an IDP for 20 Years? A Comparative Field Study on the Protection Needs and Attitudes to Displacement amongst IDPs and Host Communities in Azerbaijan, Brookings Institution and London School of Economics Project on Internal Displacement, December 2011

Guterres, A. (2010) Protection Challenges for Persons of Concern in Urban Areas, *Forced Migration Review* 34, February 2010

Haver, K. (2008) Out of Site: Building Better Responses to Displacement in the Democratic Republic of the Congo by Helping Host Families, Oxfam International Research Report, September 2008

Heisler, M. (2000) Now and Then, Here and There: Migration and the Transformation of Identities, in Albert, M. et al, *Identities-Borders-Orders*, Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press

Hopkins, D. (2011a) Flooded Communities: Explaining Local Reactions to the Post Katrina Migrants, *Political Research Quarterly*, April 2011

Hopkins, D. (2011b) National Debates, Local Responses: The Origins of Local Concerns about Immigration in the USA and UK, *British Journal of Political Science*, 41(3)

Hopkins, D. (2011c) Politicised Places: Explaining Where and When Immigrants Provoke Local Opposition, *American Political Science Review*, February 2010

Hoshour, K. (2012) Undermining Development: Forced Eviction in Bangladesh, *Forced Migration Review* 41, December 2012

Human Rights Comment (2012) Internally Displaced Persons in Europe: Another Lost Generation, Human Rights Comment, September 2012, <http://humanrightscomment.org/2012/09/03/internally-displaced-persons/>

Hutton, L. (2013) Displacement, Disharmony and Disillusion: Understanding Host-Refugee Tensions in Maban County, South Sudan, Danish Demining Group, Copenhagen, available at <http://www.drc.dk/news/news/artikel/ddg-promoting-the-understanding-of-refugees/>

International Organisation for Migration (2011) Haiti Facts 17 Months On, April 2011,

International Refugee Rights Initiative (2013) The Disappearance of Sudan: Life in Khartoum for Citizens Without Rights, Kampala, May 2013, available at www.refugee-rights.org

Kalin, W. (2007) Address of the Representative of the Secretary General on the Human Rights of Internally Displaced Persons to the International Conference on Addressing the Humanitarian Needs of Refugees and IDPS in Iraq and Neighbouring Countries, 17th and 18th April 2007

Lindley, A. and Haslie, A. (2011) Unlocking Protracted Displacement: a Somali Case Study, Refugee Studies Centre, Oxford University, Working Paper 79, August 2011

Lopez, R. Arredondo, C. and Salcedo, G. (2011) The Effects of Internal Displacement on Host Communities: a Case Study of Suba and Ciudad Bolivar Localities in Bogota, Colombia, Brookings Institution and London School of Economics Project on Internal Displacement, October 2011

Luft, R. (2008) Looking for Common Ground: Relief Work in Post Katrina New Orleans as an American Parable of Race and Gender Violence, *Feminist Formations* 20(3), Fall 2008, Johns Hopkins University Press

Luft, R. (2007) White Anti Racism Organising in New Orleans: 'European Dissent' after Katrina, www.katrinareader.org

Lyytinen, E.(2009) A Tale of Three Cities: Internal Displacement, Urbanisation and Humanitarian Action in Abidjan, Khartoum and Mogadishu, Research Paper no. 173, UNHCR New Issues in Refugee Research, March 2009

Malischewski, C. (2013) Integration in a Divided Society: Refugees and Asylum Seekers in Northern Ireland, Refugee Studies Centre, Oxford University, Working Paper 91, April 2013

McAdam, J. (2012) The Normative Framework of Climate Change Related Displacement, Brookings Institution, 3 April 2012

McClure, M. (2005) Solidarity not Charity: Racism in Katrina Relief Work, www.katrinareader.org

Miller, L. (2012a) Receiving Communities and Persons Displaced by Hurricane Katrina, in Weber, L. and Peek, L. (eds)(2012) Displaced: Life in the Katrina Diaspra, University of Texas Press

Miller, L. (2012b) Evacuee Reception in Rural East Texas, in Weber, L. and Peek, L. (eds)(2012) Displaced: Life in the Katrina Diaspra, University of Texas Press

Montemurro, M. and Walicki, N. (2010) Invisibility of Urban IDPs in Europe, Forced Migration Review 34, February 2010

Nepal IDP Working Group (2009) Distant from Durable Solutions: Conflict Induced Internal Displacement in Nepal, 15th June 2009, available from www.idmc.org

Nigg, J. Barnshaw, J. and Torres, M. (2006) The Flooding of New Orleans: Emergent Issues in Shelter and Temporary Housing, Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, vol. 604, 2006

Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement, <http://ochaonline.un.org>

Pavanello, S. Metcalfe, V. and Martin, E. (2012) Survival in the City: Youth, Displacement and Violence in Urban Settings, Policy Briefing 44, Humanitarian Policy Group

Peek, L. (2012) They Call it Katrina Fatigue: Displaced Families and Discrimination in Colorado, in Weber, L. and Peek, L. (eds)(2012) Displaced: Life in the Katrina Diaspra, University of Texas Press

Quigley, W. (2011) (Loyola University, New Orleans) Blog post on 23rd June 2011, Nation of Change, www.nationofchange.org

Quigley, W. (2010) (Loyola University, New Orleans) Blog post on 12th January 2010, www.nationofchange.org

Ray, S. (2012) Why UK Asylum Advocacy Should Take Citizens Complaints Seriously, Refugee Studies Centre, Oxford University, Working Paper 84, October 2012

Republic of Kenya (2012) The Prevention, Protection and Assistance to Internally Displaced Persons and Affected Communities Act, Act 56 of 2012, Date of Assent 31st December 2012, published 4th January 2013, Kenya Gazette Supplement no. 220, Nairobi

Reliefweb (2013) Overview of Serbia, March 2013, www.reliefweb.int

Ryan, L. (2013) Everyone for Themselves in DRC's North Kivu, *Forced Migration Review* 43 (Special Edition on Fragile States), Refugee Studies Centre, Oxford University

Schrover, M. and Schinkel, W. (2013) The Language of Inclusion and Exclusion in the Context of Immigration and Integration, *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 36(7), June 2013

Seelinger, K. and Freccero, J. (2013) Safe Haven: Sheltering Displaced Persons from Sexual and Gender Based Violence, Human Rights Centre, School of Law, University of California (Berkeley), and UNHCR, available from <http://www.unhcr.org/pages/4a1d28526.html>

Sluga, N. (2011) Still a Long Way to Go: Local Integration of IDPs in Yei, Southern Sudan, in Ferris, E. (ed) *Resolving Internal Displacement: Prospects for Local Integration*, Brookings Institution and LSE Project on Internal Displacement, June 2011

Terminski, B. (2012) Mining Induced Displacement and Resettlement-Social Problem and Human Rights Issue: a Global Perspective, University of Geneva Working Papers, August 2012, <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2028490>

Tibaijuka, A. (2010) Adapting to Urban Displacement, *Forced Migration Review* 34, February 2010

Turton, D. (2003) Refugees and Other Forced Migrants: Towards a Unitary Study of Forced Migration, paper presented at Workshop on Settlement and Resettlement in Ethiopia, UN Emergency Unit on Ethiopia/Ethiopian Society of Sociologists, Social Workers and Anthropologists, Addis Ababa, 28th-30th January 2003

United Nations (2012) "Respect for human rights, confidence in security sector, and consolidation of peace necessary for durable solutions for IDPs", press release on the visit of Chaloka Beyani, Special Rapporteur on the Rights of Internally Displaced Persons, to Cote d'Ivoire, Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, 31st July 2012

United Nations (2009) "RSG calls on Chadian State to take responsibility for the internally displaced", Press Release on visit of Walter Kalin, Representative of the Secretary General on the Human Rights of Internally Displaced People, to Chad, 2nd February 2009

United Nations Human Rights Council (2011) Report to the UNHRC of the Special Rapporteur on the Human Rights of Internally Displaced Persons, Chaloka Beyani, 26th December 2011, 19th Session of the UNHRC

Uslaner, E. (2002) *The Moral Foundations of Trust*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press

Uslaner, E. and Badescu, G. (2002) Honesty, Trust and Legal Norms in the Transition to Democracy, paper presented at Collegium Budapest, 22nd – 23rd November, 2002

Varano, S. Schafer, J. Cancino, J. Decker, S. and Greene, J. (2010) A Tale of Three Cities: Crime and Displacement after Hurricane Katrina, *Journal of Criminal Justice* 38, pp.42-50

Vidal Lopez, R. (2011) IDPs and Peace in Columbia: the Challenge of Durable Solutions in an Ongoing Armed Conflict, paper presented at Conference on Displacement and Reconciliation, St Pauls University Ottawa, 9 and 10 June 2011

Voices from the Dust Bowl, Research Fieldnotes (1940) The Charles L Todd and Robert Sonkin Collection, American Folklife Centre, US National Library of Congress

Weber, L. (2012a) When Demand Exceeds Supply, in Weber, L. and Peek, L. (eds)(2012) *Displaced: Life in the Katrina Diaspora*, University of Texas Press

Weber, L. (2012b) No Place to Be Displaced: Katrina Responses and the Deep South's Political Economy, *Southern Spaces*, August 2012

Weber, L. and Peek, L. (eds)(2012) *Displaced: Life in the Katrina Diaspora*, University of Texas Press

Weber, L. and Peek, L. (2012b) Documenting Displacement, in Weber, L. and Peek, L. (eds)(2012) *Displaced: Life in the Katrina Diaspora*, University of Texas Press

Whitaker, B. (1999) Changing Opportunities: Refugees and Host Communities in Western Tanzania, *New Issues in Refugee Research* paper no. 11, December 1999, UNHCR

Wilson, J. (1998) *The Earth Shall Weep: the History of Native America*, New York, Grove Press

Zetter, R. and Deikun, G. (2010) Meeting Humanitarian Challenges in Urban Areas, *Forced Migration Review* 34, February 2010