

Theoretical and Practical Motives for Participation Obstacles in Resettlement Programs. Review from the Mining Perspective

Michael O. Erdiaw-Kwasie^{1*} Eric Doe Ackuayi² Matthew Abunyewah² Solomon O. Appiah³

1. Faculty of BELA, Australian Centre for Sustainable Business and Development, University of Southern Queensland, Toowoomba, Queensland, Australia
2. Department of Planning, College of Architecture and Planning, Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology, Kumasi, Ghana.
3. Ghana Institute of Management and Public Administration, Achimota, Accra, Ghana.

*Email of corresponding author: Michael.Erdiaw-Kwasie@usq.edu.au/ michaelodei2012@yahoo.com

Abstract

Studies on the rationale for effective involvement of affected population in resettlement programs have increased significantly in recent years. Yet, practical aspects of handling participation challenges remain under researched. This paper assesses the effectiveness of livelihood-promoting interventions in mining-induced resettlement programs using case evidences from the literature. The paper first reviews the historical background of the concept and other ideas that have come to brand the practice over time. It further justifies the discussion in the context of the mining industry. Thirdly, the paper adopts the concept of territorial governance to provide a theoretical base for the focus of the paper. After the theoretical justification, the paper reviews case evidences in context of engagement prospects and challenges in resettlement programs. Finally, the paper makes suggestions that have policy implications to help better the current resettlement practices. The paper observes that until participation challenges are overcome by resettlement practitioners, mining-induced displacement and resettlement (MIDR) programs cannot revitalise the livelihoods of the affected population as envisioned in resettlement guidelines.

JEL Classification: M14, H7, D21,

Keywords: Resettlement Programs, Mining Induced Displacement and Resettlement, Stakeholder Participation, participation challenges

Introduction

Development projects are often spatial activities which involve the introduction of direct control over land previously occupied by other users. Development interventions including creation of game parks and biodiversity zones, urban renewal or development programs, industrial parks, natural resource extraction policies and infrastructure projects (such as highways, bridges, irrigation canals, and dams) all require land, often in large quantity. Though development is fundamentally about reorganising space, the affluent, politically powerful, highly populated and non-indigenous urban communities are unlikely to experience such development displacements (Downing, 2002). As a result, most poor and politically weak local communities continue to suffer the upheavals and displacement that accompanies these 'so-called' development interventions. The imposition of resettlement plans on affected communities rather than engaging in a healthy consultation has worsened the situation in recent years.

Displacement resulting from infrastructure projects such as dams, roads, state-owned plantations, mining, pipelines, and urban reconstruction is estimated to be between 100 and 200 million people since 1980 (McDowell 1996; Cernea, 2000; Koenig 2002). According to Picciotto, Van Wicklin, and Rice (2001) and Witness for Peace (WFP) report (1996), such displacement schemes have ranged from positive to grim hence generating winners and losers on a significant scale, especially countries in Africa, Asia and Latin America. Oliver-Smith (1992) indicates that tensions associated with resettlement actions usually result in high level of social conflicts and confrontation between local communities and implementing agencies.

In handling such tensions in resettlement cycle, there have been changes in paradigm on how a successful resettlement action is evaluated. Whereas past practitioners only consider the displacement of people from the project area without any major complications for the project schedule as a benchmark for success, these views are changing in recent times among development practitioners. Recent practitioners have become increasingly aware that the side-effects of some development projects can destroy, temporarily or permanently, the lifestyles and living standards of poor people in local communities (Gutman, 1994). These changes have been codified in many international financial institutions' policies and guidelines on involuntary resettlement including the World Bank Operational Policy (WB, 2004) and the Asian Development Bank Operations Manual Section F2/BP – Involuntary Resettlement (ADB, 2003).

Despite the plethora of resettlement action plans (RPA) as an instrument towards mitigating displacement impacts, lack of effective engagement of affected population in the mitigation process has derailed resettlement

outcomes (Bartolome et al., 2000). This observation made by the aforementioned author continues to be stunningly commonplace in resettlement actions within the mining industry. One of the commonest negative effects of mining today is the forcing of thousands of people to abandon their current places of residence. The paper therefore critically reviews the effectiveness of livelihood-promoting interventions in mining-induced resettlement programs.

The paper first reviews the historical background of the concept and other ideas that have come to brand the practice over time. It further justifies the discussion in the context of the mining industry. Thirdly, the paper adopts the concept of territorial governance to provide a theoretical base for the focus of the paper. Then after, the paper reviews case evidences that show the state of engagement prospects and challenges in resettlement programs. Finally, the paper makes suggestions that have policy implications to help better the current resettlement practices.

Methodological Approach

In developing this review paper, published documents such as peer-reviewed journal papers, edited published literature such as eBooks and journal articles that has the focus of this paper in its key subject were collected. In sorting out the most important literature sources base on the focus of this paper, all the collected literature sources were sorted out to capture mainly the ones that discussed issues including historical context of resettlement theories and practice, categories of DIDR, stakeholders issues in resettlement programs, empirical case studies on resettlement programs in terms of its successes and failures and consequences of resettlement programs. In doing this, all the ones that discussed other dimensions of displacement programs that have no direct relevance to this review were discarded. Further sorting was done to capture those whose discussion was in the context of mining-induced displacement, as that forms the contextual scope of this paper.

Historical background of resettlement Programs

Traditionally understood, migration studies are the oldest system of analysis of human spatial mobility (Stanley, 2004). Research into evolution of migration studies in the late nineteenth century shows it however developed primarily on the basis of economics, focusing on the analysis of the determinants of voluntary human mobility. The primacy of economic categories established by Ravenstein strongly dominated the study of migration throughout the twentieth century and persists to this day. In the words of Ravenstein(1889), the desire inherent in most men to 'better' themselves in material aspects produces the largest flows of migrants in terms of volume as compared with factors including oppressive laws, heavy taxation, unattractive climate and even compulsion (slave trade). Walter (2007) supported the economic assertion that by the 19th century, India had already become an arena of forced relocations associated with the opening of coal mines in Jharkhand. As a consequence, almost all influential migration theories, such as neoclassical theories, the Hicks model, the Harris-Todaromodel, Wilbur Zelinsky's mobility transition model, or the push-pull theory of Everett Lee are based on economic categories.

The early and mid-twentieth century saw the evolution of a new involuntary human mobility on the basis of politics and law. This primarily involved the category of refugees who are under protection on legal grounds. From the very beginning the category of refugees was strongly associated with the institution of asylum. The first formal efforts for refugee protection are associated with the Fridtjof Nansen activities at the end of the First World War. Until the early fifties, protection of refugees was not a universal concept, but was developed in response to current political problems in order to help certain categories of people forced to leave their countries of origin. The origin of the international protection of refugees as a universal concept was associated with the adoption of the Geneva Convention in 1951, the creation of the UNHCR in 1950, and the signing of the New York Protocol in 1967 (Terminski, 2013). All these international legal instruments as well as the UN system of humanitarian practice helped shape thoughts and conceptualisations on involuntary human mobility in this category of migration studies.

Though studies on the social repercussions of development-induced displacement had already emerged in the mid-fifties and early sixties, in the context of projects like the Great Dam of Aswan, the Kariba Dam on the Zambezi and the Akosombo Dam on Lake Volta in Ghana, it took a selective character in the seventies (Terminski, 2012). Among the first studies on the social consequences of development-induced displacement include the works of applied anthropologists such as Elizabeth Colson, Thayer Scudder and Robert Fernea. Also, despite tracing studies on environmentally-induced displacement far back to the forties, latter works in the field during the seventies were based on more advanced scientific investigation and linked to the activity of international institutions such as UNEP. The seventies were also a decade of increased attention to development-caused involuntary resettlement, inter alia among applied anthropologists and sociologists cooperating with the analytical structures of the World Bank.

In 1980, the first World Bank guidelines devoted to planning and implementation of involuntary resettlement was adopted. The first half of the eighties was another period of rapid development of studies on development-

induced displacement and resettlement (DIDR). The volume *Putting people first: sociological variables in rural development* edited by Michael M. Cernea and published by the World Bank has played an important role as the initiator of more advanced studies in this area. It was in the mid and late eighties that the term "development-induced displacement and resettlement" (DIDR) first started to appear in scientific publications.

The term "disaster-induced displacement" had already appeared in the scientific literature in the mid and late nineties. The aftermath of the major natural disasters of recent years: the earthquake-generated tsunami in South Asia (December 2004), Hurricane Katrina in the US (August 2005), and the tsunami on the coast of Japan and its associated nuclear power plant accident in Fukushima (March 2011) saw a plethora of scientific studies in this field. Global public opinion and international institutions suggest that natural disasters in recent years have been one of the greatest causes of internal displacement worldwide. Estimates by IDMC confirms that, globally, natural disasters expelled 42 million people from their homes in 2010, 149 million people in 2011, and finally 324 million people in 2012 (Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre (IDMC) report, 2012).

Today, the interest of the scientific community has been focused on virtually all causes of forced displacement, as reflected in the rapid development of detailed classification of causes of internal displacement. Terms such as 'dam-induced displacement', 'mining-induced displacement', 'conservation-induced displacement', and 'climate change-induced displacement' have permanently entered into the scientific discourse. It is suggested that though much disaster-induced displacement consists of long-term and reversible evacuations, the problem of development-induced displacement emerges as perhaps the world's largest statistical category of internal displacement to date (Terminski, 2013). This paper focuses on internal displacement and resettlement caused by the consequences of economic development, particularly mining.

Resettlement Planning Process

Scudder and Colson proposed the first model of involuntary resettlement in 1982 that shows the 'how' resettlement program should be carried out and how people and socio-cultural systems respond to resettlement (Stanley, 2004). The Scudder-Colson model focused on the different behavioural tendencies common to each of a series of stages through which resettlers passed. The model which was often called Scudder-Colson model identified four key stages namely (i) recruitment, (ii) transition, (iii) potential development and (iv) handing over or incorporation. In the recruitment phase, policy-makers and/or developers formulate development and resettlement plans, often without informing those to be displaced. During transition, people learn about their future displacement, which heightens the level of stress experienced. Potential development occurs after physical relocation has occurred. Displacees begin the process of rebuilding their economy and social networks. Handing over or incorporation refers to the handing over of local production systems and community leadership to a second generation of residents that identifies with and feels at home in the community (Scudder & Colson, 1982). It is therefore indicated that resettlement action is deemed successful after it has gone through all the stages.

In recent decades, the planning process of resettlement programs and plans have gone through significant changes by international organisations as shown in Table 1. Recently developed resettlement guidelines by international organisations have improved on the societal dimension gaps associated with earlier resettlement models and guidelines. Despite such improvement, Gutman (1994) and Bartolome et al. (2000) indicate that there is more to go in order for such improvements and adjustments to yield significant impacts on the whole process of resettlement. It is argued that the consultation process in resettlement planning process is treated a sub-activity, hence carried out superficially by most practitioners at the detriment of displaces. Consequently, Bartolome et al., (2000) indicate that most resettlement programs that are intended to help restore the displaced to their former economic and social conditions rather tend to add to the plights of the affected population. A critical issue that have characterised most resettlement actions till today, among which mining-induced resettlement programs is a typical case.

Table 1: Examples of stages adopted in Resettlement Planning

Stages in Scudder-Colson Resettlement Model (Scudder & Colson, 1982)	Stages in Resettlement Outline (IFC, 2006)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Recruitment ❖ Transition ❖ Potential development ❖ Handing over or incorporation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Identification of Project Impacts and Affected Population ❖ Legal Frameworks ❖ Compensation Frameworks ❖ Resettlement Assistance and Livelihood Restoration ❖ Budget and Implementation Schedule ❖ Organizational Responsibilities ❖ Grievance Redress ❖ Monitoring and Evaluation

Why Mining-Induced category of DIDR

Mining-induced displacement and resettlement, a specific category of development-induced displacement and resettlement is present in many countries worldwide. Nevertheless, the high standards of responsiveness of businesses in the developed world to public opinion hold back such negative outcomes, since rapid redress paid with surplus is always in place to cover the economic and social costs of relocation (Terminski, 2012). This condition is apparently absent in many developing countries where the issue of MIDR is a critical plague.

According to Downing (2002), the Lack of any national data and a small degree of interest within international institutions makes it difficult to circumscribe the approximate scale of the phenomenon. Nevertheless, alarming reports from non-governmental organizations such as Operations Research Group (ORG), a consultant of Coal India Limited (CIL), indicate that the consequences of MIDR has gone beyond economics and environmental impacts, and now creating a pattern of “gross violation of human rights,” and “enormous trauma in countries such as India” (Mathur and Marsden, 1998). This give rise to unparalleled dose of certainty that mining-induced displacement is a critical social problem in several countries in the world such as India, China, Ghana, Mali, Zimbabwe, Indonesia and Papua New Guinea. The problems of people resettled due to mining development are analogous to those with which other categories of people displaced by development struggle.

Although mining is currently not a statistically significant category of development-induced displacement and resettlement (DIDR), its social costs of exploitation are great and requires urgent attention in terms of research. Also, authors including Stanley (2004) and Terminski (2012) argue that research works in this field appears limited. The internationalization of capital flow, along with the conduction of extraction by transnational corporations makes the sector to be profit centred hence less attention on social discontents issues that are associated with its' actions.

A Look at MIDR Today

Early cases of displacement resulting from mining activity can be traced back to the nineteenth century. India (and the practices of British colonists) or the United States. Actions of this kind were evidenced in Africa, during the colonial era as well as against Indians, in the time of the gold rush in America (Terminski, 2012). In the majority of cases, the natives became the victims, a situation which has persisted throughout resettlement history till today. Gold mines in Tarkwa, open-cast copper mines in Papua New Guinea, coal mines in Jharkhand (India) and diamond mines in Zimbabwe are few examples of activities leading to the displacement of large numbers of people worldwide.

Today, the growing interest in development-induced displacement is partly explained by the dramatic increase in numbers of development projects around the globe and their socio-economic impacts on local populations attached to these schemes (Cernea, 2000; WCD, 2000). In the context of MIDR, a contemporary category of development-induced displacement on the globe, the increment pattern is not different from that of the aggregate and its' occurrence is currently predicted to outweigh other development-induced displacement actions in the future. Available evidences have confirmed the severity of problems that have risen out of MIDR. For instance, Sonengberg and Munster (2001) document that the southern Africa MMSD regional report discovered 37,000 displaced over 5 years. Also in South Asia, mining-induced displacement is now so acute that some communities have been displaced more than once, creating a floating population of development-induced poor (Downing, 2002). This argument was confirmed in the speech of the Indian government who estimated that more than 30 million people have been displaced since Independence and MIDR accounts for 2.55 million people between 1950 and 1990 (IGNOU, 2001).

Up to date, developing countries are still the greatest victims of displacement actions and there are no evidences of change in the pattern. According to FIAN (2001), MIDR has gained such momentum in most developing countries due to the liberalised nature of their national mining policies and affirms that current situation will even heighten as far as companies continue to opt for open-cast mining and rural population density increases. Downing (2002) as well forecasts a greater increase in the current occurrence pattern of MIDR in such regions as long as rich mineral deposits are found in areas with relatively low land acquisition costs (in the global market), fertile lands and high population density within poor definitions of land tenure and politically weak and powerless populations, especially indigenous peoples.

The trend in mining-induced resettlement not limited to poor and developing countries has stood the test of time till today. Problems of this kind also take place in European countries like Germany, Serbia and Poland as well as North American countries. Terminski, (2012) explains that although such incidences occur in the developed world, the presence of high standards of rights-protection institutions to promote the voice of the displacees and ensuring the responsiveness of business to public opinion, hold back such negative consequences with the practice. In such cases, reparation is mostly paid with surplus, which means it covers the economic and social costs of relocation. Unlike in the cases of Africa and Asia, such process is characterised with homelessness, unemployment and social disintegration.

Theoretical Perspective: The place of Territorial Governance in Resettlement Programs

According to Bagnasco and Le Galès (2000), the concept of the territory as a “social and political construction” mainly stresses collective action that is the actions undertaken by a set of actors that are related to the solution of a collective problem. The collective action springs from the mobilisation of groups, organised interests and territorial institutions, in a process in which actors’ interactions can lead to different results (confrontation, cooperation, conflict). On the other hand, governance is seen both as the capacity to integrate and shape organisations, social groups and different territorial interests in order to represent them to external actors, and to develop more or less unified (and unifying) strategies (Le Galès, 2002). Following this view, it is deciphered that Governance is the capacity of public and private actors to build a mutual consensus that involves the contribution of each actor in order to define common objectives and tasks.

Territorial governance is defined as the process of territorial organisation of the multiplicity of relations that characterize interactions among actors and different, but non-conflictual, interests (Le Galès, 2002). Territorial governance action can only be more effective in reaching its goal provided certain conditions are considered as priorities and respected. These conditions are (i) vertical coordination (ii) horizontal coordination, (iii) the participation and involvement of civil society and organised interests, and (iv) territorialized actions (ESPON, 2006). The report further suggested that differences of importance exist among these conditions: some are considered as basic conditions, the *conditio sine qua non* without which the action that is being analysed cannot be qualified as a territorial governance action. Also, whereas some are important in building a territorial governance action and in reaching its objectives, others are those that give added value by making the action more effective in achieving its intended results (ESPON, 2006). For the purposes of this paper, emphasis will be placed on the ‘participation and involvement’ condition and assess how best such condition can improve resettlement actions; one typical example of territorial governance action which has gained unparalleled global attention till date.

Davoudi et al. (2008) argue that involvement and participation is a central fundamental condition that needs to prevail to make territorial governance action a success. Two levels of participation were identified in their study. The first is concerned with the involvement of stakeholders and interests (public/private partnerships), whose participation is necessary for the design and implementation of the process. The second is concerned with the ‘diffuse’ participation of private actors (generally identified as “citizens”), which is desirable but which has limits in practice. In furtherance, participation strategies need to distinguish between those who are able to represent their interests and those who are not (“joiners” and “non-joiners”). The former include those who are members of organized groups and hence capable of making their voices heard in policy-making processes. The latter are those who are systematically excluded from participation (Davoudi and Petts, 2000).

In terms of involvement and participation, new forms of governance are mostly partnership-based and seldom oriented towards wide and comprehensive participatory mechanisms. The most common form of participation involves, in fact, organised interests (whether public or private) group whereas the process of participation is often developed around a public consultation or by simply informing citizens of what is going on. Davoudi et al. (2008) share the view that the latter is more problematic in practice. This gives rise to a question on the effectiveness of the governance process, especially where the issue of accountability is considered. It is often the case that citizens and interest groups, whose active participation is desirable, are supposed to rely on a process that cannot guarantee effective, concrete results in a reasonable time and whose leading actors are often not clearly accountable. From the afore discussions, a wide participation of different types of actors, including weakly represented actors interests is a key ingredient in achieving a successful territorial governance action of which resettlement actions are of no exception.

Stakeholder Participation; Prospects and Challenges

Some of the most challenging decisions in resettlement programs stem from the relationship between the affected population and the implementing agent. According to Williams and Walton (2013), development of healthy relationships potentially creates a platform for balanced negotiations and co-creation of outcomes, where a company's actions and behaviors are aligned to community expectations and aspirations. It is therefore worth restating that the consequences of resettlement actions depend largely on how resettlement is planned, negotiated, and carried out. This is evidenced in modern resettlement empirical studies where displacement strategies and resettlement schemes have ranged from optimism to cynicism. According to Bartolome et al (2000), the complex and dynamic nature of developmental problems requires flexible and transparent decision-making that embraces a diversity of knowledge and values.

Understanding participation

The public’s attitudes, perceptions, beliefs, and knowledge can have a profound effect on the success of displacement and resettlement programs. While economic development can serve as a rational foundation for such actions, in many cases it is those groups impacted by displacement projects that decide how acceptable a decision is and influence how effective planning and management will be. Peoples’ experiences and culture,

understanding of an issue, and support of an agency can each shape their support for and compliance with displacement and resettlement decisions and policies.

Twyford and Baldwin (2007) view stakeholder participation as a processes whereby all those with interest in the outcome of a program or project have the enabling environment to actively influence decisions on planning and management. The World Bank (1995) also views participation as the process through which people with an interest (stakeholders) influence and share control over development initiatives and the decisions and resources that affect them. The WB report (2005) further emphasized that, in practice, this involves employing measures to identify relevant stakeholders, share information with them, listen to their views, involve them in processes of development planning and decision-making, contribute to their capacity-building and ultimately, empower them to initiate, manage and control their own self-development. According to Mathur (2006), subjecting the process of displacement and resettlement under the forces of participation help makesettlers more innovative, increase their living standards and consequently aid them to regain control over their communities.

Participation can take different forms, depending on the breadth of stakeholders involved and the depth of their participation. Box 1 describes six progressive levels of stakeholder involvement. The first three levels (information-sharing, listening and learning and joint assessment) constitute consultation, and are considered as prerequisites for participation. The next three levels (shared decision-making, collaboration and, finally, empowerment) constitute progressively deeper and more meaningful levels of participation. As one moves from “shallower” to “deeper” levels of participation, stakeholders have greater influence and control over development decisions, actions and resources (World Bank, 1995).

Box 1: Different Levels of Stakeholder Involvement

Consultation

1. **Information-sharing:** dissemination of documents, Public meetings, information seminars.
2. **Listening and learning:** field visits, interviews, consultative meetings.
3. **Joint assessment:** participatory needs assessment, beneficiary assessments

Participation

4. **Shared decision-making:** public review of draft Documents, participatory project planning, workshops to identify priorities, resolve conflicts, etc.
5. **Collaboration:** joint committees or working groups with stakeholder representatives, stakeholder responsibility for implementation.
6. **Empowerment:** capacity-building activities, self-management support for stakeholder initiatives.

Source: Adapted from World Bank, Participation Sourcebook, 1995

Benefits of Participation: Evidence for the claims?

Previous researches (e.g. Blackstock et al., 2007) indicates that although stakeholder participation does not guarantee conflict prevention or lead to broad public acceptance of a resettlement project, there is surfeit of evidences that good practice can contribute to conflict reduction and improvement in decision making process.

Stakeholder participation reduces the likelihood that those on the periphery of decision-making context are marginalised. This ensures that affected population is involved in decisions that affect them, hence helping to promote active citizenship with benefits for wider society. According to Richards et al. (2004), stakeholder participation may increase public trust in decisions and civil society, if participatory processes are perceived to be transparent and consider conflicting claims and views. Picciotto, Van Wicklin, and Rice (2001) point out that, in the case of China's Shuikou and Yantan dam projects whose economic justification was powering of mineral processing plants, displacees' incomes and living standards improved while satisfaction with resettlement was (reportedly) high. According to the aforementioned authors, although the economic capacity for this particular project was adequate to ensure the success of the resettlement exercise, the enormous involvement of the displacees in key decisions cannot be overlooked.

Also, stakeholder participation adds quality information to the resettlement process, which promotes effective management of the expectations of affected population by practitioners. According to Dougill et al. (2006) and Reed et al. (2008), taking local interests and concerns into account at an early stage of resettlement actions ensures that, outcomes of such interventions tend to be more sensitive to local community needs. Fischer (2000) also share the view that participatory processes anticipate and ameliorate unexpected negative outcomes associated with such interventions before they occur. Also, participatory processes have the capacity to transform adversarial relationships and find new ways for participants to work together (Stringer et al., 2006). In the case

of Rio Tinto's Murowa diamond mine in Zimbabwe which is cited in literature as an ethical and appropriate resettlement action, healthy corporate-community relationship was enforced from the discovery phase to its completion (Nish and Bice, 2012). The Murowa diamond mine resettlement program is a good example of broad public participation in resettlement schemes, negotiations significantly in advance of resettlement, and detailed public infrastructure agreements.

Effective stakeholder participation enables social interventions and technologies to be better adapted to local socio-cultural and environmental conditions. According to Martin and Sherington (1997), adhering to resettlement standards and participatory planning methods help to enhance the rate of adoption and diffusion among target groups, and their capacity to meet local needs and priorities. A typical case is the Mexico Hydroelectric Projects (MHP) that displaced a total of 3,500 people. These dams had its economic justification based on the provision of power for mineral processing such as aluminum smelting as in the case of the Tucuri Hydropower Complex in Brazil as discussed by La Rovere (2000). Despite the initial problems encountered, the resettlement action in the MHP's two projects was largely considered to be a success. According to Guggenheim's chapter (1993), the low numbers of displacees involved might have made such a success easier, but the World Bank's insistence on high resettlement standards and participatory planning methods were undeniably important factors in the success.

Stakeholder participation further promotes social learning. This manifests where stakeholders and the wider society in which they live, learn from each other through the development of new relationships, building on existing relationships and transforming adversarial relationships. This helps to build some level of trust among individuals and learn to appreciate the legitimacy of each other's views. Hare and Pahl-Wostl (2004) argue that social learning may be one of a number of mechanisms that can deliver more pragmatic benefits from participation, with groups of people developing more creative solutions through reflective deliberation. The Rio Tinto's Murowa diamond mine resettlement program is a typical case (Terminski, 2013). According to the newsletter of Rio Tinto (2001), the transitional form of engagement adopted by the company promoted the building of meaningful relationship between them and their host communities, where community relation officers learn so much from locals. This informs an appreciable level of trust required to meet community expectations.

Challenges of participation

Although resettlement practitioners continue to grasp themselves with various participatory methods in resettlement programs as espoused in most resettlement guidelines, yet, affected population participation in mining-induced displacement and resettlement actions remains low and slow. This section of the paper presents key challenges that impede effective local community participation in resettlement process despite its diverse advantages discussed in resettlement guidelines and literature.

The political environment of a country is a critical factor for successful stakeholder participation. In country where prevailing ideology does not encourage freedom of speech and openness rather state of affairs is dictated by a government, it is difficult to undertake a genuine participation (Oakley 1995). According to Downing (2002), unregulated MIDR is a common phenomenon in regions with politically weak and powerless populations, especially indigenous people. A typical case is the one reported by Amnesty International (2000) on a prospective oil exploration and the human right abuses suffered by displacees in Sudan. According to the report, government troops have reportedly used bombings, helicopter gunships, and mass executions as tools to ensure that people flee the region. the resettlement action led to the forced expulsion of tens of thousands of people from their homes. The report described this process of expulsion as one characterized with intense confrontations rather than a peaceful consensus. Non-democratic political environment is a key travesty to the basic principles and standards of resettlement programs.

Another important factor that affects the process of participation in resettlement actions is the existence of weak legal frameworks that limits stakeholder participation and protection of socially weaker persons. FIAN (2001) suggest that displacement and resettlement actions devoid of effective local participation are bound to increase as long as national mining policies are liberalized and companies continually opt for open-cast mining. During the resettlement action by the Goldfields Ghana Ltd which removed approximately 30,000 people from their homes, Akabzaa and Darimani (2001) noted that, the compensation policy did not consider the tenant status of many local people. The aftermath of such action was several displacees left uncompensated, hence now living in makeshift wattle structures on the fringes of Tarkwa due to high housing rents in the town.

Corruption is a critical factor that limits local group privileges in decision making and discourages the views of the minority in most actions that impact their livelihood. According to Cooke (2001, p. 19), a corrupt participatory process yields a 'dysfunctional consensus', which in the long term result in consultation fatigue. According to Vedwan et al. (2008), such participation challenges like corruption undermines the effectiveness of participation and makes it to become "talking shops" that create ambiguities and delay decisive action. The resulting cynicism can lead to declining levels of local community engagement and put the credibility of participation at risk. For instance, Obusu-Mensah's (1996) primary fieldwork in the early 1990s, discussed

practitioners personal enlightened economic interest as one key factor that led to resettlement failure in Ghana's Akosombo Dam Project on the Volta River, which displaced 80,000 people.

Again, attitudes of resettlement planners and practitioners towards the inputs of locally affected population in decision making process remain a barrier to participation. Davis (2001) indicates that views of local communities in most resettlement interventions are considered by practitioners as banal and one that lacks technical knowledge. In most cases, the credibility of sidelining the involvement of local communities in critical decisions is due to their insufficient expertise to meaningfully engage in what are often highly technical debates (Fischer and Young, 2007). This is argued to be one of the main causes of upheavals that have characterized resettlement actions in times past. Oliver-Smith (2010) draws attention to the case of CompaniaMineraAntamina, a mining project located in North-Central Andes which led to the displacement of thousands of local residents. It was revealed from the study that people displaced in its aftermath were deprived of access to the contents of the World Bank guidelines on resettlement. As Szablowski (2002) noted that CompaniaMineraAntamina (CMA) did not inform local residents on complaint procedures available for them through Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency (MIGA). These authors (Oliver-Smith, 2010; Szablowski, 2002) suggest that such attitudes by resettlement practitioners were the basis for the numerous upheavals that derailed the whole resettlement process.

Wayforward & Conclusion

As we look towards the future, it is of need to appreciate the idea that resettlement outcomes are not new and unique, rather is one ubiquitous social discontent that have characterised human development interventions. With increasing world concern for the wellbeing of host communities for such economic interventions, it can be anticipated that societal dimension of resettlement guidelines and standards will pick up an unparalleled momentum in the next generation.

Today, the commonest problem with MIDR is the lack of effective participation of the displaced in the design and implementation of the resettlement process. Despite the wide range of positive impacts that 'stakeholder participation' has on development interventions by industries, particularly the mining industry, the practical approaches of resettlement programs in host communities continue to be substandard. The paper discusses unfavourable political environment, corruption, weak mining policies and legal frameworks as well as prejudiced perceptions held by practitioners as key factors that have undermined the active involvement of affected population in resettlement decisions.

Rethinking the planning and management approach towards bettering the execution of involuntary resettlement actions requires strategies that are sensitive to gaps ranging from institutional failures to local community weaknesses. The paper therefore makes some policy recommendations towards eradicating the inhibiting factors in displacement and resettlement programs and creating enabling platforms to ensure effective local community participation in decisions.

1. The societal dimension of resettlement guidelines should be given extra momentum in terms of its importance and public awareness by rights-protection institutions. Local communities should be educated on their significant role in resettlement guidelines and the need for them to insist on its adherence by implementing agencies. This will equip locally affected population with the right attributes required to ensure that enabling platforms are created for their voices to be incorporated in the resettlement process. Consequently, it makes resettlement interventions more responsive to the expectations of local communities emerge.
2. Good governance that respects the full participation of affected group in development intervention projects should be advocated and promoted by local communities and social activists such as NGOs. It was clearly indicated in earlier discussed case studies that, most regions in developing countries have witnessed human rights abuses on the grounds of economic development interventions. The repercussions of such interventions have been chaos and upheavals, which are total travesty of true development. Valuing the views of affected population can help overcome the 'involuntary' component of resettlement actions, which has sabotaged the ultimate goal of resettlement actions from time past till today.
3. Further assistance from experts should be consulted to render training to resettlement facilitators on apt participatory approaches, that can help them cope with issues of openness and accountability. Ensuring that practitioners acquire such skills helps them to tolerate the views of the affected population in the resettlement process. This helps to develop an open and meaningful dialogue that can influence decision making, build trust and legitimacy, address community concerns, tap local knowledge and negotiate mutually beneficial future that are more sustainable and localized.
4. Effective and more localized monitoring and evaluation systems should be developed and enforced by implementing agencies as well as other social activists who share interest in the process. In doing this, officers in charge of the surveillance of the process should ensure an in-depth operation, maintenance and updating of the monitoring system. This done will ensure that all allocated resources are efficiently channeled to the appropriate areas and all activities executed as planned. A proper effective evaluation can help to critically assess the extent to which the completed projects did meet set targets prior to its commencement. This implies that a proper

monitoring and evaluation can serve as checks and balances on all actions that derailed the objective of such social interventions.

5. Strict mining policies and legal frameworks should be pursued and enforced. According to FIAN (2001), countries with liberalized mining policies tend to suffer most from MIDR actions. It is therefore suggested that reformed mining policies and legal regulations should incorporate other sensitive issues in MIDR including apt mining method for exploitation, proper definition of the land tenure system and the ‘social license to operate’ which bestows power for the commencement of the mine in the hands of the locals.

In conclusion, despite the community stakeholder case in resettlement process posit by this paper, it is still unclear as to whether affected local communities really have what it takes to effectively engage in a meaningful dialogue. Further studies are therefore required to access the local capacity of such communities in the resettlement decision making process.

References

- Amnesty International 2000, “Sudan: The Human Price of Oil”, London.
[http://web.amnesty.org/aidoc/ai.nsf/3f8e4594e0eef1f880256d57004ab6c2/b9e91835b287f935802568e9006d481f/\\$FILE/AFR5400100.pdf](http://web.amnesty.org/aidoc/ai.nsf/3f8e4594e0eef1f880256d57004ab6c2/b9e91835b287f935802568e9006d481f/$FILE/AFR5400100.pdf)
- Asian Development Bank 2003, “Operations Manual bank policies – Involuntary resettlement”, OM Section F2/BP, Manila: Asian Development Bank.
- Bagnasco, A & Le Galès, P 2000, “Introduction. European cities: local societies and collective actors?”, in A. Bagnasco and P. Le Gales (eds.), *Cities in Contemporary Europe*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (1st edition: *Villes en Europe*, La Decouverte, Paris), 1-32.
- Bartolome, LJ, De Wet, C, Mander, H, Nagaraj, VK 2000, “Displacement, resettlement, rehabilitation, reparation and development”, World Commission on Dams.
- Blackstock, KL, Kelly, GJ, Horsey, BL, 2007. “Developing and applying a framework to evaluate participatory research for sustainability”. *Ecological Economics* 60, 726–742
- Cernea, M 2000, “Impoverishment Risks, Risk Management, and Reconstruction: A Model of Population Displacement and Resettlement”, George Washington University, Washington, DC.
- Cernea, M 2003, “For a new economics of resettlement: A sociological critique of the compensation principle”, *International Social Science Journal*, 55(175): 37-45.
- Davoudi S & Petts, J 2000. “How to include the public in waste planning”, proceedings of the Fifth National Conference in Strategic and Local Planning for Waste, MEL Research, 5-6 July, Birmingham.
- Cooke, B 2001, “The social psychological limits of participation”, In: Cooke, B., Kothari, U. (Eds.), *Participation: the New Tyranny?* Zed Books, London, pp. 102–121.
- Davoudi, S, Evans, N, Governa, F, Santangelo, M 2008, “Territorial Governance in the Making. Approaches, Methodologies, Practices”, *Boletín de la A.G.E*, 46, 32-52.
- De Wet, Chris. J. /ed./2006, “Development-Induced Displacement. Problems, Policies and People”, Berghahn Books, London.
- Dougill, AJ, Fraser, EDG, Holden, J, Hubacek, K, Prell, C, Reed, MS, Stagl, ST, Stringer, LC 2006, “Learning from doing participatory rural research: Lessons from the Peak District National Park”, *Journal of Agricultural Economics* 57, 259–275.
- Downing, T, 2002, “Avoiding New Poverty: Mining-Induced Displacement and Resettlement”, World Business Council for sustainable development, International institute for environment and development (iied). Mining, Minerals and sustainable development (MMSD).
- ESPON 2006, “Governance of territorial and urban policies from the EU to the local level”, final report, ESPON, available in www.espon.eu
- FIAN 2001, “Ghana: Hundreds of Villagers in Western Ghana Forcibly Evicted and Harassed by Gold Mining Corporations”, FIAN Intervention 0106 HGHA, February <http://www.fian.org/english-version/e-0106.htm>
- Fischer, F 2000, “Citizens, experts and the environment”, *The Politics of Local Knowledge*, Duke University Press, London.
- Fischer, A & Young, JC 2007, “Understanding mental constructs of biodiversity: Implications for biodiversity management and conservation”, *Biological Conservation* 136, 271–282.
- Guggenheim, S 1993, “Peasants, planners, and participation: Resettlement in Mexico”, in S. Guggenheim and M. Cernea (eds.), *Anthropological Approaches to Resettlement: Policy, practice, and theory*, pp. 201-28, Oxford: Westview.
- Gutman, PS 1994, “Involuntary resettlement in hydropower projects”, *Annual Reviews Inc.*, 19, 189-210.
- Hare, M & Pahl-Wostl, C 2002, “Stakeholder categorization in participatory integrated assessment processes”, *Integrated Assessment* 3, 50–62.
- Indira Gandhi National Open University (IGNOU) 2001, “Understanding Development Caused Displacement”.

- <http://www.rronline.org/programmeguide/CHAPTER02.htm>
- Koenig, D2002, "Toward local development and mitigating impoverishment in development-induced displacement and resettlement". RSC Working Paper No. 8. Refugee Studies Center. Oxford, UK: University of Oxford.
- Martin, A & Sherington, J 1997, "Participatory research methods: implementation, effectiveness and institutional context", *Agricultural Systems* 55, 195–216.
- Mathur, HM 2006, "Resettling people displaced by development project: some critical management issues", *Social Change*, 36 (1-52).
- Mathur, HM & Marsden, D1998, "Development projects and impoverishment risks", Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- McDowell, C1996, "Understanding Impoverishment: The Consequences of Development-Induced Displacement", Oxford and Providence, RI :Berghahn Press.
- Nish, S & Bice, S2012. "Community-based agreement making with land-connected peoples" [In] Vanlay, Frank, Esteves Ana Maria. /eds./ (2012). *New Directions in Social Impact Assessment. Conceptual and Methodological Advances*, Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.
- Oakley, P 1995, "People's Participation in Development Projects", London, INTRAC.
- Obusu-Mensah, K1996, "Ghana's Volta Resettlement Scheme: The long-term consequences of post-colonial state planning", London: International Scholars Publications.
- Oliver-Smith A2010, "Defying Displacement-Grassroots Resistance and the Critique of Development", University of Texas Press, Houston.
- Picciotto, R, Van Wicklin, W, Rice, E (eds.) 2001, "Involuntary Resettlement: Comparative perspectives", World Bank Series on Evaluation and Development, Vol. 2. *Transaction Publishers*, London
- Reed, MS, Fraser, EDG, Dougill, AJ. 2008, "An adaptive learning process for developing and applying sustainability indicators with local communities", *Ecological Economics* 59, 406–418
- Richards, C, Blackstock, KL, Carter, CE2004, "Practical Approaches to Participation", SERG Policy Brief No. 1. Macauley Land Use Research Institute, Aberdeen.
- Rio Tinto 2001, "Murowa Project Newsletter", Harare, Zimbabwe.
- Sonnenberg, D & Münster, F2001, "Mining Minerals Sustainable Development Southern Africa. Research Topic 3: Mining and Society Involuntary Resettlement", African Institute of Corporate Citizenship and MMSDSA Regional Research, Birnam Park.
- Stanely, J2004, "Development-induced displacement and resettlement", Forced Migration Organisation. <<http://www.forcedmigration.org/guides/fmo022/>>, [Accessed 10 March 2014].
- Stringer, LC, Prell, C, Reed, MS, Hubacek, K, Fraser, EDG, Dougill, AJ2006, "Unpacking 'participation' in the adaptive management of socio-ecological systems: a critical review". *Ecology and Society* 11, 39 (online).
- Szablowski, D 2002, "Mining, Displacement and the World Bank: A Case Analysis of CompaniaMineraAntamina's Operations in Peru", *Journal of Business Ethics*, vol. 39, no. 3, pp. 247-273.
- Terminski, B 2012, "Mining-Induced Displacement and Resettlement: Social Problem and Human Rights Issue (A Global Perspective)", Social Science Research Network, Geneva.
- Terminski, B2013, "Development-Induced Displacement And Resettlement: Theoretical Frameworks And Current Challenges", Social Science Research Network, Geneva.
- Twyford, V & Baldwin, C 2007, "Stakeholder Participation in Dams and Development: Report to UNEP Dams and Development Project", United Nations Environment Program, Nairobi
- Williams, R & Walton, A2013, "The Social Licence to Operate and Coal Seam Gas Development. A literature review report to the Gas Industry Social and Environmental Research Alliance (GISERA)". March 2013. CSIRO, Canberra.
- Witness for Peace (WFP) 1996, "A People Dammed: The impact of the World Bank Chixoy Hydroelectric Project in Guatemala", Washington, D.C.
- World Commission on Dams (WCD)2002, "Dams and Development: Anew framework for decision-making", London: World Commission on Dams.
- World Bank1995, "Participation Sourcebook", Washington, World Bank.

The IISTE is a pioneer in the Open-Access hosting service and academic event management. The aim of the firm is Accelerating Global Knowledge Sharing.

More information about the firm can be found on the homepage:
<http://www.iiste.org>

CALL FOR JOURNAL PAPERS

There are more than 30 peer-reviewed academic journals hosted under the hosting platform.

Prospective authors of journals can find the submission instruction on the following page: <http://www.iiste.org/journals/> All the journals articles are available online to the readers all over the world without financial, legal, or technical barriers other than those inseparable from gaining access to the internet itself. Paper version of the journals is also available upon request of readers and authors.

MORE RESOURCES

Book publication information: <http://www.iiste.org/book/>

IISTE Knowledge Sharing Partners

EBSCO, Index Copernicus, Ulrich's Periodicals Directory, JournalTOCS, PKP Open Archives Harvester, Bielefeld Academic Search Engine, Elektronische Zeitschriftenbibliothek EZB, Open J-Gate, OCLC WorldCat, Universe Digital Library, NewJour, Google Scholar

