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Over 25 million people are internally displaced; but beyond the statistics are individual human beings - human beings with needs and fears, but also with hopes and dreams. Listening to internally displaced persons has always been a priority in my efforts to promote the human rights of internally displaced persons. As I have traveled to different countries and different regions, I have always insisted on meeting with internally displaced persons and these conversations have always helped me to understand what their situation is and how it could be improved. In fact, what the displaced tell me often finds its way into my recommendations to governments and UN agencies. The importance of listening to internally displaced persons cannot be over-estimated. In fact, the process of listening to IDPs and of taking their concerns seriously can, in itself, enhance their dignity.

I am thus pleased to introduce this report Listening to the Voices of the Displaced: Lessons Learned which brings together some of the voices of IDPs from four regions around common themes and priorities. I am grateful to Roberta Cohen, co-founder and Senior Advisor to the Brookings-Bern Project on Internal Displacement, for taking the initiative to commission surveys of IDPs and for compiling this report.

I am also appreciative of Co-Director Elizabeth Ferris’ continuing support of this initiative. Consulting with IDPs remains high on the agenda of the Brookings-Bern Project. In November 2007, the Project convened a meeting on “Consulting with IDPs: Moving Beyond Rhetoric” to provide a forum for sharing experiences of consulting with IDPs and to reflect on guidelines for carrying out those consultations. The study prepared for that meeting and the resulting guidelines will be published shortly and will serve as a resource for those seeking to integrate IDPs into their work.

These two initiatives are complementary. While Listening to the Voices of the Displaced focuses on the concerns and issues raised by IDPs, Consulting with IDPs provides guidance on setting up a process through which the voices of IDPs can be heard by those working to assist and protect them.

We hope that these publications will encourage more governments and organizations to do more to ensure that the voices of internally displaced persons are heard.

Walter Kälin
Representative of the Secretary-General on the Human Rights of Internally Displaced Persons
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INTRODUCTION

Internally displaced persons (IDPs) are the best placed to articulate their needs and evaluate the national, regional and international responses to those needs, but most decisions on situations of internal displacement still do not sufficiently reflect their thinking.

The purpose of this report is to make better known how IDPs view the major issues affecting them. Listening to their voices is important because:

❖ The special needs of IDPs are often different from those of other war affected populations. As Khalid Koser, Deputy Director of the Brookings-Bern Project has observed: “IDPs often have particular vulnerabilities not encountered by other civilians in armed conflict; they need shelter, they may be unable to replace or receive official documents, and often encounter problems regaining land and property left behind.” Understanding their special needs is the first step toward ensuring that they are addressed.

❖ Heeding what IDPs have to say can correct misinformation about their priorities in emergencies.

In the Balkans in the 1990s, security was a major concern for IDPs while aid agencies focused on food, medicine and shelter. This led displaced people to tell the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) almost in desperation: “We do not need food. We are not starving to death. We are being persecuted.” In Galle, Sri Lanka, in 2005, a major concern for IDP families was their children’s education. Yet an international NGO converted the one empty room at the camp into a play area rather than a reading room where the children could study and do their homework. “They never asked us,” IDP families told a visiting delegation; “if they had, they would have known that we wanted a study room.” One humanitarian expert put it well, “Perhaps aid workers need smaller mouths and bigger ears.”

❖ Information from IDPs helps bring to light human rights and humanitarian abuses in a country that need to be aired. IDPs can provide valuable eyewitness accounts of their forced displacement, its causes and scope, and the protection problems they face while they are displaced and during return or resettlement. Their information often reveals whether acts of genocide, ethnic cleansing or other comparable crimes have been committed. After listening to the testimony of refugees and IDPs, journalist Roy Gutman was able to break the story about the concentration camps in the former Yugoslavia. In Darfur Sudan, information about systematic and deliberate sexual violence against African tribal women, many of them IDPs, came to light after NGOs interviewed them. In Turkey, Kurdish IDPs interviewed in Batman, Diyarbakir and Hakkari revealed that their displacement was not caused only by the Kurdistan Workers’ Party (PKK) as the government earlier insisted but by government security forces and that the practices of beatings, killings and burning down of their houses
were intended to evict and punish them for alleged PKK sympathies. While it is true that IDP accounts may be colored by emotion, time, distance and political agendas, it is also true that IDPs are the most authentic source of human rights and humanitarian information in emergencies. In fact, because of the potency of the information, governments frequently try to discredit their accounts, or may even retaliate against them or the relief agencies helping them.

IDP information enables governments, international organizations and NGOs to design responsive policies. As an NGO in Uganda told a meeting on internal displacement in Kampala: “In order to develop appropriate responses... the IDPs do know better than the agencies...” It was in line with this approach that Walter Kälin, Representative of the UN Secretary-General on the Human Rights of IDPs (RSG Kälin) learned that IDPs following the tsunami were experiencing a wide range of protection and human rights problems such as discrimination in aid provision, enforced relocation, sexual and gender-based violence, and problems with property restitution. He then developed needed guidelines that integrated protection and human rights concerns into international approaches to disasters which were welcomed by agencies on the ground and which the UN Inter-Agency Standing Committee adopted in 2006.

Consultations with IDPs can reinforce peace processes. The sheer scale of displacement in some countries is so significant and accounts for such a large proportion of the population that it is simply unrealistic to plan for a stable and peaceful future without incorporating the needs of the displaced into peace agreements and involving the displaced in consultations. In Sudan, one of the reasons the Darfur Peace Agreement of 2006 failed to bring peace to the region was that it was drafted without adequate consultation with IDPs and civil society; as a result, most IDPs and rebel groups rejected the agreement. Today displaced Darfuris have asked for a seat at the table warning that negotiations could fail without their participation.

Reconstruction and development projects have a better chance at sustainability if the views of IDPs are taken into account. In Aceh, Indonesia after the tsunami, large portions of the government’s master plan for reconstruction had to be modified because it was developed with little input from local communities. The lack of consultation with IDPs led to the setting up of temporary housing far from transport and livelihoods and to camp designs that failed to protect women. In Azerbaijan as well, when IDPs were not consulted as to where they would be relocated, they found themselves distant from employment opportunities or land. While on a mission there, RSG Kälin pointed out that timely consultation with IDPs would not only ensure the efficient use of government resources but would also give IDPs a sense of ownership and control over their lives. He and Miloon Kothari, the UN Special Rapporteur on Adequate Housing, have emphasized that it is essential to the recovery of local economies for IDPs to be consulted in the formulation of need and loss assessments, aid distribution and reconstruction. Likewise in Turkey, after interviewing IDPs, the Turkish Economic and
Social Studies Foundation (TESEV) found that consultations with IDPs could gain for the government greater legitimacy, transparency and accountability in its programs.  

❖ **Failure to listen to the voices of IDPs can promote instability and sometimes lead to violence.** In Bogotá, Colombia, toward the end of 1999 IDPs occupied the offices of the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) and remained in them for several years to protest the government’s failure to address their health, housing and education needs. In Liberia, in 2005, IDPs stormed the offices of a community based organization in Monrovia, and two years later, IDPs from nine camps demonstrated in Monrovia for aid to enable them to return home. They charged that the government and local and international organizations had ignored them. Acts of aggrieved IDPs have also taken place in Darfur directed against UN officials, while in Iraq in 2007 400 IDPs in Baghdad’s southern district of Al-Saydiyah staged a demonstration to demand government protection to enable them to return home.  

❖ **Failure to listen to IDPs can lead to complaints in regional and international fora.** When governments fail to meet their obligations to the displaced, they may find themselves the object of petitions in regional and international organizations. In Moldova, for example, a group of IDPs petitioned the European Court of Human Rights in 2005 accusing the government of non-fulfillment of its commitment to provide IDPs with houses. In Turkey, hundreds, if not thousands of IDPs have also brought cases before the European Court and in a number of cases have succeeded in obtaining compensation for lost property.
METHODOLOGY AND SCOPE

Collecting the views of IDPs has been a part of the work of the Brookings Project on Internal Displacement since it was founded in 1994. Both the former and current co-directors of the Project — the Representative of the Secretary-General on Internally Displaced Persons, Francis M. Deng (1992-2004) and the Representative of the Secretary-General on Human Rights of Internally Displaced Persons, Walter Kälín (2004- ) — have met with IDPs and their representatives during their missions to more than 30 countries. IDPs and their representatives have also participated in Project seminars in different parts of the world, including in the South Caucasus, Indonesia, the Americas and Uganda. It was at a Project Workshop on Internal Displacement in Colombia in 1999 that IDP representatives and officials from the government were brought together for the first time in formal discussion. In 2006, the AMAR International Charitable Foundation, with support from the Project, organized a seminar in London on internal displacement in Iraq to which IDP leaders from the Marshlands were invited to make known the concerns of their communities.

Beginning in 2005, the Project began to compile its material on IDP voices and also engaged local think tanks, experts and non-governmental groups in Colombia, South Asia (Bangladesh, India, Nepal, Sri Lanka), Sudan and Turkey to undertake more methodical research. In 2005 and 2006, a group of local partners interviewed between 800 to 900 IDPs individually and also in focus groups. The hundreds of IDPs interviewed included people in all phases of displacement — those at risk of displacement, during displacement and during return, resettlement and reintegration. Most had been displaced by conflict but those in South Asia were also uprooted by natural disasters and development projects. The IDPs were in diverse locations — camps, rural communities, and urban areas, and encompassed a broad range of IDP leaders, women heads of household, elderly people, youth, and representatives of ethnic and indigenous groups. Many had been displaced for long periods of time, up to ten years or more.

In Colombia, NGO leaders Juan Bustillo and Carlos Huertas Sánchez interviewed 60 to 70 IDPs on the basis of questionnaires and also organized focus groups in five regions of the country – 1) Bogotá and the neighboring municipality of Soacha; 2) Barrancabermeja (Santander) and the neighboring municipality of San Pablo (Bolívar) in the Magdalena Medio area; 3) Quibdó (Chocó); 4) Buga and Guacari (Valle del Cauca); and 5) Pasto (Nariño). Gimena Sánchez Garzoli supervised the project. The areas selected were not only geographically diverse and urban, semi-urban and rural but varied with regard to the extent to which state agencies, UN bodies or NGOs were active and present. IDPs ranged in age from 16 to 69, their period of displacement extending from ten months to ten years, with most having experienced multiple displacement. More than 50 percent were women; a substantial number were ‘organization leaders’ who knew about conditions in their communities; the vast majority were “mestizo peasants,” Afro-Colombians and indigenous people. In some
METHODOLOGY AND SCOPE

instances, security conditions limited discussions. A female interviewer was included in discussions with IDP women.

❖ In South Asia, the Calcutta Research Group (CRG), together with partner organizations and experts met with 528 displaced people, predominantly in camps and settlements in Bangladesh, India (Gujarat, Kashmir, Orissa and Bodoland, Assam), Nepal and Sri Lanka. 100 IDPs were interviewed in Bangladesh, 206 in India, 119 in Nepal and 103 in Sri Lanka. Of the IDPs, more than 269 had been displaced by conflict, 91 by development projects and 66 by natural disasters. More than half were women; nearly half of the IDPs were displaced for more than five years and more than half had been displaced multiple times. Attention was paid to maintaining balance when it came to ethnicity and disadvantaged groups. CRG relied on questionnaires, focus group discussions, testimonies of individuals, and case studies. In 2006, CRG published its report to make better known the needs of the displaced. The report prompted questions in the Assam Parliament, in particular about the IDPs “languishing in camps such as those in Kokrajhar” who received no help from local, national or international organizations. The Assam government as a result announced that each IDP family would receive cash compensation of Rs. 50,000 ($1,301).

❖ In Sudan, the NGO Kush together with local Sudanese partners organized twelve focus groups (with approximately 12 IDPs in each group), half of them in Abyei County (an area between north and south) and half in Juba County in the south. The focus groups in Abyei were composed of young women, elder women, male elders (including 5 chiefs), young men and volunteer teachers, most of who were of the Ngok Dinka tribe and had returned from the north following the signing of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement of 2005. In the south, in Juba, the IDPs included elders, ‘intellectuals’ (those who graduated from high school), and youth, each broken into male and female groups. These IDPs unlike those in Abyei had remained in camps and shanty areas close to their home areas and had been uprooted largely by the Lord’s Resistance Army (LRA), reportedly with the support of the Sudanese government. Some had also been displaced by government armed forces, the SPLA and local tribal militias (eg. Murle). In both Abyei and Juba, the discussions were based on questionnaires that used the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement and other rights-based frameworks. The report has been given to government officials in the south.

❖ In Turkey, the Turkish Economic and Social Studies Foundation (TESEV) interviewed 92 IDPs displaced by conflict and human rights violations in 2005 and 2006 in Batman, Hakkari and Diyarbakir. Some of the interviews were part of a 19-month long project involving academic and field work on internal displacement in Turkey and others were done exclusively for this report. In Batman, the interviews covered the city center, the districts of Besiri, Gercus, Hasek and Sason and four villages where there had been partial returns; in Hakkari - the city center and the district of Cukurca; and in Diyarbakir - the city center. Interviews were done individually or in focus groups (in Batman – 14 individually and 29 in seven focus groups, in Hakkari 42 in focus groups, and in Diyarbakir 7 individually). TESEV also held in-depth interviews with 10 NGO
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representatives (4 in Batman, 3 in Hakkari and 3 in Diyarbakir), the bar associations in Batman and Diyarbakir, and 14 lawyers working with the displaced (8 in Batman, 3 in Hakkari and 3 in Diyarbakir). Its survey was published and widely circulated in 2007.34

SOME GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

It cannot be claimed that the views of IDPs upon which this survey is based are wholly representative of all IDPs in the countries concerned or of the more than 25 million IDPs worldwide. Yet the information gleaned does provide a compelling portrait of IDP experiences in a diverse set of locations in a variety of countries and of the varied subgroups within the IDP community.

A limitation of this study is that IDPs living in areas controlled by non-state actors could not be included. In Sri Lanka, for example, CRG was unable to make contact with IDPs in war-affected or tsunami-affected areas controlled by the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE). In fact, Killinochchi and Mullaituvu were the only areas with IDPs that the interviewers did not visit.35 As for the RSGs, when RSG Deng visited Angola in 2000, he had no access to areas controlled by UNITA.36 In Mexico, in 2003, Deng had limited access to the “autonomous communities” under the control of the Zapatistas, who he reported had suffered greatly and may have been traumatized.37

Another limitation of this report is that not all IDPs interviewed were comfortable providing information. Some feared that they could be personally endangered. Indeed, sometimes IDPs said they hid the fact of their displacement to protect themselves and avoided contact with authorities and even aid organizations.38 At the same time, they wanted to provide information in the hope that this would ultimately prove helpful to them and their communities. Some IDPs were skeptical about the usefulness of providing information. They had met with many national and international agency staff without tangible results.39 Others felt cynical about recording narratives given the multiple displacements and terrible conditions they endured.40

The report includes IDPs uprooted by development projects and natural disasters in addition to those displaced by conflicts, the main focus of many human rights and humanitarian organizations. It is noteworthy that RSG Kälin has added IDPs uprooted by natural disasters to those of concern to his mandate, a new role confirmed by the UN’s Human Rights Council.41 As for IDPs displaced by development projects, the Calcutta Research Group included them among the IDPs they interviewed, taking the position that internal displacement in South Asia cannot be discussed without focusing on all three types of displacement. The effort to capture the broadness of the IDP condition wherever possible is repeated in this report.

That IDPs have special problems emanating from their displacement resonates throughout the report. The loss of homes, communities, livelihoods and property invariably set the IDPs apart from others in the population. Whether in camps or settlements or merged with others in cities and
villages, they report difficulties in obtaining life-supporting food, medicine, shelter and clothing as well as obstacles to accessing education and jobs. They also report greater vulnerability to human rights abuse, in particular direct violence, sexual attacks, recruitment of children into armed groups, restrictions on movement, and violations of land, housing and property rights. In cases where IDPs appeared not to be dramatically worse off than the general population, as in Azerbaijan, RSG Kälin found that one of the reasons was that the government had stepped in to provide them with monthly allowances, free accommodation and free services such as electricity.  

That IDPs find themselves in a worse economic and situation than they were before displacement can be seen in report after report. In Turkey, a common complaint voiced by those returning to their villages in the southeast was “the significant drop in their living standards in comparison to their pre-displacement lives.” “In the old times,” explained an IDP, “we had a lot of animals. Everyone had cattle, orchards, and gardens. We had fruits. Now, only a handful of us have a few animals.”

A church official in Colombia explained the phenomenon well in his country: IDPs may have been poor before their displacement but “the peasant on his land remains free; [whereas] in the city he becomes a beggar, his daughter becomes a prostitute; he becomes a parasite...” Even a decade after the end of an emergency, IDPs, unlike others, often remain economically vulnerable. And when it comes to retrieving their property and possessions, IDPs generally encounter difficulties, having lost their documents or not being able to easily obtain new ones. CRG concluded after interviewing hundreds of IDPs in South Asian countries: “... once a section of population is pushed to the margin, it is difficult for them to come back to the mainstream of life.”

Finally, whatever the country or circumstances of the IDPs, the experience of displacement left them with a lack of confidence in their government and its institutions. Although governments have the principal responsibility to address the assistance, protection and reintegration needs of IDPs, repeatedly the displaced spoke of being abandoned by their governments and regularly recounted how their governments failed to respond to their concerns in a timely or effective way. “We’re an abandoned lot, uncared for,” said an IDP in Kashmir. “We feel very unprotected,” IDPs in Colombia told RSG Deng. In Nepal, IDPs said that both the government and civil society neglected them and asked: “Isn’t it the government’s responsibility to provide us security and support?” In Sri Lanka, where more than 90 percent of IDPs interviewed had received some form of support from their government or other institutions, they expressed problems with the speed and equity of the distribution. In countries, where governments had adopted specific policies or laws to address IDP needs, there were also disappointments. In Uganda, IDPs pointed to the gap between the declared policy announced by the government and its implementation. In Chechnya in the Russian Federation, IDPs reported that the assistance promised by the government to help rebuild their homes had not materialized. In Turkey, interviewers found “a legacy of mistrust” between the state and the displaced despite policies and laws to provide aid and compensation. This was due in part to the “top-down” response taken by the government and to the fact that for nearly two decades the displaced had received little or no help, having been “invisible” to the government. “I have no expectations from the state,” an IDP told TESEV “... it has abandoned me. It forced me out of my village. What should I expect?”
SPECIFIC IDP PRIORITIES AND CONCERNS

IDPs in different political, economic and social contexts face different problems but they also share common experiences arising from their having been forcibly uprooted from their homes, communities and livelihoods. Some of the main points of concern were the following:

ACCEPTANCE AS INTERNALLY DISPLACED PERSONS

IDPs interviewed for this study considered displacement the single most defining feature of their lives and wanted their displacement acknowledged and accepted. Whether uprooted by conflict, natural disasters or development projects, they saw themselves as people forcibly displaced and in need of attention in the form of assistance, protection and reintegration support. In Turkey, for example, IDPs no longer wanted to be considered “invisible” and to depend on whatever social networks happened to exist for them. They wanted attention by the government and local communities to the problems emanating from their displacement.53

IDPs also wanted the stigmas associated with their displacement to be lifted. In Sudan, IDPs in the north living in camps ringing Khartoum (called the “Black Belt”) objected to being viewed as ‘enemies’ or second-class citizens by the government and host communities because they were of a different ethnic and racial group. What they wanted was to be acknowledged as first-class citizens who had become displaced inside their own country.54 In Assam, in northeast India, Muslim and Adivasi displaced also spoke about discrimination by local government and host communities based on their displacement and their minority status.55

In Sri Lanka, IDPs objected to being considered outsiders rather than citizens. One IDP complained: “Some people look at us and call us refugees. We have to face this type of experience in public places such as in the market, the lake and also in the public sector…” 56 In the United States as well, IDPs uprooted by Hurricane Katrina challenged their being called ‘refugees.’ As one IDP put it, “We’re American citizens. We’ve had a tragedy yes, and we’re out of our homes. We are not refugees.” 57

The stigmas associated with displacement were also felt in Colombia, but these were based on political bias. IDP women working as household employees in urban areas told RSG Kälin that they were considered to be ‘a priori untrustworthy.’ People believed that since they were displaced, they “must have done something wrong or colluded with the armed groups and that their displacement was some sort of retribution.” 58

IDPs have also been excluded from being acknowledged as displaced by governments that put forward narrow interpretations of who is an IDP. In Colombia, for instance, IDPs displaced by
insurgent groups found it easier to be registered as IDPs and receive assistance than those displaced by law enforcement officials or paramilitary groups. Those displaced by fumigation campaigns were not considered to be IDPs at all. In Turkey, for years the government failed to acknowledge that government military action was displacing people, claiming rather that the government was protecting people and that it was the PKK that was the main cause of displacement. By 2007, however, following considerable external and internal pressure, the government finally acknowledged that there were close to one million IDPs in the country and that they had been uprooted by both insurgent and government action, although its 2004 compensation law does not apply to those who fled to avoid the effects overall of armed conflict.

In other cases, governments were more prepared to acknowledge those uprooted by conflict as IDPs than those uprooted by development projects. In Bangladesh, the Calcutta Research Group found that the government was more ready to accept as displaced those uprooted by conflict than those uprooted by development projects. In India, however, the government was more ready to accept those uprooted by development projects as IDPs than those displaced by state or communal violence. In Nepal, IDPs displaced by conflict were largely ignored, viewed primarily as economic migrants by the government and international organizations. RSG Kälin, however, pointed out that the conflict arising from the Maoist insurgency had produced substantial displacement as well as hastened economic decline; the displacement therefore was the result of both insecurity and economic downturn. Subsequently, the government acknowledged as IDPs those uprooted by conflict and developed a policy on internal displacement, which even gives “priority” to those forcibly displaced by conflict.

IDPs afraid to be identified as displaced are unable to receive benefits. In Nepal, RSG Kälin reported that substantial numbers of IDPs failed to register as IDPs for fear of being recognized and subjected to reprisals by Maoists or being suspected of disloyalty to the state. Similarly in Colombia, IDPs feared that they might be subject to attack if they were identified and therefore missed out on material aid.

GREATER SUPPORT FOR IDP ASSOCIATIONS

IDPs belonging to associations advocating for the rights of the displaced would like to see them better supported and financed. In the Americas, where such associations are the most active, IDPs complained that too often international funds are channeled through established NGOs even though the displaced persons’ groups may be the best informed about the needs of the displaced. In Peru, women’s IDP groups, formed to empower displaced women, called for funds to be channeled directly to their groups and for legal recognition so that the associations could apply for loans from governments and private banks. The UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) in 2004 provided direct support to La Liga de Mujeres Desplazadas (the League of Displaced Women) in Cartagena, Colombia to construct a community center. The Afro-Colombian IDP association,
AFRODES (Asociación de Afro Colombianos Desplazados), has also benefited from international funding. Its leaders have recommended training for IDP associations so that they can develop the skills required to apply for funds from international donors.69

In Colombia, IDPs who were interviewed said the main obstacles to the effective functioning of their associations were limited resources, threats from armed groups and the lack of internal cohesion within their organizations. Their leaders and members, they pointed out, became discouraged by having to navigate complicated registration procedures; being subjected to discrimination and threats; achieving too little from the state in the way of assistance, jobs and training; and seeing far greater privileges offered to demobilized paramilitary groups.70 The goals of the associations have been to improve the living conditions and security of the displaced, help them gain access to employment, and help them recover their land and property. To these ends, the leaders of the organizations have represented IDPs with local, national and international authorities, provided training to IDPs, and helped them file papers and prepare complaints and petitions for land adjudication, credits, and resettlement.

At times IDP leaders have adopted tactics which have alienated international organizations and with which their own followers are not comfortable -- for example, the IDP occupation of the offices of the ICRC and UNHCR in Bogotá in 1999-2000. Women IDPs have sometimes formed their own organizations because those run by men did not adequately reflect their concerns or include women in senior management. IDP organizations and leaders have also been accused of trying to manipulate or control IDP populations. In Uganda, for example, government officials charged IDP camp leaders in Acholi with discouraging displaced persons from returning to their homes for fear of losing their power over these groups.71

At the same time, members of IDP associations have reported notable achievements, in particular raising awareness about the problem of displacement in their country and most importantly, securing positive responses from the government with regard to humanitarian aid, education, land adjudication, housing and training. In Georgia, the IDP Women’s Association in Tbilisi has organized summer camps for children, helped members to develop crafts to sell and has helped with payments for costly medical procedures. In Colombia, IDPs said that these organizations contributed to their “psychosocial recovery” by engaging them in solidarity with others in similar situations and succeeded in making them more aware of their rights and how to promote them. “I have learned that I have dignity” and “We have improved our self-esteem” typified the comments made by members of IDP organizations in Colombia. By contrast, those who did not belong to IDP associations expressed little or no understanding of their rights and were less aware of the UN Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement.

Today, IDP associations can be found in a growing number of countries, including Colombia, Georgia, Guatemala, India, Iraq, Mexico, Moldova, Peru, the Philippines and Uganda.
GREATER PROTECTION FOR IDP LEADERS AND THEIR ORGANIZATIONS

Leaders of displaced persons organizations, especially in the Americas, have been threatened, targeted and in some cases killed because of their advocacy for IDP rights and their defense of IDP land claims. Sometimes they are branded as subversives or terrorists by governments, paramilitary forces and government security forces; sometimes they have been targeted by insurgent groups. In Colombia, Marino Córdoba, the founder of AFRODES, had to flee the country in 2002 because of threats to his life. He had been outspoken in calling upon the government to implement Law No. 70 of 1993, which gave land title to Afro Colombians. Even though the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights of the Organization of American States called upon the Colombian government to protect Córdoba, the steps taken by the government were not sufficient to ensure his safety. AFRODES’ current president, Geiler Gustavo Romano Cuesta, continues to receive death threats and has been forced to take security precautions.

In 2007, in Cartagena, an arson attack destroyed the premises of La Liga de Mujeres Desplazadas. According to a report by the organization:

Between 2001 and 2005 we have been victims of 2 threats against the life of our women; 3 cases of kidnapping, and retention against the will of women; 2 cases of homicide; 1 case of violent sexual access; 1 case of personal injury; 2 cases of theft; 3 cases of telephone threats against the organization and an attempt of homicide against one of the youth program leaders.

UNHCR, following the fire, announced that it would help rebuild the center and commented: “We are very concerned that many of our humanitarian partners and community leaders face an increasingly tense and volatile security situation in the entire Atlantic region.”

IDP leaders in Colombia have requested greater police protection and also equipment such as cell phones, radios, and bulletproof glass and vests. They have urged the authorities to arrest those responsible for attacks. Members of IDP organizations interviewed in Colombia appealed for greater national and international attention to the security of their leaders and their associations.

RAPID AND NON-DISCRIMINATORY ACCESS TO EMERGENCY AID

The IDPs interviewed identified a series of obstacles to their access to emergency aid.

In Colombia, IDPs complained that the criteria for eligibility to receive emergency aid were highly politicized. To be considered eligible for aid as an IDP, those interviewed said it was easiest to claim to have been displaced by insurgent groups. If the displaced said they had been displaced by government security forces, the authorities would reply that “law enforcement does not cause
displacement.” If they said they were displaced by paramilitary groups, they would be challenged by the response that “there is no longer displacement by paramilitary groups because they already demobilized.” They might also be rejected if they said they were caught in the middle of a conflict and fled. “The fear of being murdered does not constitute a reason for displacement,” some were told.  

Colombian IDPs also pointed to bureaucratic obstacles and complex requirements in gaining access to the health system, schools, urban housing subsidies, income generation projects, training, and land allocation. They further called attention to what they described as incomplete aid (e.g. provision of medical consultations without medications or clinical tests) and uncoordinated aid (e.g. provision of land without provision for housing, or provision of property without help to deal with legal problems, or provision of education without providing food and nutrition at schools). The overall result was that many IDPs remain in extreme need.

Discrimination was given as another reason obstructing access to emergency aid. In Sudan, IDPs in the north said that “Assistance was provided but for Muslims only and not for non-Muslims.” Others complained that because they were “black people” they were denied aid:

> We were settled in desert where there was no water or trees. As time passed, the Government saw that we were suffering … and decided to let the NGOs provide us with small services, like some water and food. But this was not enough to meet our needs.  

In some countries, IDPs complained of corruption on the part of NGOs and civil society organizations as impeding their access to emergency aid. These organizations, they said, received large scale assistance from donor agencies but they do not always use the funds for the purposes intended. In Nepal, IDPs wondered if the budgets of some of these organizations had been manipulated for other purposes the organizations wanted to pursue. 

Elderly IDPs in particular felt discriminated against in access to aid. Eighty-four percent of the IDPs interviewed in India and more than 68 percent in Bangladesh said that no special support was given to the elderly. In Nepal, most elderly persons also said they received no special attention. A widow in Jammu and Kashmir said she had to fend for herself when it came to relief aid, cash assistance and health care. CRG found that:

> The major problems faced by elderly IDPs were lack of food, adequate shelter, clothing and deteriorating health conditions… In addition to these problems, poor eyesight, loss of hearing, other physical weaknesses, adjustment problems in the urban areas due to the differences in the life pattern they [were] used to, were also the problems in the camps. Discrimination in the current settlement area by local inhabitants was also straining them.  

In a large number of countries, access to aid was impeded because IDPs had no documents – either
they had lost them in displacement, or left them behind when fleeing or because security forces or insurgent groups had confiscated them.

ASSISTANCE WITH DOCUMENTATION

Most IDPs expressed the need for assistance in obtaining documents. The need for identity cards, birth and marriage certificates, diplomas, election records, military registration cards and property documents is considered essential to establishing identity, gaining access to basic health and social services, conducting bank transactions and business, enrolling children in school, being hired for jobs, proving title to land and property, and voting in elections.

In Serbia, RSG Kälin found that obtaining documents was one of the major issues for IDPs and the key to solving many other of their problems, in particular access to health care and other state services to which they are entitled. Often, the procedures to obtain documents were needlessly bureaucratic. In Serbia, the documentation and registration requirements were cumbersome with IDPs having to travel long distances to obtain them. The problem was particularly acute for minorities, in particular displaced Roma (many of whom are illiterate), Ashkali and Egyptians, who were living in makeshift huts and corrugated metal containers and badly needed government support.\(^\text{84}\) In Azerbaijan, RSG Kälin found that less than half the IDPs were in possession of IDP cards documenting their status and making them eligible to receive allowances as well as exempting them from payments for public services.\(^\text{85}\)

Lack of identity documents not only impedes access to food and social services but can make the displaced easy victims of racketeering and corruption schemes. In the Ivory Coast IDP women told RSG Kälin of their difficulties when trying to enroll their children in school without birth certificates. The children became vulnerable to exploitation as prostitutes or as agricultural labor.\(^\text{86}\)

Women in particular face problems without documentation, which they may never have had due to social and cultural constraints, lack of resources or illiteracy. In Bosnia, female heads of household who lost their husbands in the war often lacked property titles, which prevented them from submitting claims for both repossession and reconstruction of their houses. Others lost access to their pre-war property due to divorce or because their husbands had abandoned them.\(^\text{87}\) In Sri Lanka, obtaining documents could mean having to return to dangerous areas of origin. An IDP woman explained it well: “Most of the people don’t have a birth certificate and identity card. We tried many times but still couldn’t obtain these because our registration is still in the north” where it is too dangerous to go.\(^\text{88}\) In Gujarat, India, IDP widows could only receive compensation from the government if they produced a death certificate, which was difficult for some women to obtain.\(^\text{89}\)

Lack of documentation makes it difficult to establish ownership of property and land. In Sri Lanka after the tsunami, IDPs without documents found it difficult to make land claims. Even in a country
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As developed as the United States, some IDPs after Hurricane Katrina complained about difficulties obtaining identity documents or papers that could verify their ownership of land and property. In Nepal, an IDP storekeeper told RSG Kälin that she was seeking compensation for the goods she left behind when forced from her home. She had invested her entire life savings in those goods, but she was having difficulty in obtaining compensation because she had not been able to take with her the receipts when she fled.

BETTER RELATIONSHIPS WITH HOST COMMUNITIES

Many IDPs who stay with extended families and host communities over long periods find tensions developing in these relationships. Some look to the international community to help address these.

In Juba, south Sudan, IDPs pointed out that conflict occurred with host communities when the World Food Program distributed relief items. IDPs questioned as an effective strategy the delivery of food only to IDPs in camps in Juba County. “Food is what put us in conflict,” one woman IDP said because the host communities are not included when food and other relief items are distributed. “Those who host us here are not involved in the distribution,” an elder IDP added, yet “They deserve the same access to food because they are in our same conditions.” Although local chiefs resolve the disputes, the IDPs also looked to the international community. As a young woman IDP commented, “International agencies should still distribute food in a way that does not cause conflict.”

In the Ivory Coast, IDPs told RSG Kälin that they had been living off their host families for several years and that this had contributed to the impoverishment of families and had led to tensions between them and their hosts. The families received no assistance from the authorities or from international humanitarian organizations.

In many countries, local communities where the displaced fled have been generous toward their compatriots but have run out of resources. In Nepal, for example, some IDPs chose to return to conditions of insecurity because the burden on host families had grown too heavy and they felt that they had no other option. In other countries, host communities have been openly hostile to the displaced, often because they were of a different ethnic origin. In Indonesia, government authorities decided to relocate IDPs from camps in West Kalimantan because they had been threatened by the local population and it was too unsafe for them to return home. In Turkey, the antagonism in some areas was more social than ethnic. An IDP in Diyarbakir where the people were of the same ethnic origin explained that the people in the cities “looked down upon us,” because the displaced came from rural areas. In Hakkari, a local woman from the “host” community reinforced this: “They [IDPs] are peasants. They don’t know how to live in the city. They brought their cows into the city.”
ENHANCED SECURITY AND PREVENTIVE MEASURES

Many of the IDPs interviewed reported concerns about their safety in areas of displacement and the failure of the state to prevent displacement.

In Colombia, IDPs mentioned the presence of armed groups in areas where they had fled, especially paramilitaries but also guerrillas, as well as specific incidents of intimidation, threats and murders directed against them. Law enforcement authorities, they complained, failed to take action even though IDPs provided information about the threats of armed groups. Moreover, “Early warning alerts for impending massacres are not listened to by the authorities,” said an Afro-Colombian IDP leader. IDPs expressed fear about giving out information to government offices since some officials, they said, supplied information to paramilitary groups. They expressed deep disappointment at the failure of the state to prevent displacement. Indeed, they noted that the armed forces in their operations against guerrillas often attacked peasants, damaged their villages and uprooted people. Indigenous groups and Afro-Colombian communities complained that preventive measures were not taken against armed groups encroaching on their lands. Indeed, the complicity of the armed forces was raised. Cases of young girls having to flee communities because of forced sexual relations with members of the armed forces or armed groups were brought to RSG Kälín’s attention.

In Sri Lanka, RSG Kälín was struck by the pervasive sense of fear among IDPs. Among the sources of insecurity in Sri Lanka were roundups and detentions by government security forces; attacks by the LTTE and other Tamil armed groups; disappearances, abductions and looting by all parties; delayed mine clearance; and the failure of civilian police to respond in a timely manner to security incidents. In the Ivory Coast, IDPs also became victims of serious human rights violations during their displacement, with attacks and sexual violence committed by all sides in the civil war.

In Sudan, in Abyei, IDPs expressed lack of confidence in the government’s capacity to protect them upon return home as “there is no peace in Abyei because the militias are still holding guns in Abyei town and our surrounding villages.” Even though the Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) was signed between north and south in 2005, “we are still displaced, because even though we have come home, there is no peace in Abyei. And even though peace monitors are here, there are no changes since they came.”

ADEQUATE HOUSING

Most IDPs complained of substandard housing conditions. Although it is frequently assumed that shelter is an integral part of emergency response, it has been found to be “among the poorest addressed and most neglected aspects” of that response.

Beyond languishing in camps, large numbers of IDPs may live for years in railway cars, aluminum
containers, abandoned buildings, empty hospital rooms, collective centers and urban slums. For the IDPs interviewed in Colombia, housing was one of their main priorities. Without adequate housing, most said they could not feel integrated into their communities. In Turkey, TESEV found that IDPs in urban areas “live in overcrowded, unhealthy and small houses, which often do not have central heating or clean drinking water.” In Diyarbakir an IDP family of 15 was found living in a house with two bedrooms, a small living room and no central heating, “a typical example of the current conditions of the displaced in urban areas...” 105 In Azerbaijan, RSG Kälin found some IDPs living “in tent camps, railway wagons, and mud brick houses after more than a decade,” and in urban areas, he found most IDPs to be in “rundown, overcrowded dormitories or public buildings, including former schools.”106

EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES AND ACCESS TO LAND

“We do not want more humanitarian aid; we want income from jobs,” said an IDP interviewed in Colombia.107 Across the world an IDP woman in Abyei, Sudan echoed the same sentiment: “What we will grow is better then the relief given to us.” Or put another way, “We don’t trust or believe in relief work because it will take us nowhere, but we appreciate any help concerning agriculture.” 108

Indeed, whatever the country, IDPs yearned for jobs in cities or to be working the land so that they could have stable incomes. In Sri Lanka, access to livelihoods was a major concern for IDPs returning to their home areas.109 In Nepal, of the IDPs interviewed, 61 percent complained of economic/employment related problems, and in Bangladesh, 58 percent marked economic concerns as their main problem for survival.110 In Assam, India, IDPs identified lack of work opportunities as a major problem.111 In Colombia, those interviewed emphasized jobs as one of their highest priorities.112

Many IDPs complained that in the positions available to them -- domestic work, agricultural day work, sorting trash, and serving as night watchmen -- the pay was low, the hours were long and the jobs were unstable. Both in Colombia and in Azerbaijan, IDPs complained of finding only low paying jobs in urban centers where they were disadvantaged because they came from rural areas and had few specialized skills.113 In Turkey, IDPs who fled to urban areas, ending up with informal, temporary and low-paying jobs, often suffered exploitation. According to an IDP neighborhood leader outside Batman:

How did they [IDPs] make a living? They held seasonal jobs [in more affluent areas] - without health insurance, without social security... The feudal lords in Batman and Diyarbakir exploited them. They made IDPs work in cotton fields for 40 TL [Turkish lira] per kilo, whereas the rate was 80 TL in Adana and Mersin... 114

Training and income generating projects are few and far between for IDPs. In Juba, the capital of southern Sudan, IDPs complained that “Education and training programs for IDPs are non-existent”
and “there have been intentions, but no follow-up.” 115 In Colombia, only a small number of those interviewed had received skills upgrading or vocational training. The government did, however, have a program for promoting micro businesses to help IDPs earn a living and reintegrate effectively. But for most IDPs, developing a successful project proposal in the business sector proved too difficult. Moreover, credit, they pointed out, was difficult to repay. 116 In Bosnia, problems also arose with credit programs. Returning IDPs who needed financial assistance found that the high interest rates of micro credit programs deterred self-employment initiatives in urban areas. 117 Creating livelihood opportunities for the vast majority of IDPs remains a major challenge.

Many of those displaced by development projects in India had trouble finding jobs in the industrial sector. Indeed, CRG concluded that “it is a myth that development-related IDPs are also beneficiaries of development projects.” Those displaced by development projects could be found working in the domestic sector and suffering greatly from economic problems. 118 In Khulna, Bangladesh, many of those displaced by shrimp cultivation projects and forced off their land could not find satisfying new livelihoods; many found only temporary jobs “moving from one slum to another.” 119 CRG found that those displaced by natural disasters were more likely to be rehabilitated within a year whereas those displaced by development projects or conflict might remain displaced for more than five years.120

In Sri Lanka, security concerns often impeded access to livelihoods, 121 whereas in other countries, discrimination impeded access to the labor market. In Sudan, an IDP returning to Abyei said that, “Finding a job [in Khartoum] after completing a university is one of the biggest problems,” because the job will invariably go to an Arab, even though he is only one among ten other black people applying. 122 An IDP woman in Abyei voiced similar views, after looking at the positions available at organizations managed from Khartoum: “The Dinka people have no chances to work. Only the Arabs are employed.”123 In Bosnia, discrimination based on ethnicity, political affiliation and gender also obstructed access by returning IDPs to the labor market, mainly in the postal, telephone, electricity and forestry companies, controlled by the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina and by the government in the Republica Srpska. RSG Kälín reported a strong tendency to employ only members of the dominant ethnic group or political party.124

Tajikistan offered the example of IDPs failing to seek employment because of dependency they had developed upon the international community. RSG Deng found that some returning IDPs did not begin to cultivate their lands because they had become reliant on international food aid. When he asked how long the returning IDPs were planning to continue to live on wheat flour distributions, he was told: “as long as you [the international community] are willing to feed us.”125

In rural areas, unless IDPs could have jobs on the land, many had difficulties finding gainful employment. In Azerbaijan, RSG Kälín found that the vast majority in rural areas remained unemployed.126 Only a minority of those in isolated settlements in rural areas found employment in schools, clinics or small factories constructed by the government. Working the land, however,
also presented its own set of problems. In Bosnia, the slow pace of mine clearance made cultivating land difficult. In Sri Lanka, because of the conflict, government authorities at times imposed limitations on access to fields or fishing grounds or the IDPs themselves might not go to these areas to avoid abduction or harassment at checkpoints.

In Colombia, many IDPs were skeptical that they would ever regain control of the lands they owned or farmed that had been taken from them through transfer of titles under duress or through forgery of land titles. RSG Kälin reported “a widespread perception among displaced persons that there is no willingness to return land and other property to them.” Of the IDPs interviewed, some benefited from the land opportunities offered under the Instituto Colombiano de Desarrollo Rural (INCODER), but many said they were unfamiliar with the rules and with their rights and found the procedures too lengthy and complicated. Those who did submit applications sometimes received no response, or received negative responses for various reasons. In some cases, the government offered IDPs the possibility of acquiring land and participating in agricultural projects with demobilized paramilitaries. While some IDPs agreed to participate in these projects, others refused to work with ex-paramilitaries who, they said, had pushed them off the land in the first place. None of the indigenous persons or Afro-Colombians interviewed had benefited from land allocation programs. They pointed out that Law 70 of 1993 which provides for the adjudication of land to communities of African descent has not been effectively implemented.

COMPENSATION FOR PROPERTY LOSS AND FOR DAMAGES TO PROPERTY AND PERSON

In a small but growing number of countries, compensation systems are being established for IDPs and other civilians for their loss of property and possessions and for the suffering they experienced. In Turkey, a Compensation Law was adopted in 2004 to provide compensation for damage done to property and person. TESEV called the law “the most significant step the government took so far toward remedying the plight of the IDPs,” but in its interviews in 2005 and 2006, IDPs noted the extremely “slow pace” of the processing of applications (by January 2006, of the 180,000 applications filed nationwide, some 16,000 — less than 10 percent — were concluded and only 6,000 were to receive compensation). IDPs also felt that their property was undervalued. TESEV therefore concluded that “the implementation of the Compensation Law is too slow and the amounts of compensations awarded fail to meet IDPs’ expectations for justice.” To speed the implementation of the law, the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) and the Brookings-Bern Project have been helping to train lawyers and members of the damage assessment commissions.

At the close of his mission to Colombia, RSG Kälin recommended that the National Reconciliation and Reparation Commission include the crime of forced displacement as a human rights violation that should give entitlements to IDP claimants. He also recommended that those applying for amnesty should have to disclose whether they forcibly displaced people and to report on what was
done with IDPs' land and possessions. He said this would help reestablish IDP rights to restitution, compensation, rehabilitation and reparation.\textsuperscript{132}

The Darfur Peace Agreement (DPA) of 2006 provided $30 million for IDPs and other war affected populations for “damages and losses,” a figure most IDPs deemed grossly inadequate; some calculated the amount would come to $7.89 per person.\textsuperscript{133} The government of Sudan has promised to increase the total to $300 million in forthcoming peace negotiations.\textsuperscript{134} Whether or not a peace agreement will be signed in the near future between the government and the rebels, the principle of compensation for IDPs and other war affected populations has been established and will become an integral part of any future negotiation.

In other countries, little attention has been paid to compensation. Even though the conflict in the Chittagong Hill Tracts in Bangladesh between tribal groups and Bengalis over a twenty year period forced many tribe people from their lands, CRG reported that “None of the government representatives spoke to them of any policy mechanisms available for them.” Only 9 percent of IDPs interviewed in Bangladesh sought compensation.\textsuperscript{135}

In Nepal, however, of the IDPs interviewed, 67 percent asked for compensation.\textsuperscript{136} Indeed, IDPs have regularly told the RSGs on their missions that they wanted compensation for their losses and suffering.\textsuperscript{137} In Iraq, Marsh Arab leaders said they would welcome compensation for land and property destroyed by Saddam Hussein's regime. The Iraqi Property Claims Commission, however, while responding to the property claims of displaced Kurds in the north, has had difficulty with the informal or collective land claims and lack of documentation of the southern marshlands.\textsuperscript{138} IDPs displaced by development projects in India reported receiving compensation and rehabilitation/resettlement packages although there was “no uniformity in the rehabilitation policies.”\textsuperscript{139} In Orissa, compensation was provided on a case by case basis. IDPs also told CRG that the compensation took a very long time. Of the families rehabilitated after the building of the Hirakud Dam in Orissa in the 1950s, 65.3 percent did not receive full compensation until the late 1990s.\textsuperscript{140} A Rehabilitation and Resettlement Bill and a Land Acquisition (Amendment) Bill currently before parliament may deal with some of these problems.\textsuperscript{141} But as an elder Adivasi leader from the area of the Narmada dam pointed out, the uprooting of people cannot be compensated for. “Adivasis are like this tree,” he said, “you cannot replant us anywhere else without killing us.”\textsuperscript{142}

**EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES**

Most IDPs considered education an essential factor in their children's development. “I don't need wealth, but I do want education – I want there to be a future for our children,” asserted a Ugandan IDP at a Brookings workshop.\textsuperscript{143} In Peru, some IDPs would not return home because of a lack of schools in areas of return,\textsuperscript{144} while in Mozambique children were left temporarily behind so they could continue their education.\textsuperscript{145}
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Schooling was seen also as a means of normalizing their children’s life, and as a security measure, providing safety against sexual exploitation, military recruitment and being preyed upon by criminal gangs. Indeed, it was proposed that children in south Sudan be sent to boarding schools in order to remove them from war zones.146

Yet IDPs interviewed complained of encountering barriers to their children’s education. Parents in Georgia and Colombia pointed to lack of school supplies, proper clothing and shoes as factors preventing their children from attending school,147 while in Indonesia, high tuition fees made it difficult for children to be in school. 148 In Sri Lanka, parents complained about safety and transportation problems because there was no school nearby:

Our children have to walk more than 6 km or have to hire an auto. We don’t have enough bus services. Because of that reason our girls can’t continue their education.149

Another Sri Lankan mother said, “Every day school teachers are asking for money. That is also the main barrier to continue children’s education.”150 In Juba, southern Sudan, parents lamented that “Some go to school, whose parents can afford, but most cannot.” As a result, “We fear about the future.”151 Other barriers about which IDP parents complained included: damaged school buildings and supplies; untrained teachers; languages unfamiliar to indigenous and minority children; loss of needed documents for entry to school; and inability to meet residency requirements.152

In several countries discrimination was reported to be practiced against IDP children. An IDP in Colombia recounted how her son had been told by his teacher: “No wonder you are so stupid – you are a displaced.”153 In Azerbaijan discriminatory attitudes toward IDP children were also reported.154 In Sudan, southern IDPs complained of religious and racial discrimination. A young IDP man who had gone to school in Khartoum said that “We learned Islamic doctrines in Khartoum by force.” If a student refused to attend such classes, “his marks would be reduced at exam time.” In the view of one of the teachers, “… the Arab teacher discriminates against the black. African students are given little education.”155

IDPs in Sudan also complained about children in school being vulnerable to recruitment as soldiers. “They joined the army before finishing their schooling, because they were being brainwashed while in the school,” said one of the parents.156

At the same time, not all IDPs keep their children in school, needing them instead to generate income for the family. Many IDP families do not receive support for education. In South Asia, some 60 percent of the more than 500 IDPs interviewed received no support for their children’s education,157 although in Azerbaijan the government has exempted IDP families from tuition fees and taxes.158 And in Turkey, the government instituted a Conditional Cash Transfer for low income families that registered their children in primary and secondary school. 159 However, even with this program, TESEV reported a low attendance rate because older children were needed to do seasonal agricultural work with their parents or to labor in textile sweatshops or peddle on the streets.160 “The
high rates of adult unemployment,” TESEV emphasized, “make families dependent on child labor as a strategy to cope with poverty.”

**POLITICAL PARTICIPATION**

IDPs in a number of countries have complained of obstacles in voting in local and national elections. In the Balkans, in Bosnia and Herzegovina, minority returnees had trouble voting in elections because of the limited information made available to them, or because of lack of transportation. Many Roma IDPs were excluded from voting because they lacked documentation.

The Project on Internal Displacement at Brookings has documented obstacles to IDP voting in thirteen countries. It has found that in countries where IDPs cannot return to their areas of origin to vote, they have often faced obstacles voting in the areas in which they are living. In Tbilisi, Georgia, for example, IDPs were restricted by law from voting for candidates in local elections or in elections for the parliamentary deputy representing the district where they currently resided. IDPs met by RSG Deng considered this “not acceptable especially as we have been here not for only a few days but several years and yet we’re made to feel like second-class citizens.” The Georgian government in 2003 took action to end this discriminatory treatment. In Liberia, groups of IDPs threatened to boycott the October 2005 general and presidential elections unless plans were made to enable their return home prior to the vote. They called upon the NGO community to help them intercede with the government and UN agencies to ensure that they could vote for senators and representatives while still in IDP camps.

**CONSULTATION MECHANISMS WITH GOVERNMENTS**

IDPs would welcome more effective procedures for consultation with their governments. “Permanent dialogue and coordination ... will help promote political will to address internal displacement,” said an IDP leader from Peru. In Colombia, IDPs have been given the opportunity to express their views in municipal and departmental assistance committees but the authorities, IDPs said, should be willing to act on what they hear and include IDP concerns in their local and national assistance programs. They questioned the inclusion of law enforcement officers in the mechanisms since these discouraged IDP participation.

In Iraq, tribal leaders returning to the Marshlands underscored the need for the government to consult with Marsh Arab communities in restoring the Marshlands and in deciding how to utilize Marshland resources, in particular the exploration of oil and the restoration of agriculture. Similarly in southern Sudan and in Abyei, returning IDPs expressed the desire for consultation with the Khartoum and Juba governments in deciding how to apportion resources, in particular oil revenues. The “government should consult the people first before introducing such projects,” said an IDP.
From interviews with IDPs, it became clear that government programs could be more effectively implemented if there were more consultation. In Turkey, TESEV interviewers found that IDPs did not always know about or understand government laws and policies. Not all IDPs had accurate information about the government’s Conditional Cash Transfer, intended to improve school enrollment, and as a result, not all eligible families applied. Not all IDPs apply for aid under the Return to Village and Rehabilitation Project, which provides in-kind assistance for those returning to their home areas. Some did not know about the program or they had misconceptions about its application. In the case of the 2004 Compensation Law, the government did not sufficiently disseminate it or explain its provisions. Many IDPs knew about the law from the efforts of NGOs and bar associations but did not always understand what was covered under the law and how to apply for compensation. In fact, the majority of IDP women interviewed did not know about the law. In the case of the 2005 Framework Document, which sets forth the Turkish government’s main principles and goals in responding to internal displacement, it was not publicly announced or widely disseminated (it first appeared on the Ministry of Interior website in March 2006). As a result, the NGOs and lawyers working with IDPs and the displaced themselves did not know about the document or how they might use it.

IDPs expressed the desire to jointly develop public policies on internal displacement with their governments. An IDP leader at the Mexico City seminar said that “The Mexican state should have a public policy on IDPs that would seek to resolve displacement and assess the needs of the displaced.” In Colombia, IDPs were particularly interested in improving how IDPs and government officials worked together in early warning mechanisms. Too many alerts, IDPs complained, got stuck in bureaucratic procedures although they were supposed to be acted upon speedily by the government and armed forces. At the same time, they expressed caution about working too closely with the government. In Georgia, IDP representatives and local NGOs were pleased to participate in a government process in 2006 and 2007 to develop a national policy on IDPs. In Nepal, 39 percent of IDPs interviewed recommended policy measures to address displacement.

In a number of countries IDPs expressed interest in consultations with their governments about particular problems. For example, in Sri Lanka, IDPs would like to see government policies address the competition that has arisen between those displaced by conflict and those displaced by natural disaster. IDPs uprooted by conflict told interviewers that the IDPs uprooted by the tsunami received higher monthly rations than they did and also were awarded housing and rehabilitation aid rapidly whereas those displaced by war languished in camps for years. IDPs would also welcome policies to address the psychosocial needs of children in war zones who have become mentally disabled. In India, an IDP widow from Jammu and Kashmir wished there could be special attention paid to the elderly. The government, she said, does not think about people in her age category, although being a woman, a widow and an aged person increased her vulnerabilities. “The state,” CRG commented, “should have made separate policies to offer rehabilitation and care to such people but because there are no legal mechanisms the state treats them as collateral damage.”
In Azerbaijan, participants at a training program in Baku run by the Norwegian Refugee Council and UNHCR recommended the creation of an IDP forum to enable IDPs to have their voices better heard by national authorities and international organizations. And at a regional seminar held in Mexico City with IDP participants from Colombia, Peru and Mexico, formal consultation mechanisms were recommended, such as ‘mesas de trabajo’ between the government and civil society, with the UN playing a bridging role. Such mechanisms would enable IDPs to have a voice in the planning and implementation of policies and programs relating to their situation.

RSG Kälin suggested, while on a mission to Sri Lanka, that increased information sharing and consultation by the government with the IDPs and international organizations could substantially contribute to reducing the prevailing sense of insecurity as well as facilitating reintegration in areas of return. He noted that complete and timely communication on arrests and detention could reduce feelings of fear among IDPs and those returning. In addition, clear communication in advance of returns – about options, entitlements and the process of return – would allow IDPs to make voluntary, informed choices and understand more about housing and land in high security zones and other areas under security force control and how to obtain compensation for their losses.

The Brookings-Bern Project on Internal Displacement, at a 2007 meeting on consultation mechanisms with IDPs, concluded that consultation with IDPs could achieve a number of goals. In particular, it could restore dignity to the displaced; make solutions more durable; ensure greater accountability to IDPs; prevent exploitation and abuse; lead to greater economic and financial benefits; and create an environment of trust with the local population.

CONSULTATION MECHANISMS WITH THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY

IDPs interviewed said they would welcome closer relationships with international organizations, both as a value in itself and as a way of generating attention to their problems. “Before the tsunami the government of Indonesia did not pay very much attention to Aceh. Now, since so many foreigners have come here, Aceh is a little famous and people have to pay attention,” observed an IDP in Aceh.

Similarly in Abyei, Sudan, returning IDPs expressed appreciation to the UN for providing help to them. “The UN was one of the authorities who visited us,” bringing relief and medicines, they said, when their own government deliberately neglected them and sought to obstruct international involvement in the camps. Some of the IDPs seemed to feel instinctively that the international community had a responsibility to assist and protect them when their governments failed to do so. In Juba, Sudan, the IDPs said they would welcome greater international involvement with return and reintegration plans since their government lacks institutional capacity. IDPs were in particular grateful to the World Food Program (WFP) and also to NGOs for providing food rations each month, although the amount was not always adequate.
In Colombia IDPs interviewed said they would welcome greater contact with UNHCR and other international organizations (UNICEF, WFP). Some had benefited from training programs and consultations with these agencies and were complimentary of UNHCR’s defense of the displaced. But they also wished UNHCR and other UN agencies would act as more of an advocate on their behalf, pressing governmental authorities to fulfill their legal and policy obligations to the displaced. They see international agencies as respected observers and witnesses with the potential to speak out when armed groups threaten communities. They called for the sustained presence of these organizations in different parts of the country and a greater willingness on their part to intercede with the authorities.191

At the same time, IDPs recognized the limitations of international involvement in the area of protection. IDPs in Abyei, Sudan, for example found that even with the presence of the UN Mission for Sudan (UNMIS), they would not be safe because UN staff “are not allowed to move north of Abyei, in the land where looting and killing occur regularly” and where the Khartoum government “will not protect us.” 192

In Juba, IDPs said they would like to see governments and international authorities understand their culture better, their local values, institutions and modes of social organization, and “use what we know when they do their planning.” “They have very little knowledge of our culture,” they said.193 IDPs also would like to see international agencies better understand the context in which they are working. In Abyei, where the Ngok Dinka claim to have lost land to Arab nomads, they objected to NGOs and international agencies extending aid to the nomads which, they said “was an encouragement for them to settle in Dinka areas, instead of their own areas.”194

In Turkey, where the international community for more than a decade did little or nothing to help internally displaced persons in deference to the government, IDPs criticized the UN’s “inaccessibility and its absence on the ground.” The European Union by contrast which had publicly insisted on Turkey’s addressing the IDP issue and made that a condition for EU entry, was more highly regarded and known by IDPs. So too was the European Court of Human Rights to which thousands of IDPs had sent petitions. At the same time, IDPs welcomed greater UN involvement and were aware that in recent years, UN agencies had begun to work with the government to promote greater attention to IDPs. “These institutions should be present in the region [the southeast]. They should visit. They should sit down with us and talk to us,” said an IDP in Batman. The same view was expressed by NGOs working with IDPs. “The UN sits in Ankara and does politics like a government. It should come here and talk to people,” said another. Both IDPs and NGOs interviewed expressed interest in knowing more about what UNDP and UNHCR would do for IDPs and suggested that UNDP include more information on its Turkish website and translate more UN reports into Turkish.195

In Indonesia, a number of IDPs and others in civil society voiced suspicions about the agendas of international aid workers, especially those of NGOs, and commented that it might be better if the government and local organizations were to take on most of the recovery work since the internationals would leave once the job was done anyway.196
Negative attitudes were also expressed about NGOs in Abyei, Sudan. One IDP elder said, “NGOs don’t tell their plans or activities in the area. They make show at the beginning with no result at the end.” Another elder complained that there was no accountability. NGOs and agencies “used all the funds to do according to their will.” Indeed, the author of the Sudan report concluded that “the degree of dissatisfaction in Abyei [with NGOs] is extreme by any standards and must be noted.”

In Juba too, IDPs said, “We desire to interact with them [NGOs] but they avoid us…” or “There is no cooperation. It is the way international agencies operate.” What IDPs would like to see, an elderly man said, was the NGOs working together with IDPs “to involve the affected displaced persons in their assessments and distribution of benefits.” IDPs in particular mentioned awareness-raising about water. Boreholes, they pointed out, provided by the international community, helped save lives but also endangered lives when water borne diseases began to spread. Greater international engagement with IDPs was needed here.

IDPs in Sudan also welcomed international involvement in additional areas -- the holding of reconciliation workshops; greater education about HIV/AIDS; the provision of information on business opportunities, markets, transport and storage facilities; the extension of loans to traders; and ensuring that the distribution of natural resources “is done in an equal way.”

At the same time, IDP expectations of UN agencies are often too high. But because confidence in government is often low and the displaced may have no place else to turn but to international agencies, the UN must explore what more it can do to enhance agency presence and programs in situations of internal displacement. UNHCR because it is the international lead agency on protection, shelter and camp management in the UN inter-agency system has a special responsibility in this regard.

GREATER RESPONSIVENESS TO IDP WOMEN’S CONCERNS

IDP women in interviews expressed support for the following steps:

❖ **The distribution of food directly to women.** In Azerbaijan, the WFP’s policy of distributing food directly to women helped minimize problems of sexual violence and exploitation, especially when women staff were present during the distribution.

❖ **The inclusion of women in planning and decision-making bodies.** Women IDPs interviewed wished to be consulted in decisions on housing, education and relocations so as to ensure their and their families’ access to employment and schools. In India, a woman displaced by the tsunami in Puthur complained that “Women are not allowed to be on the planning or village committee to discuss new housing.”

❖ **A greater role for IDP women in camp settings.** Displaced men often assume the role of camp representatives, even when their numbers in the camp are small, as in Burundi.
Deng also found exclusively male spokespersons in camps in Azerbaijan. The CRG in its interviews in the northeast of India found that largely men responded to the questions in the focus groups. They therefore organized private interviews with the women. In Galle, Sri Lanka, a visiting delegation insisted that the women express their views at a meeting with camp representatives and the women IDPs did so readily.

- **Support for the creation of IDP organizations for women.** IDP women have found that such organizations can prove effective in empowering women and ensuring that women's concerns are given adequate attention in local and national decision making. The IDP Women's Association of Tbilisi, Georgia, for example, has brought to its government's attention the housing, employment and medical needs of displaced women and their members have played a role in the development of a national IDP policy. In Peru, mothers' clubs, communal kitchens, and other grass-roots women's organizations have led to improvements in the food and health of IDP families and communities and also have helped women to start small businesses.

- **Protection for women active in IDP associations and community affairs.** In some countries, women have risked their lives to create women's advocacy groups. In Colombia, in 1999, women from rural areas met in Bogotá, the capital, to set up their own national IDP organization, but several of the organizers were murdered thereafter – even though their initial meeting was under the protection of the wife of the President. To lend support to such groups, UNHCR announced in 2007 that it would rebuild the center of the La Liga de Mujeres Desplazadas in Cartagena, which had been burned down by an arson attack. In other parts of the world, too, such as in Gujarat, India, Muslim women organized self-help groups following the atrocities and displacement of 2002 and would welcome support in rebuilding their communities.

- **The inclusion of women in the governing bodies of IDP associations composed of both men and women.** One of the reasons IDP women set up their own organizations in Colombia more than a decade ago was that IDP mainstream groups run by men did not effectively represent them. Today, greater awareness of women's rights combined with a more assertive role played by IDP women has led to women now constituting 50 percent or more of the boards of directors of most IDP associations in Colombia. Of course limiting factors persist which IDP women interviewed thought should be addressed – continuing discrimination against women's participation, lack of awareness of women's rights, women's fear of social rejection if they fully participate, women's illiteracy, and the difficulty of balancing household duties with their participation. At the same time, IDP women noted that their participation in associations was far greater now than prior to their displacement and expressed the need for support and encouragement.

- **The creation of community watch teams to protect women.** Women IDPs welcomed the introduction of protection measures against sexual violence in camp situations. In Liberia, for example, UNHCR set up watch teams in IDP camps in which volunteers patrolled the
camps, reported criminal activity, including domestic violence, to UN troops and police and acted preventively against sexual violence.213

❖ **The inclusion of women police officers in international peacekeeping forces.** IDPs welcomed female police in the African Union (AU) civilian police forces in Darfur. They felt more comfortable telling women police about sexual attacks and found them better able to identify women’s protection needs. They also welcomed the inclusion of Sudanese female police in patrols with AU peacekeepers. 214

❖ **The setting up of firewood patrols to deter attacks against women.** IDP women in Darfur looked forward to being accompanied by AU soldiers when collecting firewood outside the camps. As one IDP woman observed, “I would not go out if there weren’t patrols by the AU. I feel safer that they are in the area and I am able to collect more wood for selling.”215

❖ **Access to micro credit programs and bank loans.** IDP women strongly support such programs to help them break out of traditional job roles and enter more lucrative economic activities. In Liberia, for example, hundreds of IDP women residing at an IDP camp in Jah Tondo Town called on local and international NGOs to provide them with the financial support to enable them to buy tools and materials to put into practice what they had learned in training at soap making, tie dying and other skills. 216 In Peru, as noted above, women IDPs called for legal recognition of their associations so that they could apply for bank loans.

❖ **Arrangements for women heads of household to have access to land in return processes.** Women heads of household, especially widows, would welcome laws and policies giving them access to their husbands’ land as well as effective dispute mechanisms to enforce the decisions taken.

**SUSTAINABLE RETURNS**

Many IDPs want to return home. In Hakkari, Turkey, for example, almost every single IDP interviewed, including women and young people, expressed a desire to go back to their village.217 As an IDP in Bangladesh poignantly put it, “… an uncertain future used to keep me awake all night. In my thought I returned to the same question again and again, when will I return home?” 218

Unsafe conditions, however, make IDPs reluctant to return to their home areas and create serious problems for their reintegration when they do return. In Turkey, IDPs cited continuing fighting between government security forces and the PKK as a reason for not returning: “If we go back, the fighting will intensify, soldiers will pressure us, and we will live the same things all over again.” 219 In Juba, south Sudan, IDPs said that “There are landmines, kidnappers, cattle herders and the LRA [Lord’s Resistance Army] to worry about.” The replacement of government armed forces in Juba with SPLA forces had not necessarily improved the situation because the southern government did
not have the “capacity to protect.” If there were the “disarmament of armed groups and deployment of police,” an elder IDP said, many more IDPs would return. Many who had tried to return had been chased away by the LRA and other militias who covet “the natural resources of the forest, agricultural lands, fishing grounds and wildlife.”

In Abyei, returning IDPs complained about the failure of the Sudanese army to leave; military forces, they said, were occupying schools and hospitals and crowding out the returnees: “there is no peace in Abyei because the [Arab] militias are still holding guns in Abyei town and our surrounding villages.” IDPs went on to tell of incidents where Arab militias assaulted Dinka chiefs and the police and army were not prepared to do anything. “Even in the presence of UNMIS [United Nations Mission in Sudan],” said one elder IDP, “crimes are done and the UN monitors are not allowed to monitor in the North. There is no implementation of the Abyei Protocol and the Arabs are saying that the Abyei Protocol died with the late [John] Garang.” IDPs called for international help in implementing the Comprehensive Peace Agreement. Some said that “When there are international agencies present, they feel safer.” Otherwise, “war might start in the same way it started in the collapse of the 1972 Agreement.”

In other parts of the world, security was also a major issue in returns. In Kosovo, violence against the Serb minority in 2004 reduced IDP returns and those IDPs who did return felt trapped in enclaves and often not able to access their lands or markets because of the insecurity. IDPs were also apprehensive in Tajikistan in the 1990s. When they tried to return, local communities blocked the trains shortly before their arrival and refused to let them disembark. IDPs’ homes and villages were looted, land taken and some returnees killed, making international involvement essential. In Chechnya, in the Russian Federation, returning IDPs told RSG Deng: “The situation is not stable in Grozny... We are afraid.” And in Nepal, those who returned to certain areas told RSG Kälin that they did not feel safe but had come back because food was insufficient in the camps or the burden on host families had grown too heavy.

Persistent discrimination also creates obstacles to reintegration. In northwest India, despite a peace accord, CRG reported that Santhals stay away from their villages and have not yet taken charge of their lands – they visit only during the day, returning to safer places at night. In Bosnia and Herzegovina, returning IDPs also face security problems if they are of a different ethnic group from the majority in the return areas.

In Abyei, Sudan, IDPs of the Dinka tribe who returned did not have access to their lands. They complained that the government had resettled Arab nomads (Missiriya) on the Dinka land: “The Arabs are settled in Dinka areas and they name the areas by different names. They are changing our indigenous names for these places. Ten oil wells were drilled on Ngok land...” IDPs noted that conflicts were developing among different ethnic groups over land, water and oil. Although the Comprehensive Peace Agreement of 2005 provided that 42 percent of oil revenues would go to the government of southern Sudan, 2 percent to the Ngok Dinka and 2 percent to the Missiriya,
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returning IDPs of the Dinka tribe in Abyei said they were not seeing oil revenues reinvested in their local communities: “Abyei is rich of natural resources but we never benefit from them; up until this time, we have never received the 2 percent of oil wealth for Abyei.” Several IDPs wanted the oil revenues to be used to fuel agriculture and provide farming equipment “so that we can go to our places of origin and start planting again in those areas.”

Indeed, IDPs were eager to rebuild their areas of origin by using what they had learned in displacement. “…we have learned different ways of building in the places where we have been and we will use them,” said a returning IDP. They hoped for tractors, modern equipment, and communications equipment “so that we will be linked to the world and have access to the internet. If the donors contribute with computers, it will encourage the displaced to all come back from Khartoum. No technology has ever been heard of in Abyei; no means of communication, no TV station and no electricity in the town.”

In country after country, IDPs have received insufficient help from their governments for their returns. In Abyei, IDPs received food aid but wanted materials to rebuild their homes: “We never heard of or received money for buying grass to build.” In Rwanda after the genocide, local authorities had limited resources to help even though the infrastructure of entire villages had been destroyed and many homes leveled by warfare and looting. In Colombia, returnees told RSG Kälin how little assistance they were receiving. Despite promises from local authorities, in some areas (San José de A partado, Antioquia) basic infrastructure remained lacking. In Valledupar, Cesar, they were forced to rebuild their property with their bare hands, because they had not even received basic tools. In India, after massacres took place in Gujarat, Muslim IDPs said NGOs, not their government, were the ones that helped them buy land, construct new houses and resettle. The Gujarat government did then provide them with a cash sum to rebuild their homes, but many reported that they did not receive any compensation for the loss of their properties. In Turkey, although the government provides in-kind aid to IDPs under the Return to Village Rehabilitation Project, some returning IDPs found that they needed to buy the iron, sand, cement and brick “at our own expense.” Some claimed that political bias interfered with their access to the aid. To receive aid, they had to demonstrate their loyalty to the state by obtaining security clearances or acting as village guards, and much of the aid, they said, went toward building gendarmerie stations or to village guards working in collaboration with security forces.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

In Turkey, IDPs wondered how they could return given the damage from the burning of their lands: “Our trees have dried, our fields are destroyed. Our houses are demolished. Why should we return? ....There is nothing left here. No tobacco to harvest, no water to drink.”

IDPs returning to south Sudan also expressed concerns about the environment in their home areas. The government, they said, had “played with the resources, calling the civilians to cut trees just so
they could see their enemies.” Now deforestation was spreading the desert southwards and bringing conflict with it as nomadic Arab tribes could no longer find sufficient water. It was the government’s responsibility, said one IDP in Juba, to establish “policies to guide the utilization and conservation of natural resources” and to “enforce laws over natural resources.” 239

In Iraq, Marsh Arab tribal leaders spoke about Saddam Hussein’s burning down or bulldozing of many of their homes after the 1991 Gulf War and the regime’s draining of the Marshes. This devastated a unique eco-system and robbed the Marsh Arabs of clean water, food, and their livelihoods (e.g. fishing, collecting reeds, and raising livestock). They wanted the government and international community to help them in restoring and reconstructing the Marshlands. “The environmental problems are enormous,” emphasized one of the tribal leaders. 240

ALTERNATIVES TO RETURN

Because of the insecurity in home areas, the inability to regain their homes and property, the inadequacy of government aid, and the lack of livelihoods and sustainability in areas of origin, substantial numbers of IDPs do not wish to return home. Moreover, many of the young people who grew up in other areas lack attachment to their areas of origin and do not wish to go back. 241

Yet in a number of countries IDPs complained of government efforts to forcibly return them to their home areas, including by direct coercion, as in Tajikistan, 242 or by cutting off humanitarian aid to them in areas of displacement, as in Burundi, 243 or promising them assistance as an incentive to return, which did not materialize. In India, for example, IDPs agreed to return to border villages in Jammu and Kashmir after being promised that their agricultural lands would be de-mined and that they would receive compensation for damaged houses, but the IDPs interviewed said these promises had not been fulfilled. 244 In Chechnya, returning IDPs also did not receive all they had been promised, in particular compensation for destroyed and lost property and adequate humanitarian assistance. 245

In some countries, IDPs have been forced to “relocate” to areas not of their choosing. IDPs in Sudan were forcibly transported to new settlements before construction was completed or integration packages were in place. 246 In Indonesia, the government selected relocation sites for Madurese IDPs in West Kalimantan that were harsh and isolated from economic activities. Following the visit of RSG Deng and the intervention of NGOs, the government agreed to look into a subsidized transportation system and to provide land titles, cash and other benefits to those who would move to relocation sites. 247

IDPs who do not return home may find that aid is only available if they return or go to specified relocation areas. In Turkey, where the majority of the displaced lives in urban areas and are not inclined to return home, IDPs echoed this sentiment: “The state should help us here [in the cities].” 248 However, according to TESEV, “the government has yet to acknowledge that internal displacement
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is first and foremost an urban issue in Turkey. “Although many – if not most – IDPs will not return to rural areas, “the government (and the international community) has not yet developed a “Plan B.”  249 In Colombia, RSG Kälin complimented the government for giving a modicum of financial support and also rent subsidies for up to two years to IDPs trying to integrate in urban and semi-urban areas. At the same time, IDPs told him that such aid does not really improve their economic situation over the long term. Accessing the benefits often cost more than the gain, some said, since they have to pay for transportation to collect the modest sums. Moreover, the aid does not provide them with the materials, infrastructure, job opportunities or credit needed for successful reintegration. 250

In some countries, like Georgia, IDPs themselves objected to moving to alternative, more comfortable accommodations in areas of relocation because doing so might undermine their goal of return, in this case to Abkhazia. But with more than a decade in displacement having gone by, IDPs began to welcome better accommodations. 251 Similarly, in Azerbaijan, RSG Kälin found on a 2007 visit that since 2000 the government had begun to focus its attention on improving the living standards of IDPs in the areas in which they now lived rather than exclusively focus on their return to Nagorno Karabakh.252

EFFORTS AT RECONCILING JUSTICE AND PEACE

IDPs are divided about the extent to which principles of justice should be sacrificed to the goal of achieving peace.  

In Colombia, all the IDPs interviewed expressed opposition to the reintegration into society of members of armed groups as provided in Law 975 of 2005. “They tell us we have to forgive those who harmed us,” explained one IDP, but asked what kind of peace could take place if it were based on impunity and rewarding the perpetrators. The demobilization of paramilitary groups, moreover, did not reduce their power. Many IDPs doubted that they could ever recover their lands and expressed discomfort with having to be associated with demobilized paramilitaries in agricultural projects being promoted by the government. Some said their participation was being used by the government to gain support for these projects from the international community. IDPs complained that the resources allocated to demobilization were greater and with fewer limitations than those devoted to IDPs. 253

By contrast, in Uganda, IDPs weary of more conflict expressed willingness to forgo the arrest and trial of Joseph Kony and other heads of the Lord’s Resistance Army (LRA) by the International Criminal Court. Efforts at justice, they feared, could undermine the peace process and impede their return home. They advocated instead traditional forms of justice involving admission of responsibility for crimes, forgiveness and compensation to victims or their survivors.254

In Turkey, where most perpetrators of human rights violations committed against IDPs have not been prosecuted, TESEV argues that greater stability in the society and trust between IDPs and the state would result if there were justice.255
GREATER DISSEMINATION OF THE GUIDING PRINCIPLES ON INTERNAL DISPLACEMENT

IDPs in Colombia who were members of local NGOs and of IDP organizations were aware of the Guiding Principles and favored their greater dissemination. They found them useful as a basis for the requests they made to the authorities. They also found them useful in protecting IDP rights under the constitution, noting that the Constitutional Court, the highest court of the land, had based several of its decisions on the Guiding Principles.

IDPs have also used the Guiding Principles to advocate for their rights. In Sierra Leone, a displaced man who had been living in a camp for some time waved a copy of the Guiding Principles in front of a UNHCR official and said: “It is your duty and your responsibility to provide us with education. This is one of our rights and I know them because they are listed in the document.” IDPs in Sri Lanka have advocated with camp commanders for more ample food rations, more timely deliveries of food, clean water and more personal security on the basis of the Guiding Principles. When discriminatory electoral laws were identified in Georgia, a group of IDPs made an appeal to the Supreme Court. When the court did not rule in their favor, IDPs together with NGOs appealed to the government, which announced at the UN that it would explore bringing this and other laws into line with the relevant provisions in the Guiding Principles, and the government subsequently did so.

Knowledge and dissemination of the Guiding Principles, however, is not sufficiently widespread. Of the 528 IDPs interviewed in South Asia, the interviewers found that “international principles, norms, and laws” do not reach most IDPs; only one third had knowledge of the Principles. In Bangladesh, 97 percent of the IDPs interviewed had no knowledge of the Principles. In Nepal, 25 percent had heard of the Guiding Principles through newspaper reports, radio and TV. In Juba, southern Sudan, there was no knowledge of the Principles although when IDPs were asked what human rights meant to them, they spoke of access to food, water, health and protection. In Turkey, TESEV reported that NGOs and lawyers working for IDPs in Batman and Diyarbakir had no knowledge of the Guiding Principles.

In Angola, where the UN provided training to groups of IDPs in the Principles, there were positive responses. One woman at Salga Camp in Luanda province said (in a now widely quoted comment): “I knew that we had rights, just like any other person. Now that I know exactly what they are, it is my responsibility to ensure that my community understands them too. I am a widow, mother of four. I never went to school. I am thankful for this opportunity to learn and teach about our rights. If we know about the Guiding Principles and the [Angolan] Norms [on Resettlement], we know our lives can improve.”
Solutions to the problems IDPs face will require a broad range of measures. The recommendations that follow derive directly from listening to their voices. From the general to the highly specific, these are:

A better international understanding of who is an IDP. An international public information campaign is needed to make clear, as stated in the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement (a document recognized by more than 190 governments in the World Summit Outcome Document of 2005), that IDPs are persons uprooted by conflict, natural disasters or development projects. It makes no difference whether war, a tsunami or a dam uprooted them or whether they were displaced by insurgent forces, government security forces or fled out of fear of conflict or persecution. An international ‘definition’ must be promoted to make governments aware that they can not “cherry pick” which persons are IDPs and offer aid and compensation only to those who happen to fit their definition.

Acceptance of IDPs as a category of concern. Governments and the international community need to promote greater national and international solidarity with people who are internally displaced. Many IDPs interviewed spoke of discrimination against them because of their displacement or pointed out that their governments or societies neglected or refused to acknowledge their plight. They also pointed to discrimination against them because of their ethnicity, religion, caste or race. Raising awareness about displacement and the need to combat discriminatory attitudes should contribute to greater national responsibility as well as greater international involvement. In South Asia, CRG has called for “legal recognition” of IDPs as “a category” at the national level, in order to ensure their basic rights.

National policy frameworks in support of IDPs. IDPs themselves need to know what to expect from their governments and the international community when they are displaced and to have a framework against which to measure performance. The “framework for national responsibility” developed by the Brookings-Bern Project contains 12 key steps governments could take. One of these steps, the development of policies and laws, was raised by many of the IDPs interviewed. In South Asia, IDPs called for national resettlement policies for people displaced by development projects, environmental causes and conflict. To help formulate these policies, CRG called upon national human rights institutions to play a strong role.

Making information about national laws and policies better known. Too many IDPs and NGOs are unaware or have incorrect information about national laws and policies that have been introduced and as result do not utilize or apply for benefits under them. Not only should governments widely publicize and explain the provisions of their laws and policies but they should provide technical
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assistance on how to apply for aid under these laws. Governments should also be pressed to apply the laws and policies without discrimination on political, ethnic, religious, or racial grounds, since this will ensure that national laws and policies are successfully carried out.

Increased consultation with IDPs. Because the opinions and preferences of IDPs are critical to the successful development and application of national policies and laws, formal consultation mechanisms must be built into the planning, drafting and implementation processes. Such mechanisms will not only reduce the dependency and marginalization of displaced populations, but ensure that the provisions in these policies correspond to the actual needs of IDPs and that they are addressed fairly and effectively. IDPs must also be consulted when it comes to peace processes and peace agreements. Where there are large uprooted populations, peace will be less sustainable if IDP views are not taken into account.

Closer relationships and consultation with UN agencies and NGOs. UN agencies and NGOs should make their objectives and programs better known to displaced communities and establish a closer and more directly accessible relationship with IDPs. As CRG pointed out: “International mechanisms have to be popularized” among IDPs. Doing so will make IDPs more realistic about what to expect from these agencies and more ready to cooperate with them. Embassies of donor governments should also consider opening a channel of communication with IDPs so that they can learn their particular concerns. In addition, IDP views should be integrated into the reconstruction and development plans of international agencies and donor governments to make them more responsive to the needs of affected populations. Greater attention to the culture and context in which international agencies are working would also increase the effectiveness of assistance and development programs, especially when different ethnic groups are involved.

Greater involvement of regional organizations. Expanded initiatives should be undertaken by regional organizations to promote the rights of the displaced. IDPs interviewed found the role of regional organizations to be valuable. For example, the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights of the Organization of American States has sought to protect IDP leaders; and the European Court of Human Rights has provided compensation to IDPs who have lost their property. The African Commission on Human and People’s Rights and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe have also become involved in promoting protection in situations of displacement. However, all these and other regional bodies could do far more. In South Asia, where the South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation does not concern itself with internal displacement, the CRG recommended that a regional policy and mechanism be developed to monitor IDP conditions.

Increased support for IDP associations and local NGOs. Building the capacity of IDP associations and local NGOs can promote long term solutions to the needs of displaced populations. In many situations, international presence is limited and local engagement is needed; moreover, international organizations can depart leaving local groups to care for the displaced. To help IDP associations and local groups, resources should be directly channeled to them as appropriate and training programs
instituted to provide their staffs and members with needed skills, including how to effectively apply for and manage national and international funds.

Increased protection for IDP associations and their leaders. Protection programs should be developed for IDP associations and their leaders in the same way that protection programs are developed for human rights defenders in different countries. National human rights institutions, donor governments, and regional and international organizations should work together to promote greater security, including through police protection programs and advocacy campaigns, for IDP leaders and their associations.

Greater attention to overall IDP security. Most IDPs interviewed called attention to their need for enhanced physical safety, especially in camps and settlements. Women IDPs in particular welcomed firewood patrols led by international troops and police, and increased numbers of women police officers assigned to IDP camps. Indeed, greater international presence among communities at risk should be instituted. As IDPs in Colombia and southern Sudan told their interviewers, they feel safer when there is international staff in the vicinity and when that staff exhibit a willingness to intercede on their behalf. At the same time, material and other incentives should be given to IDPs to keep watch over their own communities and to contact the appropriate national or international authorities when there are incursions into camps or attacks on their residents. In situations where displacement and attacks upon communities are anticipated, IDPs have urged early warning systems, replete with mechanisms to monitor and strengthen their functioning.

More resources and attention to host communities. More efforts are needed to channel resources to host communities, especially when displacement situations become protracted. For example, emergency food rations or cash payments should be paid to families and communities hosting IDPs to help them more effectively absorb the costs of responding to the displaced. Too often they are left without help of any kind even though the IDPs may receive emergency aid. In addition, tools, seeds and agricultural equipment could be provided to those in need when returning IDPs are given such aid by international organizations. In Kosovo, a leading donor provided aid not only to the Serb minority but also to neighboring Albanian villages. This reduced resentments between ethnic groups and helped increase IDP returns to the enclave.269

More simplified registration for gaining access to emergency services. IDPs interviewed in country after country complained about the difficulties and obstacles they experienced in accessing aid. Both RSG Deng and Kälin in their country missions have urged governments to simplify lengthy, bureaucratic processes so that IDPs can more easily obtain needed services and benefits.

Easier and more rapid access to documentation. Because documents are critical to the receipt of aid and basic services, as well as to personal security, governments and international organizations should ensure as a matter of high priority that IDPs are issued the documents they need for the exercise of their rights without having to return to their areas of origin. They also should work out flexible
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procedures until such documents are available, for example providing basic services without needed cards, as was done in Azerbaijan.270

Greater focus on housing. Increased resources are needed to ensure that IDPs do not spend long periods in substandard, squalid housing. Too often it is assumed that crises will soon be over and that IDPs will return home. But many situations are protracted with housing and shelter largely neglected or ignored. One recommendation meriting greater attention, made by RSG Kälin in Colombia, was that IDPs should receive grants toward the building of homes, while municipalities should set aside plots of land for displaced populations and equip them with basic infrastructure (e.g. drinking water and basic sanitation).271 Creative solutions like this in different countries could go a long way toward addressing the serious shelter problem IDPs experience.

Education as a priority. Education for children should be treated not as a luxury but as a priority, with the goal of ensuring that most IDP children are in school or in non-formal education programs. To this end, the following steps should be considered -- the abolition of school fees for low grades, the introduction of scholarship programs and feeding programs for IDP children, the rapid issuance of documents to facilitate entry to school, the expansion of languages used in schools, and the provision of escorts or a comparable arrangement to ensure safety for children walking to and from school.272 A different approach should also be introduced, such as evening classes or skills-training programs for children who cannot attend school. Where there are teacher shortages, volunteer teachers should be recruited from the IDP population. And to overcome discrimination against the displaced and improve their education, IDP children should be integrated as quickly as possible into local schools.

Expanded job training programs for IDPs. Among the training programs IDPs specifically called for were those empowering them to advocate for their rights, gain new employment skills, help them find jobs, and learn how to apply for micro credit funds and bank loans. As IDPs interviewed in Colombia emphasized, this would also help them integrate effectively in their new urban communities.

Greater access to micro credit systems and bank loans and a tailoring of these systems to IDPs. To support long-term employment solutions for IDPs, greater access to micro credit systems and bank loans at affordable rates should be instituted when emergency phases are over. RSG Kälin has recommended more development oriented approaches over humanitarian aid and poverty alleviation programs for IDPs. Since they are often at the “very bottom of the social pyramid,” without some initial investment, they will not be able to undertake economic activities. He recommended that micro credit systems be expanded and complemented with a system favoring IDP access to bank loans in which the government could be the guarantor. This would allow people who have undergone retraining to acquire the materials necessary to exercise their new professions.273 IDPs should also receive training and assistance in how to apply for micro credit systems and bank loans as well as set up small enterprises.
More attention to vulnerable groups within the IDP population, in particular the elderly. IDPs in different countries recommended greater attention to the elderly, pointing out that no special programs existed to respond to their needs. In South Asia, CRG recommended the conducting of state surveys in consultation with the displaced to establish basic information about their communities, with particular reference to the elderly and other vulnerable groups within the displaced population.

The empowerment of women. Women comprise a substantial proportion of IDPs everywhere and want to play more of a role in national and local decision-making bodies and to gain access to land ownership, economic opportunities, micro credit schemes and bank loans. The formation of women’s associations to bring women’s concerns to the fore reflects this attitude and should be supported by international organizations. Legal measures should also be introduced to address the property and inheritance rights of women returnees.

Restitution and compensation. The international community should urge governments with displaced populations to develop laws and policies for restitution or compensation for damaged property or personal damages suffered by IDPs. International experience after the Balkans wars, in South Asia after the tsunami and with development banks regarding development-induced displacement has made it possible for the international community to offer advice and counsel to countries on how to deal with property claims and compensation. RSG Kälin has made suggestions for how to deal with land claims in situations of displacement, for example by identifying the displaced owners when land is abandoned, or by respecting customary landholders’ rights and ensuring that individual sales of land are not recognized when customary ownership is collective. Experts should be regularly called upon to provide technical assistance to governments following situations of displacement. At the same time, countries that have compensation systems should make sure that their systems operate with speed and fairness and bring justice and satisfaction to the applicants. As TESEV observed, improvements are needed in the operation of these systems both in Turkey and other countries.

Greater attention to making returns sustainable. In far too many countries in the world, returns of IDPs are taking place without attention to their security or ability to survive economically. Not only does this cause great suffering to the millions who return but also jeopardizes stability in these countries. A far greater international focus is needed on making returns sustainable. IDPs interviewed who were about to or had returned to their home areas strongly appealed for greater national and international help in rebuilding the infrastructure of their communities and in reversing the destruction, environmental degradation and ethnic strife long plaguing these areas. This was especially the case in the report of Kush on Sudan.

Return and also resettlement as a solution. Because many IDPs cannot or do not wish to return home, they should not be pressed to do so either by governments or groups with political agendas. As set forth in the Guiding Principles, IDPs should have choices – to return, integrate where they currently reside, or resettle in another part of the country. As CRG aptly concluded after interviewing more
than 500 IDPs in South Asia, “The obligation to resettle should be considered as equally important as the displaced persons’ right to return.” As TESEV emphasized, there is need for a “Plan B” for those who choose to remain in urban areas in Turkey. Governments and the international community should lend support not only to IDPs who choose to return but to those who choose resettlement as a solution.
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