

EDID

Ethics, Development and Displacement

Workshop Report

Stephanie Hobbs & Pablo Bose

**Ottawa, Canada
October 25, 2004**



ETHICS OF DEVELOPMENT-INDUCED DISPLACEMENT PROJECT

Centre for Refugee Studies
322 York Lanes, York University
4700 Keele Street, Toronto, Ontario, M3J 1P3
E-mail:edid@yorku.ca
Phone: 416-736-2100 ext. 20559

Workshop Conveners

Jay Drydyk, Philosophy, Carleton University
Pablo Bose, EDID Project, Centre for Refugee Studies
Peter Penz, Environmental Studies, York University

Participants

Bipasha Baruah, Environmental Studies, York University
Rita Bowry, International Development Research Centre
Daniel Buckles, International Development Research Centre
Richard DeVidi, Philosophy, Carleton University
Tim Dottridge, International Development Research Centre
Amani El-Jack, Women's Studies, York University
Janet Fishlock, Environmental Studies, York University
Sheila Gruner, Pueblos en Camino
Catherine Guirguis, Osgoode Hall Law School
Stephanie Hobbs, Osgoode Hall Law School
Pablo Idahosa, African Studies, York University
Michelle Kooy, Geography, University of British Columbia
Melissa Marschke, Natural Resources Institute, University of Manitoba
Jason Morris, World Wide Fund for Nature-Vietnam
Phedra Morris, Environmental Studies, York University
Collette Murray, Geography, York University
Rosemary Nagy, Law, Carleton University
Anthony Oliver-Smith, Anthropology, University of Florida (Gainesville)
Sam Pillai, Asian Development Bank
Darryl Reed, Social Sciences, York University
Allison Sauer, Environmental Studies, York University
Regan Suzuki, International Development Research Centre
David Szablowski, Osgoode Hall Law School
Peter Vandergeest, Sociology, York University
Adriel Weaver, Osgoode Hall Law School

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION	4
THE EDID PROJECT AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF ETHICAL GUIDELINES	6
INTRODUCTION TO THE OTTAWA WORKSHOP	7
SOCIAL MOVEMENTS AND POPULAR RESISTANCE TO DISPLACEMENT	8
THE EDID PROJECT ETHICAL GUIDELINES	9
SESSION 1: BUSINESS ETHICS, GLOBALIZATION AND MINING	11
SESSION 2: PARTICIPATION AND EQUITY	14
SESSION 3: CONSERVATION AND DISPLACEMENT	15
SESSION 4: CONFLICT, VIOLENCE AND GENDER	17
FUTURE DIRECTIONS FOR RESEARCH	19
CONCLUDING NOTES	22

Introduction

Participants from academic and civil society met at Carleton University, Ottawa, Canada on October 25, 2004, for a workshop on “Ethics, Development and Displacement” as part of the Ethics of Development-Induced Displacement (EDID) Research Project of the Centre for Refugee Studies at York University. The workshop served as a forum to disseminate and examine findings from the multi-year, multi-country EDID Project study on economic development and population displacement. The event was a day-long gathering organized by **Pablo Bose**, EDID Research Coordinator, in cooperation with host and EDID Research Faculty member **Jay Drydyk** of Carleton University and Project Director **Peter Penz** of York University. Workshop presenters included EDID faculty members, graduate students, research assistants, and representatives from the NGO and policy communities.



Workshop participants

The following report provides a brief overview of the EDID project as a whole as well as a summary of key presentations and discussion at the workshop. The day’s proceedings were opened by a keynote address from **Anthony Oliver-Smith** of the Department of Anthropology, University of Florida (Gainesville), a leading scholar in the field of displacement whose work over the past thirty years has focused in particular on how communities rebuild after both man-made and natural disasters.



Anthony Oliver-Smith

Oliver-Smith’s comments were followed by a series of presentations throughout the day on themes ranging from business ethics, globalization and mining, to participation and equity, conflict, violence and gender, and conservation and displacement. The day’s discussion concluded with a commentary and suggestion for areas of further research, policy and development practice by project member **Pablo Idahosa**, of the African Studies Program at York University.

EDID Project Overview



The issue of population displacement is often associated with refugees of political conflicts and upheaval. And yet while such involuntary or forced migration is indeed a pressing problem, with upwards of 20 million people having been displaced worldwide by both cross-border and internal strife¹, there exists a problem of even greater global proportions: the case of development-induced displacement (DID). The latter can be defined in the first instance as the forcing of communities and individuals out of their homes, often also their homelands, for the purposes of economic development. Such geographic displacement can be within a city or district, from one village or neighbourhood to another; it can also involve displacement across long distances and borders, sometimes to economically, socially and culturally quite different settings. A broader conception of displacement is also possible; this includes displacement from economic activities and cultural practices without geographic moves. When the latter do occur, they often result in the former. DID thus involves a fundamental dilemma: economic development to improve people's living conditions is desirable, but the displacement associated with it can and does harm people and can and does restrict their ability to make life choices.

Critics estimate that as many as 100 million people across the globe have been dislocated as a result of processes of economic development—including infrastructure projects such as dams, urban highways, industrial zones and game parks.² The effects of DID are felt especially strongly amongst socially and economically vulnerable (and often politically marginalized) groups, and indigenous communities worldwide. There has been a particular intensification of DID in recent years as a result of increasing globalization. In effect, economic liberalization policies, structural adjustment, and stabilization programs have made the problem of development-induced displacement all the more urgent.

¹ Jenny Robinson (ed.), *Development and Displacement* (Milton Keynes: Open University Press and Oxford University Press, 2002).

² Christopher McDowell (ed.), *Understanding Impoverishment: The Consequences of Development-Induced Displacement* (Providence, R.I.: Berghahn Books, 1996).

The EDID Project and the Development of Ethical Guidelines

The Ethics of Development-Induced Displacement (EDID) Project is an ongoing multi-year multi-country study of economic development and population displacement, carried out in conjunction with several other Canadian and international partners. One of the EDID Project's chief contentions is that socio-economic development has not only beneficiaries but also victims; in particular, the displaced, those who are uprooted and forced to migrate. It is this vulnerability to displacement by development that has been the focus of the EDID Project's research. Its purpose is to articulate international development ethics, with particular reference to the population displacement that can result from development practices in which Canada's private, public and voluntary sectors participate and to the moral obligations that arise from such displacement effects.

Over a seven-year period, the EDID Project has carried out this work through a combination of research initiatives and methods. Our work has been interdisciplinary, drawing on and integrating theoretical approaches in political economy and applied political philosophy in our analysis of development-induced displacement. The EDID project has undertaken two primary tasks. The first has been to provide, through a series of illustrative case studies, causal accounts of how and why displacement occurs, detail what its impacts—on communities, ecosystems and economies—look like, and describe the ethical positions held by key actors in these situations. This inquiry is based on a wide range of geographic and sectoral examples.

The second and concurrent objective of the EDID Projects has been to explore the theoretical frameworks and normative assumptions that underlie contemporary processes of displacement. This has meant looking at the relationship between development and displacement, both historically and in the current context. It has meant a critical analysis of the varying and shifting justifications given for engaging in development that displaces. It has also meant reviewing not only the evaluative tools used to judge the efficacy of projects and policies, but also prescriptive measures designed to ensure their desirability as well. In particular, the EDID Project has engaged in a review of existing international policy guidelines regarding displacement and has developed its own set of ethical frameworks that might help to better understand processes of population displacement. These ethical guidelines are framed as an 'obligations and responsibilities approach' and focus on the moral behaviour and imperatives of a range of actors—including institutions, individuals, and systems of power and knowledge.

The development of such guidelines or “normative principles” is part of an ongoing effort by the EDID Project to engage the issue of displacement within an ethical framework in order to assess development-induced displacement (DID) and determine those conditions that might justify displacement as a consequence of development, as well as to highlight inequities and injustices that might be rationalized in the practice of both development planning and project evaluation. Such an approach helps to examine many of the complex issues that characterize DID, in particular, the tension between the right to development on the one hand and the damage to people and their human rights on the other, damage that often is a direct result of development-induced displacement.

Introduction to the Ottawa Workshop

The workshop held in Ottawa on October 25, 2004 provided a forum for EDID Project members to share their findings with representatives from partner organizations and members of the academic, policy and non-governmental communities, creating an opportunity for generative debate and discussion. The day began with a welcome from Pablo Bose, EDID Research Coordinator and workshop organizer to the presenters and participants. Bose introduced EDID Project Director Peter Penz who gave a brief overview of the project and its goals.

Penz began by describing some of the underlying tensions and key questions that have guided the EDID research. In particular, he highlighted the nuanced context that characterizes much DID, noting the intersectional and often correlative relationship between displacement, development, and armed conflict. Penz also framed the general ethical dilemma that surrounds the issues of DID and questioned the very notion of 'justifiable displacement'. He asked how development practice might possibly qualify as "good" or "acceptable" when it results in DID. Penz focused on two questions in particular during his introduction:

- 1) When is migration displacement and is this displacement always objectionable?
- 2) If displacement is characterized as 'forced migration', what philosophical debates are raised around the nature of coercion?

According to Penz, the EDID Project has found that intentional DID, or forced migration, can occur through a possible combination of root compulsion, threats, and force, and that while these displacements are *prima facie* objectionable they can be mediated to influence or address differentiated ranges of harm imposed upon DID-affected people. Further, he noted that these mitigations would depend upon the sort of DID experienced, depending on whether a displacement is direct or repercussive.

Penz concluded his talk by suggesting that the purpose of the workshop was not merely about disseminating the EDID Project results but also (and perhaps more importantly) about gaining feedback from those practitioners, legislators and jurists, policy and funding bodies, activists, advocates and politicians with whom the EDID Project has been in dialogue. As Penz pointed out, the EDID Project studies and the development of a set of ethical guidelines were part of an ongoing process to understand, mitigate, and hopefully to avoid the practice of development that displaces.



Large-scale dams, flooding, and displaced communities

Social Movements and Popular Resistance to Displacement

Following the introduction from Penz, anthropologist Anthony Oliver-Smith of the University of Florida (Gainesville) provided a keynote address in which he discussed the relationship between social movements, civil society and the politics of DID and resettlement (DIDR). According to Oliver-Smith, at the core of the politics of DID is a culture of transnational civil society comprised of both the uprooted and their allies. He noted in particular that this community of the displaced is characterized by a breadth and diversity of peoples and interests. The differences both within and between social movements resisting DIDR schemes is then both a resource for and obstacle to galvanizing organized opposition. Oliver-Smith cited examples of the intersection of DID-centered politics with broader struggles for gender, security, trade, environmental, indigenous, and environmental rights, and underlined that the politics surrounding DID and resettlement is played out by those who are displaced as well as by their allies, in coalition networks.

According to Oliver-Smith, the growing debate within civil society about the right to development in the face of displacement is indicative of a broader reconsideration of the entire development process wherein development—far from being understood as a panacea—is conceptualized in the mainstream as both a right and a risk. The competing discourses that characterize the debate between the right to development and the risks DID take shape within the framing of such mediating institutions as NGOs as they address the issues of risk and development.



Popular protests against displacement in the Narmada Valley, India

In Oliver-Smith's view, at a fundamental level the debates regarding DID focus on a discourse of rights, particularly the competing rights of oustees in opposition to the State, and—under the rubric of the State—the rights of a general public and notions of their common good. Resistance to DID is generated, however, as the interests of the general public are politically weighted against those of the oustees, with outcomes generally privileging the rights of a mythologized general public over the specific interests of DID-affected persons. The plight of the latter is further exacerbated by the mismanagement by state and private capital interests of the process of resettlement itself.

Oliver-Smith further suggested that when those who have been uprooted find their needs unmet by the state in which they are situated, they employ a tactic of global

expansion to transnational bases of support. Coalition resistance movements are necessarily complex and dynamic, engaging in a responsive resistance to DID transnationally and relying on the rapid transmission across diverse networks of differentiated actors. Within broad-based resistance movements, the often contradictory interests of the local grassroots organization and transnational allies do not necessarily impede the efficacy of resistance that is issue-specific. Oliver-Smith noted that these alliances help to level the political playing field for those who experience DID; with powerful allies, the social, economic and political capital that marginalized peoples are able to access in order to negotiate with power is dramatically increased.

From an ethics-based perspective, in order to appreciate the nuanced politics of DID and resettlement resistance, Oliver-Smith noted the necessity of invoking an approach which takes scales of interaction and conflict into account. This scale-oriented approach would consider the difference between, for example, village, town and urban neighbourhood responses, the formation of grassroots organizations, leadership and alliance formation. As well, Oliver-Smith advocated analyses of the project scale of action, including: resettlement project design, project implementation, poor project outcomes and resistance as a negotiating strategy. At the national scale of action, he emphasized the importance of studying state and DIDR goals, individuated state agencies, political space, and state collusion with wrongdoing. At the level of international scales of action, he focused on the role of International Financial Institutions, international guidelines, covenants and conventions, declarations. Within an ethical framework that is sensitive to questions of scale, Oliver-Smith suggested that any analysis of the costs and benefits of resistance to DID and resettlement should include opportunity costs, individuated risks, community risks and benefits exclusion. Successful outcomes of resistance would include land retention, resource and skills acquisition and self-empowerment. According to Oliver-Smith, resistance, thus framed, rejects any notion from the dominant society that the world's poor exist as powerless and acknowledges DID-affected persons as struggling from the margins to democratize the development process.

The EDID Project Ethical Guidelines

Oliver-Smith's keynote address was followed by a presentation by Jay Drydyk, Chair of the Department of Philosophy at Carleton University. His presentation, entitled 'Ethical Risks and Wrong-doing', was primarily concerned with an ethical analysis of justifiability given the understanding that, "even with the best mitigation programs somebody is going to fall through the cracks." According to Drydyk, the question of justifiability is even more poignant when the spotty track record of past and current mitigation schemes for DID are taken into account. If this record is any indication of risk with reference to the potential for wrongdoing in the area of DID, the likelihood of risk under current frameworks is unjustifiably high. In order to minimize the risks of harm that result from much DID, Drydyk suggested a participatory and democratized planning process be implemented from the onset of development project planning in

order to safeguard against negligence from a human rights perspective. In order that any such planning scheme be effective it must be practically enforceable, to the extent that a non-action alternative to the development project be a possible next logical step in an instance where the plan or the planning process is found to be the site of wrongdoing or unacceptable risk.



Resettlement Site for Dam Ousteers

According to Drydyk, the substantive involvement of stakeholders at every stage of development planning processes results in less DID and, more generally, in less unnecessary development. Participation, within an ethical framework, translates into an inclusive engagement between development practitioners and stakeholders that brooks no fraudulent or coercive tactics.

Negotiations throughout the consultative process should be free and access to information must be built into any consultation that might have a relationship to DID. Finally, in the interest of meaningful participatory process, representation of peoples' and their interests must be effectively accessed for all stakeholders. If any of these conditions are not met, it is understood that the project is ethically compromised and therefore not justifiable. If a development initiative has failed to progress according to these ethical norms and guidelines, Drydyk sees the risks of harm as being too great to proceed, rather, he suggests that at this point a development project is ethically bound to draw-the-line: to stop fully or to stop and start over anew. This drawing-the-line practice would mean that in the instances where development projects do not take social impacts into account—or in which planning excludes stakeholders or the where displacement is not absolutely necessary—projects would be reconceptualized or abandoned entirely, especially in a situation where the risk assessed is concluded to outweigh any benefit to the oustee.

Response from Development Practitioners

Following Drydyk's presentation, **Sam Pillai**, a staff consultant in the area of resettlement for the Asia Development Bank (ADB) spoke on the functional utility of ethical norms in the area of DIDR. Pillai suggested the implementation of a revised set of ethical norms upon which development funding would be conditional, including:

- A thorough rationale for the policy/project
- Planning with concern for displacement impacts
- Agreement on comprehensive compensation and rehabilitation principles
- Clearly established participation mechanisms
- Acceptable legal/policy frameworks in place
- Guaranteed transparency and governance (including mechanisms for redress or grievances)

Pillai discussed the issue of ‘drawing-the-line’ on development projects in the instances where ethical norms are imposed and the project fails to meet desired ethical standards.

According to Pillai, the major obstacle to the implementation of any revised set of ethical norms can be found in national governmental reluctance to put such guidelines in place. Pillai notes that this reluctance is often expressed by those who benefit from the maintenance of the status quo and that politicians and civil servants often argue for the rights of the majority to prosper at the expense of the few. Pillai commented that while many national governments will adhere to pressure from funding banks and donor agencies to implement ethical processes in the area of DIDR, there has been a marked unwillingness to apply progressive standards to projects/policies that are implemented with national funding.

During a question period following the presentations by Pillai and Drydyk, **Daniel Buckles**, a senior program specialist, in attendance from International Development Research Centre (IDRC) raised a significant point about another obstacle to the application of ethical guidelines in the development process. Buckles noted the relative ineptitude of both the academic and development community with reference to their ability to properly identify all stakeholders within development processes. According to Buckles, if the analysis of stakeholder interests is to be taken seriously as a component of EDID guidelines, the necessary step is to develop methodologies through which all stakeholders may be identified for inclusion in the consultative framework.

Following the opening address, commentaries and responses, the workshop heard presentations in four themed sessions on business ethics, globalization and mining, to participation and equity, conflict, violence and gender, and conservation and displacement.

Session 1: Business Ethics, Globalization and Mining

David Szablowski, a doctoral candidate at Osgoode Hall Law School, presented his research on private sector implementation of displacement resulting from mining developments in indigenous and rural regions of the Peruvian Andes. This research focused on the relationship between Compania Minera Antamina (CMA), a Canadian industry giant, and San Marcos, an economically and socially marginalised region in which development is occurring. In Szablowski’s research, it is clear that the conventional wisdom that assesses the fair market value (FMV) of the land from which people are uprooted in instances of DID is ineffective. He suggests that the subjective valuation of land in narrow economic terms does not accurately represent its real worth to local individuals, communities, and cultures. The fundamental right to livelihood for DID-affected persons is thus pitted against the broader ‘right to development’ for the presumed greater good of the economy as a (national and international) whole. While the recognition of DID as a paradigm in which harm is done to those who are uprooted is an important step towards justice within the broader fields of development—and in

particular private sector development—the practical application of the DID paradigm was less than effective in Szablowski's study.



CMA Operations in San Marcos, Peru

The failure of FMV with relation to DID is located both in its cultural chauvinism (western notions of exclusive ownership, tenure, and appropriate compensation, for example), and the fact that its on-the-ground application is very often unethical, even by the normative standards of the evaluative apparatus. For example, even in those instances where the legal owner is not excluded or underpaid, the assumption that the individual determined to have exclusive title to the land is the only person affected by DID is patently absurd given community contexts of resource sharing and the threat of indirect displacement. In addition to this, another practical danger of FMV compensatory schemes, suggests Szablowski, can be found in the context of economic uncertainty that characterizes economies in the 'global south' and results in widespread inflation and a dearth of money management capabilities. A context of grinding poverty translates FMV into a situation where any capital amassed in exchange for land is a short-term, one time only, influx of cash that is consumed rather than invested, resulting in an overall loss of livelihood and no emphasis on livelihood reconstruction.

In stark contrast to the FMV scheme, Szablowski believes an ethical DID paradigm focuses on a multiplicity of livelihood interests and participatory development intervention involving land replacement, temporary income support and development assistance. While both FMV and DID aim to redress the harm that results from the dispossession of land, the approach of an ethical DID paradigm is a richer and more effective strategy for the desired result of harm reduction. Szablowski elaborated on the need for changes to the regulatory processes that surround the application of a DID framework. In this case study, the private sector acted in a self-regulating capacity, and corporate interests were thus at all times privileged over those who were displaced.

According to Szablowski's research, the challenges posed by the DID paradigm to the private sector included the incommensurability of corporate aims and social development as well as the partially subjective and entirely political realities of

addressing DID. For these reasons the private sector is clearly reluctant and resistant to implement ethical DID paradigms. Given this inclination towards FMV as opposed to DID on the part of private sector interests, Szablowski underlined the importance for efficacy in the realm of regulatory apparatuses that can monitor and enforce application of DID paradigms within local contexts. Current World Bank Group (WBG) regimes of DID policy for implementation are hollow inasmuch as they place the responsibility for regulation with the private sector. The mechanism for integrity within this system—that of specialists employed by corporations—is deeply flawed and subject to little scrutiny and professional institution or accreditation. This system allows corporate agents to act as conduits between the WBG and affected-communities, controlling the flow of information between them. Within this system, Szablowski notes, the role of NGOs can be of great importance in facilitating the access of information to and from affected communities in order to empower displaced people as participatory agents within the decision-making process. NGOs may also act as advocates for DID-affected communities in multiple scales of context.

Szablowski concluded that the regulatory apparatus of the WBG DID Policy must be redesigned in order to engender deliberation through a meaningful series of checks and balances. Designated specialists must be empowered to compel corporate interests to act in socially responsible ways that engage the concerns of local actors on issues of DID paradigm application. According to Szablowski, DID policy could, through redesign, function as a community asset which would provide a framework for marginalized localities to negotiate a transformation.

Janet Fishlock, currently a PhD candidate in the Faculty of Environmental Studies at York University spoke about her firsthand experiences in the practical processes of DIDR. Fishlock's analysis of her experiences as a consultant working with mining companies operating in East and West Africa, raises significant questions about what she calls the "inherent tension" between human interests and the profit and results-based focus of business. Fishlock noted that this contradiction of interests informs the consultative and decision-making process surrounding DIDR at every step of the way.

When the issues of DIDR are negotiated through the lens of corporate interests, the resulting outcomes are necessarily about a top-down management of people and ecosystems rather than a participatory dialogue amongst all interested parties. The systemic power differential between the mining industry and the relatively disempowered rural and remote peoples with whom they 'negotiate' deflate any possibility for genuine cooperation around issues of DIDR. Fishlock noted the barriers to access for those DID-affected to participate at the level of decision-making and, following this, the modalities and priorities underwrite a framework that positions affected persons and communities at the periphery. The negotiation process is essentially a cosmetic trapping on a non-choice for affected communities. Fishlock expressed scepticism as to whether there is any real possibility that the decision-making process is a meaningful one and suggested that instead it masks a foregone conclusion that any and all economic development is worthwhile and justifiable.

In order to adequately address the ethical justifiability of development projects, the specificity of local, contextual dynamics within communities themselves must be noted in order for an ethical decision-making process around issues of DIDR from the onset of negotiations. Fishlock argued that the predominantly 'western' ethos of business development initiatives is not necessarily equipped to understand the complications of localized systems of land management and existing property arrangements of land rights and entitlements. Accordingly, Fishlock notes that the haste with which mining projects are organized is counterintuitive to the goals of social development with respect to human rights. In these instances, where haste trumps understanding, local rights to land—and in Fishlock's experience this is particularly true for the rights of women—are trampled. The capacity of any community to assert its rights with reference to DIDR is a function of the extent to which local land rights and land use schemes are articulated within the decision-making process.



Mining operations in the Andes

Session 2: Participation and Equity

Michelle Kooy a former EDID Researcher and a current Doctoral candidate in Geography at the University of British Columbia, presented her study on the relationship between neoliberal water policies and DID in Thailand. Kooy's research findings underline the multiple heterogeneities that characterize the relationship between development and displacement. According to Kooy, an analysis of DID that engages in a simple bifurcation of projects into categories of either 'forced' or 'voluntary' displacements, ignores the on-the-ground complexity of DID. In Kooy's work, the specific cases that she examined provided illustrations of both forced and voluntary displacements which had multiple impacts on affected communities. Kooy found that any community's or individual's experiences of DID are dependant upon the extent to which they were empowered to respond to and resist displacements. According to Kooy then, the determination of good or bad DID involves a necessary query of where the locus of control for the unfolding of development projects and their aftermath is located.

Allison Sauer, a PhD student in York University's Faculty of Environmental Studies, discussed DID based upon her extensive work with the Narmada Bachao Andolan (NBA). Sauer's presentation analyzed both the impacts of DID on affected communities and grassroots organizing to resistance DID from her two-year experience working as a part of the peoples' movement. In particular Sauer discussed her research on the secondary or indirect displacement of dam-affected persons during environmentally-motivated compensatory reforestation schemes. Sauer's case study illustrated the complexity of the relationship between human rights and environmentalist discourse under regimes of DID.



NBA Protestors (right) and the flooded valley (left)

Environmentalist concerns surrounding the ecological costs of the mega-dam project led to governmental mitigation programs that in some cases displaced people who had not previously been directly affected by the development. In other instances, individuals and communities who had been previously displaced were subject to further destabilization resulting from the compensatory reforestation project which had been imposed upon communities without any form of participatory consultation. The role of transnational civil society is of particular interest in the example provided by Sauer and speaks to the competing interests of the grassroots and their presumed 'allies' in movements to oppose DID. Sauer characterizes the mainstream environmental NGOs who lobbied for environmental compensatory schemes as having engaged in a form of environmental racism that echoes the problematic of the top-down, common good focus of the development paradigm. This example underlines the importance of a differentiated analysis with reference to the power dynamics among networks of DID-affected people and their allies within transnational civil society.

Session 3: Conservation and Displacement

In his presentation on land tenure reform agendas and DID, **Peter Vandergeest**, Director of the York Centre for Asian Research, noted that a preventative approach to DID is preferable to a curative approach inasmuch as efforts at mitigation have often been ineffective and excluded those whose experiences of DID are indirect. In order to evaluate the justifiability of development, Vandergeest suggests that an ethical analysis should attend to this indirect displacement. Indirect displacement, in which people are

not physically and immediately forced to move, includes those people who may 'choose' to move following a development that limits their ability to maintain their previous livelihoods, somehow constraining or undermining peoples' rights to the land through the ramifications of development or a first round of DID.

Vandergeest outlined some of the less commonly identified ways in which secondary or indirect displacements occur, specifically in the area of land tenure reform agendas in Southeast Asia.



In the context of Laotian land use planning, according to Vandergeest, the displacement has been from economic livelihoods, caused as a result of top-down development schemes that are aimed at reducing poverty. In these instances the development and ensuing displacement resulted from a paternalist lack of consultation and local authority with regard to land management. In Vandergeest's description the land tenure reforms as carried out have not been successful because they attempted to impose a relationship between people and their geographies that was counterintuitive to local knowledge and in which the design of development programs and policies were inflected by local and national politics. Vandergeest argues that the spatial reorganization of land (and thus populations), was structured as a part of a central planning mechanism which effectively enclosed land and resources as state, rather than local property. He further noted that while some level of displacement might be justified through careful assessments and in specific cases, any such assessment must include a nuanced examination not just of the direct and immediate displacements caused by development but also of the indirect and less recognizable displacements such as those from livelihoods.

Jason Morris, a resettlement and social welfare specialist with the World Wide Fund for Nature in Vietnam, described his own experiences of DID with reference to conservation and population relocation. During the creation of Cat Tien National Park, Morris was responsible for managing the displacement and subsequent resettlement of various populations located within the bounds of the area marked for conservation. The process of displacement and resettlement was bound by international guidelines, and informed by the oppositional framework of 'voluntary' vs. 'involuntary' displacements. Throughout the process, the use of preliminary consultations, stakeholder approval workshops, confirmation in feasibility studies, and negotiation of compensation were employed in order to adhere to the relevant international framework (mainly the World Bank's Operating Procedure 4.2.1).

However, according to Morris, the coercive context in tandem with a sense of national solidarity, and only partial information sharing, complicated the process sufficiently to confuse any presumption of a clear boundary between 'voluntary' and 'involuntary' displacements. This muddy issue of consent in the context of Cat Tien, particularly given the context of imbalanced power relations between state representatives and indigenous populations, cannot be abstracted from the outcome of a process that has been characterized as consultative and participatory. Norris noted that

while applicable guidelines require that DIDR occur only following “free, prior and informed consent”, there is little explicit guidance on how to recognize, ensure and define such consent.



Village in Cat Tien National Park

Session 4: Conflict, Violence and Gender

Sheila Gruner, a community-based researcher, presented her work on the structural barriers to participation in decision-making for DID-affected women in Colombia. Gruner’s study, undertaken in part during her time as an EDID field researcher, focused on identity-based politics in Colombia, with particular reference to indigenous and localized struggles over rights to land and resources. For the people with whom Gruner conducted her research—whose sense of self is geographically located—DID is thus considered to be literally a fate worse than death. Gruner noted that this location of selfhood and community in specific geography creates any displacement through development and associated conflict an act that inflicts violent cultural and personal upheaval onto the lives of DID-affected people. According to Gruner, the already disempowered position occupied by those who are most often subject to DID is only exacerbated by the lack of any meaningful participation in decision-making processes for the oustees. For women, says Gruner, the issue is more complicated as the stresses and violence imposed onto ousted communities are compounded by systemic gender oppression imposed upon women from state, corporate, NGO and local actors.



Yurumangai river in Colombia

Amani El-Jack, of the Department of Women’s Studies at York University and another field researcher with the EDID project, picked up on and highlighted the issue of gender with specific reference to conflict, development and displacement in the Sudan. El-Jack’s research included a discussion of possible points of agency in the disruption of previously existing power-relationships by DID. Uprooted women in her study were not necessarily always averse to the DID as in some instances, they negotiated displacement in such a way as to access increased power and autonomy. El-Jack’s presentation again highlights the importance of difference with reference to those who are affected by DID. These areas of distinction go beyond gender difference to include variations across class, sexuality, religious,

cultural and other mediators of experience and indicate the complexity through which displacements are experienced across population.

This presentation also teased out the relationship between conflict and DID. El-Jack noted the correlative relationship between economic development agendas and armed conflict. The African example, in particular, is one in which the relationship between civil war and resource extraction has been well documented³. The enmeshed relationship between these two distinctly conceived of forms of displacement is certainly worth examining given the implication of economic development agendas in much armed conflict both within Africa and throughout the developing world.



Refugee Camp in the Sudan

Bipasha Baruah, a PhD candidate at the Faculty of Environmental Studies, York University and community-based researcher with the Self-Employed Women's Association (SEWA) of Ahmehdabad, India, presented her study of land ownership and tenancy among urban slum-dwelling women in a South Asian context. In her research on gender and tenancy in Baruah noted several obstacles that inhibit the ability of women to claim title to the land upon which they live. The broader application of Baruah's notion of land tenure as a continuum rather than as fixed—especially with reference to the marginalized populations who are most vulnerable to DID—will hopefully translate to the level of policy formation. Any ethically sound guidelines for determining the justifiability of DID must be responsive to the complexities and varieties of tenancy and ownership, as influenced by differently experienced realities of gender, class, caste, etc. In order to ensure equitable prevention of and mitigation for DID it is essential that localized tenure arrangements be recognized as legitimate and given standing accordingly. Exclusionary understandings of tenure and property arrangements are at the heart of the ethnocentric biases that are deeply embedded within developmental institutions and paradigms.

³KAIROS, Canadian Ecumenical Justice Initiatives. *Africa's Blessing, Africa's Curse: The Legacy of Resource Extraction in Africa*. December 2004.

Future Directions for Research

In closing, Pablo Idahosa of the African Studies Program and Division of Social Science at York University offered some suggestions on directions for future research. From a methodological perspective, Idahosa noted a tendency among EDID/DID researchers to avoid a truly interdisciplinary approach to the study of DID. He suggested that any genuinely interdisciplinary approach would try to combine the empirically informed studies that have been the models for traditional migration studies with normative approaches in order for a more complete study of DID. This would help to encourage self-reflexivity with regard to evaluative frameworks as well as to engender meaningful interdisciplinarity. There is a definite distinction between the multidisciplinary methods that are generally employed in the study of DID and the notion of interdisciplinary practice in which there is, according to Idahosa, a “genuine cross-fertilization across and between the different evaluative, normative, and the ethical-philosophical approaches on the one hand, and the various social sciences on the other, concerned variously with space and scale, location, social relations, and their origins, culture, power, and the effective allocation of resources.”

Idahosa suggested that future research should also attempt to understand the location of DID within the wider spectrum of migration that occurs as a function of globalization. This worthwhile goal would seek to avoid any discussion that places DID as an isolated phenomenon and acknowledges the relationship between DID-affected persons and those who have been otherwise displaced. Understanding DID as one part—albeit distinctive—of a general trend toward increased flows of people under transnational capitalism is a potentially useful mode through which to and identify and negotiate the broader forces that are brought to bear in the processes of this and other types of human displacement. Also at stake, in the suggestion of locating DID as part of a larger framework, is the importance of recognizing the relationship of displacing-projects (such as dams) and institutions (such as the World Bank and other multilateral institutions) to other supposedly voluntary and indirect patterns of displacements. Beyond these institutions, the role of northern/western political frames in the issue of DID begs further examination and research, this being true both in terms of the international development role of developed nations but, also in reference to the internal displacement of populations in the global north. While none of the EDID workshop presentations focused on the case of internally displaced persons in the developed world, the issues addressed at the EDID workshop are certainly applicable outside of the developing world.

In accordance with Idahosa’s underlining of the importance of locating DID within broader contextual frames, the ideological/historical location of DID is worthy of note. The dispossession of persons from land, under capitalism and complicated by nationalism and global hierarchy, is by no means a phenomenon contained to the practice or era of development. By employing a wider viewpoint with reference to DID, it is possible to locate DID along a historical continuum which has been characterized by the ongoing privatization and seizure of common spaces by elite and ruling institutions. The practical purpose of this contextualization is found in the possibilities it entails for a

critical evaluation of the seemingly commonsense paradigms which characterize and influence mainstream development thought with regard to DID as well as DID/EDID research and analysis.

With reference to the moral and ethical frames through which DID is identified and conceptually evaluated, Idahosa remarked on the failure of most of these understandings to take local conceptual knowledge into account. This evaluative failure will hinder the ability of researchers and practitioners to adequately mitigate the results of DID amidst tensions over rights to resources, employment of resources and the risks that arise from development. In order to advance EDID concepts and to appreciate the consequences of DID, the whole picture of rights and entitlements as well as risks at a local scale must be taken into account, along with an acknowledgment of localized, differentiated contingencies. Situated, self-reflexive research that is sensitive of the local within the general and attentive to differentiation, must ask questions that address “*who is doing the research and for whom?*”

In any discussion of EDID/DID, Idahosa cites the need for researchers and practitioners to understand communities who are affected by DID as heterogeneous, disaggregated and differentiated. Thus, communities will be the sites of various and often conflicting levels of risk and vulnerability with reference of DID. The exercise of power within and amongst DID-affected communities is as equally important to research as the power relationships between communities and the state and international institutions. In order for any competent determination of development justifiability and ethically sound practice, the differentiation of individual communities must be intrinsically crafted into the conceptual framework so that guidelines have generally normative principles while simultaneously avoiding rigid, universalizing impositions onto communities.

Idahosa argued that the most obvious example of the central importance of differentiation as a point of analysis is that of gender and displacement, which remains a neglected and not fully-integrated frame for analysis. He expressed some surprise that despite the generalized tendency of the presented DID appraisals to identify power differentials, outside of a minority of workshop presentations gender issues were largely sidelined. Considering the centrality of issues of gender to development processes, Idahosa suggested that gender analysis and sensitivity were areas for a primary focus in any further research.

Participants and presenters argued for a broadened understanding of displacement, so that those who are indirectly displaced by development projects and those who face a double displacement are not excluded from cost benefit analyses or eventual recompense. However, it should be noted that this broadened category must remain heterogeneous, even as it attends to the common issue displacement. This differentiation must occur both as a means to understand the complexity of causality regarding displacements and in order to avoid the error of treating DID-affected individuals and communities as a uniform population. The commonality among populations tends to be that they are overwhelmingly impoverished, local or indigenous,

minorities within national orders, and living in politically marginal, though often resource-rich environmental spaces.

Several conference participants questioned the very notion of a right to develop if the proposed development will result in any displacement. Fishlock and Sauer, in particular, suggested that the argument of the greater good is a rhetorical tool deployed by interested parties in order to justify the displacement of already marginalized populations. Sauer noted that sacrifices for the 'common good' such as DID are continually asked of indigenous and impoverished populations who themselves rarely experience the benefits of development projects. Perhaps it should be noted that a measure of the extent to which ethical modes of development are at play could be found in the extent to which nations do or do not develop against the well-being of marginalized populations. Any justifiable balancing of a right to development for the whole at the expense of the human rights of vulnerable populations must include the protection of these minorities, as so often the 'good of the many' translates into a tyranny of the majority at the expense of a few.

There is a clear need for a civil society and governmental response to DID that not only prevents unethical DID but which also guarantees compensation for displacements which have already occurred and for which there has not yet been adequate recompense. The facilitation of global coalitions for DID-affected communities is more readily achievable from a perspective that links often recognized examples of DID, (such as those addressed within workshop case studies), and less visible forms of displacement. This is especially true given the fact that, as noted by several presenters, indirect forms of DID are mediated by the broad social, economic and political forces that determine the conditions of traditionally understood DID. While the prospect of coalition underlines the earlier calls for differentiation among and within displaced populations, it provides an opportunity for strengthened possibilities of resistance to unethical displacements. In addition, this broader perspective creates a richer possibility for generalized differentiation that may facilitate cooperative arrangements among funding organizations, national governments, NGOs and displaced communities in order to develop and enforce the normative guidelines upon which ethical development is contingent.

Concluding Notes

The EDID workshop created a successful venue at which policy community members, academics and members of the NGO community gathered to learn from and participate in discussions of the EDID research project findings. Crucial to the success of the workshop was the strategic location of the event at Carleton University in Ottawa which ensured relative ease of access for members of the NGO and policy communities. One of the central and ongoing aims of the EDID Project is to disseminate the results of its various studies, an objective for which the workshop served an important function. The workshop was also able to play another role, moving the concepts central to EDID in the direction of future research and policy implementation. As a forum for the dissemination of EDID and other related research, the examples cited by workshop presenters and participants offered a rich description of the ethical concerns and practical realities of DID. In the interest of the prescriptive function, Idahosa's closing remarks, the substance of and feedback to the keynote address by Oliver-Smith and other conference presenters and attendees, as well as presenters' analyses of their own research findings were effective means through which to identify ways in which the work of EDID is broadly applicable beyond the project itself.

Photo Credits

Images of the Narmada Valley and NBA are courtesy of Friends of River Narmada

Images of San Marcos and mining operations are courtesy of Compania Minera Antamina

Images of refugees and displaced persons are courtesy of UNHCR, Associated Press, and BBC News

Images of Cat Tien National Park are courtesy of World Wide Fund for Nature – Vietnam

Images of Yurumangi River are courtesy of National Geographic Magazine