

Introduction

Allan Lavell, Cassidy Johnson and Garima Jain

The problem

In cities of the global South, low-income populations suffer disproportionately the impacts of climatic and other hazard events, as well as being exposed to everyday risks to health, life, livelihood and human security. Within these populations, women, the elderly, disabled people and those belonging to particular ethnic or social groups may be especially vulnerable. The COVID-19 pandemic is reconfirming the nature of who is most exposed and vulnerable to the different hazards society faces on a recurrent or long-term basis. The growing inequality faced by society and its repercussions on many livelihoods and lifestyle conditions are of major concern in terms of understanding this relationship.

As one way of reducing existing disaster risk, national and local governments, often supported by international funding agencies, engage in resettlement and relocation processes. While this may reduce people's exposure to hazard, it can lead to numerous other problems, which can leave people more vulnerable or worse off than they were before. This volume seeks to understand better the challenges and associated outcomes of such interventions on people and cities, and to examine ways forward for avoiding the need for resettlement or undertaking this endeavour in more holistic and integrated ways.

There are many examples and studies of the resettlement of populations, its causes and motivations, and the search to reconstitute their livelihoods and their infrastructural, economic, social, cultural and psychological foundations (Ferris 2012; de Sherbinin, Castro and Gemenne 2010; Mathur 1995; Mathur and Marsden 1998; Satiroglu and Choi 2015). These include the demand for land for the development of large-scale infrastructure projects or for urban renovation, or the need to settle persons expelled from their places of origin due to conflict. Relocation

and resettlement due to the incidence or potential incidence of damaging climatic and other natural hazards are becoming increasingly common, especially in urban areas (Correa 2011). Climate change and its impact on hydro-meteorological hazards will probably increase this need in the future.

These movements and processes (unless completely spontaneous) require legal or normative frameworks in which to operate, institutional and organisational set-ups for achieving set goals, mechanisms for financing and systems for monitoring (Ferris 2014). Experience has shown that many such processes incite social conflict, competing demands and dissatisfaction with (or suspicion of) government and its ability to provide solutions. Many have not been carried out in planned, participatory, sustainable and sustained manners (Menon-Sen and Bhan 2008; Cabannes, Guimarães Yafai and Johnson 2010; Cernea and Mathur 2007).

When relocation or resettlement are related to the presence or potential presence and impact of damaging physical events of climatic and meteorological, geological, geomorphological or oceanographic origin, such practice is often conceived as part of what is now commonly known as disaster risk management (DRM). It then constitutes one of the many methods available for 'reducing' (corrective management) or 'anticipating or preventing' (prospective management) disaster risk. The latter may increasingly be related to climate change hazards (de Sherbinin et al. 2011).

Disaster risk-related relocation and resettlement may take one of many forms and be inspired and implemented according to many institutional and organisational, legal and normative, planning and participatory schemes. When decision and implementation are led by different organisations and institutions, varying rationales and processes may prevail. Thus, for example, resettlement and relocation are often related to land use planning processes as well as to disaster risk reduction goals. In fact, independent of the disaster risk link, resettlement may be seen as a concern that essentially derives from land use planning needs. In this case, the criteria for decision-making could differ substantially from those where disaster risk management concerns and practices are prevalent and the starting point for the process.

In general, similar conditions and processes play out in different time periods and help explain the permanently growing populations in areas exposed to hazards, and to hydro-meteorological hazards in particular. Little has been studied or written based on empirical evidence about the future impacts of climate change on the insecurity of such settlements, but the general notion is that climate change will increase

hazards and eventually the risk conditions that are a prelude to disasters (Revi et al. 2014). A consideration of the data and the facts presented allows us to identify a number of challenges and defining factors for risk reduction among urban populations and how resettlement interventions address regional-level systemic issues and the impact of large-scale investments in resettlement programmes on climate change.

Firstly, the number of persons living in highly hazard-prone areas is large and is growing. Here it should be noted that the notion of ‘unmitigable’ risk is specific to a particular population group. What is unmitigable for the urban poor is not necessarily unmitigable for the urban rich and economic and commercial interests as a whole. Beyond the prevailing economic processes and the concentration of income in cities, the continued migration of poorer populations is the main cause of location in unsafe areas, and climate change is expected to impact rural populations in such ways that rural-to-urban migration continues. The sum of these processes and their accumulative results means that countries face an almost impossible task in promoting pre-impact resettlement of even the most ‘at-risk’ populations. The numbers are simply too great and the resources too scarce. Also, the administrative process leading to state-incentivised resettlement is still nascent. This suggests that resettlement can most appropriately be seen as a means of last resort, once all other options for risk reduction have been considered and discarded (Ferris 2012). This is relevant not only when we consider the social and economic disruption resettlement can and has caused, but also because it is impossible to think of resettlement for all those in such need, even less so if one thinks of future population growth in unsafe areas.

A second question and challenge relate to the ability to offer alternatives to continued location in highly risk-prone areas, thus avoiding, from the outset, the need for future resettlement. Resettlement is mostly a palliative for disaster risk: a needed option due to prior failure to control location in already hazard-prone areas. Only in cases where the physical hazard has developed in post-location periods, as can be the case with changed conditions due to environmental degradation and climate change, for example, can we think of resettlement as a needed solution for changed conditions. It is, however, a need principally dictated by humanitarian, social and political considerations in post-impact situations. The search for greater prospective control over settlement in hazard-prone areas is present but still latent. This means that now, and in the future, resettlement will probably only be a real option in most cases for post-impact populations, those that have suffered disaster and where decision-making as to need and priority is dictated by the pressure

of circumstances, political considerations and short-term needs. This of course does not exonerate us or government from searching for mechanisms for the prospective control of location in insecure sites.

On population movement and resettlement

A consideration of the extensive literature on voluntary and involuntary population movements, relocation and resettlement reveals that we are dealing with a complex topic with common roots but also clear differences in context and circumstance (Ferris 2012, 2014; Oliver-Smith 2012). Thus, understanding what is what and recognising the diversity of different circumstances and conditions is essential. This diversity also indicates that we are perhaps not dealing with a single integrated, easily identified problem, but rather with a series of different circumstances which, if examined jointly, show common features but also a sum of significant differences. When this diversity of circumstances is applied to the problem of classifying, constructing typologies or systematising the different conditions under which movement takes place or is induced, this must be accompanied by a heterogeneous understanding of the proposed or possible solutions to the problems identified.

Here we will provide a view from the inside that derives from a consideration of prior terminologies and ideas, but which is coloured by the experience of the research project this book is predicated on (Ferris 2012, 2014; Correa 2011; Oliver-Smith and de Sherbinin 2014). Neither here nor later are we postulating a conceptual frame for the research as such (although this is implicit in what is said and analysed), but rather we are offering an advance on conclusions derived from the research itself. It is not our intention to review existing terminologies and notions, but instead to derive a conclusion about the most appropriate terms to be used in understanding and constructing typologies that lead to an understanding of causal factors, conditions for and solutions to the problem of hazard-prone urban populations.

The starting point for any discussion on terminology is the notion of the spatial movement, mobility or displacement of population. Such movement may be voluntary – planned as a collective response, or spontaneously undertaken at an individual family level, normally stimulated by the search for betterment or security. Or it may be involuntary or obligatory – dictated by a hierarchically more pervasive social institution or force, normally some level of government, which applies the law according to established norms or imposes its will through some form

of repression. Repression and force may and have been used by private-sector interests in the search to increase land rent for economic gain. This is a form of usurpation which constitutes theft unless undertaken with the complicity of the state, which may give it some appearance or status of legality. For example, land grabbing is now a major problem in the developing world, and can be couched in terms related to risk and natural hazards.

Voluntary or involuntary movements in response to climate-related hazards may occur under a series of different circumstances or contexts: firstly, and most dominantly, as a response to a disaster event which seriously impacts the existing population or community, leading to wide-scale loss of housing and site security. Secondly, in response to a series of smaller sequenced events that accumulatively have led to damage and loss, insecurity and fear of the future and which stimulate preventive thought and maybe action by population or authorities. Thirdly, as a preventive measure where it can be shown through scientific analysis or it is perceived that a serious event could and will occur in the near to medium-term future. Fourthly, where processes of environmental degradation have led to a changed physical environment for a community with the possibility of hazard event occurrence in the future (socio-natural events such as land sliding and flooding due to deforestation on site and upstream). And lastly, where the average climate conditions have changed to such a degree that livelihoods as practised are no longer viable at the present location (this situation can be increasingly expected in areas severely affected by climate change and where there is dependency on agricultural or natural resource-based initiatives).

Under any of these conditions the voluntary or obligatory movement and relocation of persons may be justified in terms of reduced disaster risk. At the same time, obligatory movement may also at times be explained by ulterior motives such as the potential revalorisation of the abandoned site, development needs and redevelopment of city centres by private-sector and government actors. Nothing undermines the credibility of government or the private sector more than the development of abandoned land for private or public gain where this was not explicit when the resettlement was proposed. In the case of preventative (as opposed to post-disaster) movements, the onus of responsibility for justifying the move, the complexity this involves and the technical arguments favouring it are seriously increased due to uncertainty and the fact that resettlement will seriously interrupt accepted ongoing livelihood processes and patterns and service provision on-site.

Considering the population that moves under conditions of climate and hydrological stress, we may identify two different contexts. Firstly, entire communities or zones of a city (including at times multi-community zones, contiguous in geographical terms). These may be of varied sizes from small – let us say 15–30 families – to very large, up to or above a population size of fifteen thousand. At times whole towns have been relocated or the functions of cities reassigned to new locations, even though the original city persists with changed or modified functions (for example the resiting of the capital of Belize from Belize City to Belmopan due to hurricane threats to the functioning of government and society).

Secondly, individual families or small groups of families from diverse hazard-prone communities in the same urban centre who are selected at the same time or in the frame of the same relocation/resettlement process or political decision. Such a process normally follows the occurrence of hazard events that seriously affect various parts of a town or city contemporaneously and which have affected some but not all of the community. The impacts of such ‘splitting’ of communities or families can be considerable, reducing access to social networks and livelihood options. Resettlement, particularly of this sort, can also occasion considerable emotional stress and sentiments of loss and alienation that can affect the adaptive process to the new environment (Quinn et al. 2018).

On options and solutions to voluntary and involuntary movement and the idea of typologies

In any attempt to provide a conceptual basis for understanding the processes of planned human movement under hazard stress it is necessary to also consider the range of options that exist as regards a solution to the problem of hazardous location. Here, evidence (including that from the present research) suggests various generic types of solution. Firstly, the movement all together of a community, small or large, to a single alternative location, where access to an adequate site is critical in the decision (adequate in the multiple sense of cost efficient, security of tenure, safe from hazard, well located as regards employment opportunities, services and communications, non-invasive of protected ecological zones, etc.).

Secondly, the movement all together of more than one community from different or the same parts of a town or city to a single new site and where access to adequate land and considerations of intercommunity cooperation and social networks will be outstanding factors to consider.

Thirdly, the creation of new communities in safer locations made up of individual families from different hazard-prone locations from the same or different cities or towns.

Fourthly, the movement of families or individuals from an existing community to diverse and different parts of a town or city according to their own choices and options for purchase or renting of alternative accommodation. This may include such schemes as those where persons offered relocation to a common site may reject this but are given the option of finding a family from a non-hazard-prone area that does want to occupy the new location and where the original beneficiary occupies their house. This demands that the house is certified as being in a safe and adequate location. This implies that people will be integrated into existing communities, which in itself may occasion a series of problems and challenges with respect to competition with the host community for resources as well as a potential for conflict on ethnic or class bases.

Clearly, in terms of populations in movement and the creation of new living habitats and spaces, if we consider the different conditions that stimulate movement and the characteristics of the moving populations, any typology (or double typology) would be very large. If we assume that defined types of population situations or contexts determine the need for specific and identifiable optimums in terms of types of solution, such a crossing of typologies could be a basis for the evaluation of real cases and the factors governing their success or not. Refer to [Appendix A](#) for a summary of typology of resettlement and relocation interventions from the research project.

On terminology

The case studies in this volume, together with past experience, lead us to a reflection on terminology in the search to differentiate between contexts or situations which are of importance when considering process and success and failure vis-à-vis the social and economic impacts of change.

A basic difference in types of movement, and their spatial and social aspects, requires a consideration of the relationship between livelihoods and the social structure of the original and the new location. Although the physical distance between these is important in any distinction, the notion of social and functional distance is more important. Thus, population that is moved or moves but can, without additional cost or major effort, maintain its current livelihood schemes, its access to services and determined levels of social relation and cohesion can be considered

under one category of movement. This category we can refer to as 'relocation'.¹ This category may include whole communities, large and small, single or composite, or individual families and persons from different or the same locations that are dispersed in the city or located together in a new habitat.

On the other hand, where movement clearly interrupts or seriously modifies the existing livelihood options and the types of access to existing services, and involves a need for consideration of past, or the development of new social relations and patterns of coexistence, we will refer to this as 'resettlement'.² This derives from a consideration of the term 'settlement' itself, which constitutes a condition characterised and defined by the creation of habitat and the generation and consolidation of livelihood options and social relations between members of a new community, made up of extended families, friends and others.

An alternative to this form of definition, and more in line with ongoing developments in international work on the topic, would be to consider all movements as planned (or administered or supervised) relocation and then distinguish between the two contexts discussed above using some other terminology. However, from our perspective the key distinction between relocation and resettlement derives from the fact that the notion of settlement implies a complex development of multiple dimensions of human existence, whereas relocation does not necessarily mean this, as structures, relations, behaviour patterns and goals may stay the same despite a change of location (relocation). A distinction should be made between forms of resettlement that bring a resource bundle with it, however meagre or inadequate, and outright displacement with no assistance of any sort.

The relevance of the details we provide in the examination of the multiple factors that change and condition the population movement scenario can be found in its relevance for an understanding of decision-making and implementation. Clearly, given the array of different circumstances under which movement takes place and for which solutions are sought, there can be no single theory or materialisation of decision-making and implementation procedures. Certain key factors and circumstances can be seen to come into play in general, but beyond these generic aspects, many cases show *sui generis* and idiosyncratic characteristics, and the notion of standard processes and procedures or set policy briefs and recommendations becomes difficult to achieve (there is now a plethora of guidelines developed internationally regarding relocation, forced movement and resettlement related to climate, often based on knowledge derived from prior development-induced movement and the guidelines

developed for this (for example see Leckie 2013). Relocation and resettlement are dynamic, context-related processes that show an enormous range of options, decisions and implementation challenges. This does not of course mean that lessons cannot be learned from a comparative study of different cases, nor that such a study cannot serve to identify a series of key elements which, if not taken into consideration, will lead to severe implementation and outcome problems. In pointing out the idiosyncratic character of many schemes, we are merely indicating the need for caution when decisions are taken and implementation is made effective.

Scope of the book

This book draws on the empirical findings of the ‘Reducing Relocation Risk in Urban Areas’ project, with contributions from the project team, as well as contributions from authors not directly part of the project but in line with its areas of enquiry. The book aims to reflect widely on the problem of resettlement and relocation from areas exposed to climate and non-climatic risks. It sees this problem firmly within the context of several strands of literature, including that on preventative resettlement and development displacement, on disaster risk management, and on planning, development and resilience in urban areas of the global South.

About the research project ‘Reducing Relocation Risk in Urban Areas’

The project ‘Reducing Relocation Risk in Urban Areas’ ran from 2015 to 2017. Funded by the Climate and Development Knowledge Network, it was conducted by the researchers at four partner organisations from the global South and North, including the Bartlett Development Planning Unit at UCL, the Indian Institute for Human Settlements, the Secretariat General’s Office of the Latin American Social Science Faculty (Facultad Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales – FLACSO) and Makerere University, Uganda.

Through empirical analysis, the project looked across several case studies³ from India, Colombia, Peru, Mexico and Uganda to understand 1) the political, economic and institutional contexts in which relocation and resettlement from disaster risk areas takes place; 2) the costs and benefits of relocation and resettlement from both governments’ and individuals’ perspectives; and 3) how relocation and resettlement impacts people’s wellbeing and resilience over different timeframes. The

aim was not to be comparative, but to understand the realities in each of the country contexts in order to build an empirical and theoretical basis for understanding the problem.

The research took place in four phases. For the first, diagnostic, phase of the research, each of the country studies began in 2015 with a documentary review to look for experiences of resettlement in the country and to create an inventory of case studies, as is evidenced in [Appendix A](#), which outlines the typologies of interventions. The second phase of the research was fieldwork in each country, focused on the selected case studies. The selection of case studies was dependent on addressing the relevant typologies in the country, and the scale of the research endeavour was dependent on the resources available to teams, which differed by country. The objective of the fieldwork was to find out the experiences of resettlement from the perspectives of individuals, communities, governments and other stakeholders. These took the form of interviews, focus groups and surveys with households and stakeholders, conducted in local languages. The third phase of the research was to draw upon the fieldwork in each country to develop a method for cost–benefit analysis for each country, trying to understand from the government, individuals’ and collective perspectives how relocation and resettlement impacts people’s wellbeing and resilience over different timeframes. The fourth phase of the research was a cross-regional analysis, of which this book forms an element, in addition to the policy brief in [Appendix B](#). All of these reports can be found on the project website.⁴

In India, the field study included nine sites in the state of Odisha and seven in the state of Andhra Pradesh. The study also included five rural sites to present a counterpoint to urban resettlement practices, highlighting the distinct issues and challenges faced in the urban area. These sites represented a mix of resettlement, relocation, in situ housing and infrastructure upgrading interventions (see [Table 3.1](#) for more detail). Decision-making and implementation processes were understood through 26 interviews with key officials and policymakers and two consultations each with 45 policymakers. Community-level information, for example on infrastructure conditions and cultural norms, was gathered through 10 group discussions. To understand more household-level risks, 158 primary household-level surveys were conducted to assess changes in various indicators before and after the intervention. Some individuals, especially those with special needs such as the disabled, elderly, minorities and women, were identified and 15 were interviewed to get a better sense of the risks faced by them during such rehabilitation

interventions. The methods and sample design used in the India study are discussed in more detail in [Chapter 3](#) of the book, and references to the original reports are included there.

In Colombia, the fieldwork was not specifically done for the project, but rather was based on fieldwork and research carried out by the Colombian team in Manizales over some years, using interviews and documentary sources.

In Mexico, the research was carried out in the municipality of Celestún, and the fieldwork methodology consisted of visits to selected projects in the municipality of Celestún: Las Charcas and Colonia FONDEN, and included meetings with focus groups in both resettlements and free-form interviews with residents and government authorities of federal, state (Yucatán) and municipality (Celestún) levels. The case study is elaborated in [Chapter 13](#).

In Peru, the research focused on the Amazonian city of Belén, and was based on interviews and focus groups in high-risk zones and in the area of the resettlement, interviews with government authorities and employees at a national, regional and local level, and interviews with the Lower Belén population that had moved spontaneously to other resettlement sites. The case study, and more details about the sample sizes, are presented in [Chapter 8](#).

In Uganda, the fieldwork was focused in Kampala, and particularly on two settlements in the central part of the city (Bwaise III and Natete) that are located in low-lying, often flooded neighbourhoods and have been subject to relocation from a drainage channel expansion. The fieldwork consisted of interviews with residents living in both settlements, as well as families that had relocated out of the settlements; in total 70 interviews were conducted. This was complemented by interviews with nine stakeholders including municipal officials. The case study is detailed in [Chapters 4, 9 and 15](#).

The key findings from across the countries are generalised and have been published as a policy brief, which is included in [Appendix B](#). However, it is worthwhile to indicate, in a succinct way, the key findings here in the introduction. They set up a framework or a starting point for our analysis in this book.

1. Resettlement and relocation may reduce people's exposure to hazards – but experience shows that in most cases, it leaves people worse off overall in social and economic terms than they were before.
2. In some cases, hazard exposure also continues despite the resettlement, owing to uninformed planning. Planning needs to guarantee

- safer locations for new green-site settlements, in order to avoid future needs for resettlement due to poor location in hazard-prone areas.
3. Resettlement should always be considered a last resort after all options for on-site mitigation or upgrading have been exhausted. Decision-making authorities may, and often do, understand risks differently from the communities living in environments that they know and understand, and alternative actions to resettlement may be possible.
 4. Policies and procedures must ensure people's rights are protected; legal frameworks may need to be strengthened; and international covenants on resettlement must be honoured.

Organisation of the book

The book is organised into five parts in addition to this introduction and a concluding chapter. Each part addresses a particular issue of disaster risk-related resettlement and relocation. It should be mentioned that most chapters touch on more than one issue and thus many of the themes explored cross the boundaries of the parts described below.

Part 1 provides a critical framing of the related concepts, placing resettlement and relocation in context within the development and planning discourses in urban areas of the global South. Contributors discuss the meanings we place on important terms in the discourse, such as 'settlement' and 'habitat': notions that influence how we see the problem of resettlement and relocation. The chapters frame resettlement as a last-resort approach for disaster risk management, and as an unfortunate outcome of development failures. The contributions point to current deficiencies in the implementation of resettlement schemes and provide a critical examination of the elements that need to go into decision-making.

Part 2 scrutinises the understanding and interpretation of the subjective concept of 'risk': how risk is understood, calculated and employed to decide who is at risk and to what extent it is possible to mitigate these risks. The interpretation of risk is a crucial element in whether resettlement is an appropriate course of action. The contributions shed light on how residents and communities tolerate disaster risks as a trade-off for other benefits and aspects they value about a particular location. This is juxtaposed against how institutional decision-makers in resettlement

see disaster risk as a more classic calculation of possible losses associated with calculations of hazard, vulnerability and exposure.

Following that, [Part 3](#) looks particularly at how urban communities are resisting and protesting against being resettled. The contributions in this section examine how power and politics often undermine confidence that communities have in a proposed resettlement. Resistance takes many forms, and the chapters look at how resistance activities have impacted on decision-making for resettlement.

How land is held and transacted is an important puzzle piece in understanding patterns of disaster risk-related resettlement and relocation. This theme is examined in [Part 4](#). The contributions look at how land rights and land tenure patterns influence decisions about resettlement and on-site upgrading. Evictions and dispossession are key themes across the chapters, highlighting that what is termed disaster risk-related 'resettlement' is often akin to eviction, as people may be displaced without adequate compensation that allows them to resettle, and may have little voice in the process.

[Part 5](#) contains contributions that examine the issues of resettlement or relocation to or from ecologically sensitive areas of the city. They explore the contradiction between desired development and required conservation, which leads to a clear paradox in natural protected areas. Occupation of wetland or riverside areas means people are more exposed (so they may want to relocate if given the option), but these occupations can also impact on the functioning of the wider city, if, for example, water resources are affected for the population as a whole. The contributions explore how enhanced management of these resources may be better than resettlement.

Part 1: framing the issues

In [Chapter 1](#), Allan Lavell seeks to deconstruct the hypothesis that resettlement is beset by decision-making and implementation procedures that lack understanding of the structural and contextual reasons for risk existing in the first place. The chapter therefore delves into visions, concepts, mindsets and notions that are used in the practice of resettlement. It also critically analyses the failures in disaster risk management policy in general, recognising that resettlement is most likely to be used as a last-resort mechanism for disaster risk reduction.

Anne-Catherine Chardon, in [Chapter 2](#), critiques the current approaches of resettlement for their focus on physical or natural spaces

in place of understanding the fundamental factors of ‘habitat’ and ‘inhabitation’ that relate to social, cultural, economic or financial vulnerability. She bases her arguments on an examination of resettlement projects in Manizales, Colombia. She argues that while in theory there is reason to focus on ‘inhabiting’ and all that entails, in praxis there is an incomplete institutional vision that does not allow for these qualitative factors.

Chapter 3 by Garima Jain uses case studies from both rural and urban contexts in India to understand to what extent disaster and everyday risks are really reduced by a resettlement and relocation intervention. Through detailed empirical data collected as part of the ‘Reducing Relocation Risk’ project, this chapter examines the decision-making processes and implementation procedures that went into the resettlement and relocation, and links this to the outcomes of the projects. This yields several important observations about urban resettlement projects, including that post-disaster housing developments focus narrowly on reducing hazard exposure, and in the process create other socio-economic risks.

Part 2: understanding and interpreting risk

In Chapter 4, Cassidy Johnson, Garima Jain, Vineetha Nalla and José Delfín Cáceres-Martínez look at how policy actors measure and interpret risks, and how this affects decisions that are made about resettlement. The authors consider national policies, including those related to ‘non-mitigable risk’ in Peru and ‘non-tenable slums’ in India. Also drawing on Uganda as a case study, they consider how risk, as understood in those policies, is quite different from residents’ risk tolerance and their tipping points for relocation.

How to weigh up the costs and benefits of resettlement is the topic of Chapter 5 by Shuaib Lwasa, Amir Bazaz and Garima Jain. This chapter draws on empirical data from research undertaken in India and Uganda, as part of the ‘Reducing Relocation Risk’ project, to illustrate how the narrow economic valuation of risk can be enhanced with an extended value list to inform decisions at various levels of actors.

Emily Wilkinson, in Chapter 6, draws on research in Montserrat after the 1995–9 volcanic eruption, which destroyed the capital Plymouth and led to the resettlement in the north of all those remaining on the island. Looking at aligning attitudes to risk tolerance, she argues that the resettlement policy ‘worked’ when local and central levels of risk tolerance were closely aligned, but this is beginning to unravel. This chapter

analyses why attitudes towards risk tolerance have changed and what are the impacts of these changes.

Part 3: protest and power: resistance to resettlement

Focusing specifically on the urban question of disaster- and climate change-induced resettlements, in [Chapter 7](#) Anthony Oliver-Smith explores the reasons why residents in urban areas resist resettlement. He argues that rights, governance regimes and policies can be drivers of resistance. He pinpoints the aspects of a community that make resistance to resettlement possible and offers a typology of tactics for resistance.

[Chapter 8](#), by Angel Wilson Chávez Eslava, looks in depth at the resistances to the New City of Belén resettlement project in Iquitos, Peru. Drawing on research conducted during the ‘Reducing Relocation Risk’ project, he presents an analysis of the conflicts and power relations among the different actors and reflects on what this means for resilience and local culture.

Part 4: land issues in resettlement

Based on the study of Kampala, Uganda, in [Chapter 9](#) Colin Marx looks at how property rights influence who is accountable for risk, and for resettlement and compensation. The tangle of property rights in Kampala means that local authorities have little prospect in enforcing people to stay away from settling in flood-prone areas, and it also means that when residents were evicted due to risk-reducing infrastructure investments, complex land tenure arrangements isolated residents from receiving assistance for their losses.

[Chapter 10](#), by Yves Cabannes, looks at forced evictions in order to place risk-induced resettlement and relocation within the context of drivers of forced evictions in urban areas. He uses David Harvey’s model of ‘accumulation through dispossession’ to explain the breadth, depth and variety of evictions taking place worldwide, primarily those that are climate change or disaster induced. The end of the chapter offers some glimpses of innovative programmes of emerging anti-hegemonic practices.

Giovanna Astolfo navigates the history and current urban transformation trajectory of Phnom Penh, Cambodia in [Chapter 11](#). Using a comparative analysis of four relocation sites in the city, she traces the

unprecedented scale of dispossession that made relocation and resettlement a lawful exercise of violence. She reflects that the production and sharing of knowledge is a central issue to be addressed in risk-related resettlement.

[Chapter 12](#), by Bill Flinn and Holly Schofield, focuses on the concept of self-recovery, which has been adopted by humanitarian practitioners as a method of supporting people's agency and choices about how and where to rebuild after a disaster. This chapter examines recovery in an urban and a rural area after the 2013 Typhoon Haiyan, which devastated the Visayas region of the Philippines and illustrates how land tenure security influences people's choices to rebuild on-site or relocate.

Part 5: natural resource and human occupation issues

[Chapter 13](#) draws on research Elizabeth Mansilla undertook as part of the 'Reducing Relocation Risk' project about resettlement in the Ría Celestún Biosphere Reserve in Yucatán, Mexico. She questions the logic that a conventional approach to wholesale resettlement of the population is the answer, and instead proposes that a more imaginative idea of development, based on a comprehensive management of the environmental, social and urban challenges prevailing in the area, could be a better alternative.

In [Chapter 14](#) Garima Jain, Chandni Singh and Teja Malladi offer a case study of Chennai, India to exemplify how post-disaster resettlement can further aggravate risks for the settlers and for the city if the resettlement locations are also exposed to hazards. They show how the direct socio-economic implications of first the disaster, and then the process of resettlement and the degraded conditions of living in risk-exposed resettlements, further exacerbate vulnerabilities. In effect, new socio-economic and ecological risks are created for the people as well as the city at large as a consequence of poorly planned interventions.

In the [final chapter](#) of the book ([Chapter 15](#)), Teddy Kisembo looks at household-level decision-making about relocation in Kampala. Based on empirical data from two neighbourhoods in environmentally sensitive wetland areas, she analyses the reasons why people tolerate risks and stay in the neighbourhood, and what are the tipping points that promote people to move. Although some people are drawn to staying in the neighbourhoods due to social and business ties, the lack of financial ability

to move generally inhibits people from relocating to safer locations – as most would prefer to do, if they could.

Conclusion

The concluding chapter of the book synthesises and integrates the issues raised in the preceding chapters. The lessons learned about relocation and resettlement from multiple perspectives and geographical contexts are discussed, outlining the way forward through a series of recommendations. These suggestions are aimed at helping practitioners to develop better processes for implementation and decision-making for disaster risk reduction and resettlement.

Notes

1. Equivalent to *relocalización* or *reubicación* in Spanish.
2. *Reasentamiento* in Spanish.
3. See [Appendix A](#) for a mapping of the case studies across the relocation and resettlement typology described earlier.
4. <https://www.ucl.ac.uk/bartlett/development/reducing-relocation-risk-urban-areas>.

References

- Cabannes, Yves, Silvia Guimarães Yafai and Cassidy Johnson, eds. 2010. *How People Face Evictions*. London: Development Planning Unit/University College London. <https://world-habitat.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/How-people-face-evictions.pdf>.
- Cernea, Michael M., and Hari Mohan Mathur, eds. 2007. *Can Compensation Prevent Impoverishment? Reforming resettlement through investments and benefit-sharing*. New Delhi and Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Correa, Elena. 2011. *Populations at Risk of Disaster: A resettlement guide*. With Fernando Ramírez and Haris Sanauja. Washington, DC: World Bank and GFDRR. https://www.gfdrr.org/sites/gfdrr/files/publication/resettlement_guide_150.pdf.
- de Sherbinin, Alex, Marcia Castro and François Gemenne. 2010. *Preparing for Population Displacement and Resettlement Associated with Large Climate Change Adaptation and Mitigation Projects. Background paper for the Bellagio workshop, 2–6 November*. https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-55215-4_2.
- de Sherbinin, A., M. Castro, F. Gemenne, M.M. Cernea, S. Adamo, P.M. Fearnside, G. Krieger et al. 2011. 'Preparing for resettlement associated with climate change'. *Science* 334 (6055): 456–7. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1208821>.
- Ferris, Elizabeth. 2012. *Protection and Planned Relocations in the Context of Climate Change*. UNHCR Geneva. <https://www.unhcr.org/protection/globalconsult/5024d5169/27-protection-planned-relocations-context-climate-change-elizabeth-ferris.html>.
- Ferris, Elizabeth. 2014. *Planned Relocations, Disasters and Climate Change: Consolidating good practices and preparing for the future. Background document. Sanremo consultation, 12–14*

- March, 2014. UNHCR, Brookings-LSE and Georgetown University. <https://www.unhcr.org/53c4d6f99.pdf>.
- Leckie, Scott. 2013. *The Peninsula Principles on Climate Displacement within States*. Geneva: Displacement Solutions. <http://displacementsolutions.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/12/Peninsula-Principles.pdf>.
- Mathur, Hari Mohan. 1995. *Development, Displacement, and Resettlement: Focus on Asian experiences*. New Delhi: Vikas.
- Mathur, Hari Mohan, and David Marsden, eds. 1998. *Development Projects and Impoverishment Risks: Resettling project-affected people in India*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Menon-Sen, Kalyani, and Gautam Bhan. 2008. *Swept off the Map: Surviving eviction and resettlement in Delhi*. New Delhi: Yoda Press.
- Oliver-Smith, Anthony. 2012. 'Debating environmental migration: Society, nature and population displacement in climate change'. *Journal of International Development* 24 (8): 1058–70. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jid.2887>.
- Oliver-Smith, Anthony, and Alex de Sherbinin. 2014. 'Resettlement in the twenty-first century'. *Forced Migration Review* 45: 23–5.
- Quinn, Tara, François Bousquet, Chloe Guerbois, Elias Sougrati and Matthieu Tabutaud. 2018. 'The dynamic relationship between sense of place and risk perception in landscapes of mobility'. *Ecology and Society* 23 (2). <https://doi.org/10.5751/ES-10004-230239>.
- Revi, A., D. Satterthwaite, F. Aragón-Durand, J. Corfee-Morlot, R.B.R. Kiunsi, M. Pelling, D.C. Roberts and W. Solecki. 2014. 'Urban areas'. In *Climate Change 2014: Impacts, adaptation, and vulnerability. Part A: Global and sectoral aspects. Contribution of Working Group II to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, 535–612. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Satiroglu, Irge, and Narae Choi. 2015. *Development-Induced Displacement and Resettlement: New perspectives on persisting problems*. London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315760520>.