1 Scope of the question

The differences between camp and settlement approaches to refugee assistance are behind what Kibreab once called the ‘most sustained single controversy in African Refugee Studies’ (Kibreab 1991) which surrounds the comparative advantages of self-settlement to organized settlement and refugee camps. It is a debate with very real implications. Although these numbers should be treated with caution, according to UNHCR (2002 est.) there are currently some 5.8 million refugees hosted in camps and centres around the world. This includes over 50 per cent of all UNHCR-assisted refugees in Africa (a total of 2,169,558 people), and 35 per cent of refugees in Asia. Clearly, camps and, albeit to a much lesser degree, planned rural settlements, constitute the main method of refugee assistance in the developing world, with the notable exception of Latin America.

Indeed, refugee camps easily qualify as the most conspicuous element of refugee assistance. They shape most Western images of the refugee phenomenon in developing countries – reflected for instance in the fact that awareness-raising campaigns by Médecins Sans Frontières (MSF) involve a travelling exhibition reproducing a refugee camp. It is notable though that even though camps are often seen as a third-world phenomenon, increasing use of detention centres in the West seems to reintroduce ‘camp-based’ answers to refugee issues here too.
On the other hand, large quantities of refugees still self-settle all over the world, despite the fact that increasingly restrictive policies by host governments have not only reduced the number of spontaneously settled refugees but also have meant that these situations can no longer be studied without attention to the potential risks such studies can entail for their subjects. At the Arusha Conference in 1979, figures of self-settled refugees in Africa were estimated to be 40 per cent of the total (Rogge 1987), and Chambers (1979) claimed them to reach 77 per cent in the same year. These numbers are of course notoriously imprecise partially because self-settled refugees tend to live outside the assistance circuit of international agencies. Karadawi notes that only up to 40 per cent of those self-settled may receive material assistance (Karadawi 1983) whereas Cuenod estimated that no more than 25 per cent of African refugees lived in settlements where they could receive aid (Cuenod 1989).

Websites:
UNHCR statistics
http://www.unhcr.org/cgi-bin/texis/vtx/home/opendoc.pdf?tbl=STATISTICS&id=3d0df49c4

Jeff Crisp, ‘Who has counted the refugees? NHCR and the politics of numbers’
http://www.unhcr.org/cgi-bin/texis/vtx/research/opendoc.pdf?tbl=RESEARCH&id=3ae6a0c22

Radical Statistics
Oliver Bakewell, ‘Can we ever rely on refugee statistics?’
http://www.radstats.org.uk/no072/article1.htm

1.2 User’s guide
This review falls necessarily short of providing an exhaustive overview of all cases and arguments that defend, define, or denigrate different forms of refugee settlement. Instead it tries to provide a useful overview of the main issues concerned and to guide further study. Geographically it is skewed towards Sub-Saharan Africa. This is for the simple reason that Africa is host to both more refugees and more refugee-camps than any other region. Section One offers some methodological caveats and deals with definitional issues. Section Two is organized by issue area and deals with directly comparative issues. The admittedly awkwardly named rubric ‘social aspects’ covers socio-economic as well as socio-psychological issues. Readers more interested in some of these aspects are asked to also refer to FMO guides on psycho-social issues and gender. Given the disproportionate amount of research done on refugee camps, Section Three references literature that deals more or less exclusively with self-settled refugees and organized rural settlements. In each section, web-based sources are provided for further study. A bibliography of referenced and/or other important paper-based sources is provided at the end of this document.

1.3 Terminology and conceptual issues
The debate about the costs and benefits of different forms of refugee settlement was revived in the 1990s but still retains much terminological confusion. In the standard literature, the terms ‘camps’ and ‘settlements’ tend to be used interchangeably. The catalogue of the Refugee Studies Programme in Oxford, for instance, distinguishes between ‘organized settlements’, which include closed camps; ‘camps’, which include settlement literature; and ‘assisted self-settlements’. Far from revealing inaccuracy on the part of the author, librarian, or practitioner, such definitions indicate how effectively blurred are the distinctions between these groups. UNHCR itself has
differentiated between ‘permanent camps’ and ‘camps’. It calls the ‘Rhino-camp’ (official name) in Uganda a ‘settlement’ (official definition), but then lists Ugandan settlements as camps/centres in its statistical overview.

Moreover, different authors may situate the debate quite differently depending on the way the two categories (camps and settlements) are defined. There is often a tendency to define both according to the way they relate to an ultimate, durable solution: for some, camp and settlement approaches refer to two different stages in the refugee cycle, the former referring to temporary shelter, the latter to a durable solution, namely integration into the host country - which might or might not be preceded by a period of camp-based assistance. Others define camps as part and parcel of another durable solution, namely repatriation, while also holding settlements to be inevitably part of integrationist approaches.

Perhaps more appropriately, ‘camps and settlements’ can be understood to cover three forms of assistance policies: (1) planned and (2) unplanned rural settlements which are based on various forms of officially recognized self-reliance, and (3) camps generally based on full assistance. This perspective postpones, (for purposes of definition only) the politically charged question of durable solutions, and instead concentrates on the different forms of assistance in situ. The UNHCR’s Evaluation and Policy Unit has in some ways taken this last approach by introducing the umbrella terms of ‘protracted refugee situations’. This approach bypasses many of the definitional issues involved. The terminology applies to both organized settlements and camps, as long as they exist for more than five years without clear prospects of finding a durable solution such as voluntary repatriation, local integration, or resettlement. The approach excludes spontaneous or self-settlement. It is in line with UNHCR statistical tables, which also generally combine camps and planned settlements in one category called ‘camps/centres’ (even though here no time limit is specified).

1.3.1 Defining camps and settlements

For many observers, the Rwandan refugee camps in Zaire, and more specifically those three camps around Goma (Kibumba, Mugunga, and Katale) which in 1994 together hosted about 800,000 people (alongside a cholera epidemic), have certainly gained ‘paradigmatic status’ – and fuel much of the scepticism of camps. Yet the notion of camps covers a much wider range of situations, and apart from the relatively clear-cut distinction between planned and self-settlement, definitions of refugee situations frequently lack objective criteria and clear demarcations. This is less important when one deals with immediate policy questions but inevitably skews any argument about policy-alternatives.

The table below indicates patterns of settlement in a continuum from integration/non-camps to segregation/closed camps (Van Damme 1998):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urban refugees &amp; integrated rural refugees</th>
<th>Peaceful cohabitation</th>
<th>Spatial separation</th>
<th>Spatial segregation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-settled Rwandans in Rutshuru Zaire</td>
<td>Rwandans in small open camps, Uvira, Zaire</td>
<td>Rwandans in large open camps, Goma, Zaire &amp; Benaco,</td>
<td>Rwandans in closed camps, Ngozi, Burundi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the wider literature, ‘camps’ are rarely conceptually defined, even though a number of characteristics underlie the usage of the term. The terminology always implies a specific mode of assistance.

Stein, for instance, favours Murphy’s (1955) emphasis on the effects of camps: ‘although the physical conditions of camps may vary widely, from hell to hotels, the effects tend to be uniform. The most important characteristics of the camps are: segregation from the host population, the need to share facilities, a lack of privacy, plus overcrowding and a limited, restricted area within which the whole compass of daily life is to be conducted. This gives the refugees a sense of dependency, and the clear signal that they have a special and limited status, and are being controlled.’

What follows are five parameters which frequently underlie the usage of the terms ‘camps’ or ‘settlements’, and which serve to define refugee accommodation. Most of the below criteria are not dichotomous measures; many are quantifiable. Taken together they inform most of the typologies and choice of vocabulary recurrent in the literature. Hoerz (1995) uses them to describe a settlement continuum ranging from low to high spatial and economic integration of refugees with the surrounding population, similar to Van Damme’s typology above. His categories move from ‘completely separate existence of refugees and locals (“closed camps”’); ‘in camps but free to trade’; ‘in camps but free to move and trade’; ‘separate status but equal opportunities with locals’ (e.g. agricultural settlements); and ‘integration of refugees and refugee settlements’. A more directly descriptive typology, which uses some of the parameters below, can be found in Jacobsen 2001.

Parameters for camps and settlements

(1) Freedom of movement: the more this is restricted, the more a refugee settlement is generally seen to take on the character of a camp. Even though the cases where refugee movement outside designated areas is strictly impossible are rare, legal restriction and even lax and arbitrary enforcement have large implications for refugee livelihoods. This characteristic of camp situations is amply documented and moreover echoes refugee perceptions: the Rwandese refugees in Tanzania, who were studied by Malkki, protested against the misnomer ‘settlement’ for their location, arguing that ‘it is a camp because we cannot leave when we want to’ (Malkki 1995).
(2) **Mode of assistance/economics:** one may distinguish between camps based on relief handouts and food distribution with little possibility for refugees to engage in subsistence farming or other economic activities, and, on the other hand, situations in which refugees can engage in a wider range of economic activities. Measurable indicators may be plot size in camps and the range of de facto restrictions on work. In camps, generally only limited income-generating programmes are permitted, while self-settled refugees will tend to be more integrated into the local economy, be it with or without governmental permission.

(3) **Mode of governance:** this indicates the mechanisms of decision-making within or over the refugee community. Chambers (1979) uses this parameter when he states that settlements are like camps when hierarchies are external and abusive, defining camps and settlements in terms of different mechanisms of power. Camps are thus notably distinguished from self-settlements by the parameters of control: the restrictions on socio-economic, political, and cultural freedoms that are placed on their inhabitants over and above those existing for local populations. At the extreme end, Hyndman defines camps as ‘sites of neo-colonial power-relations where refugees are counted, their movements monitored and mapped, their daily routines disciplined and routinized by the institutional machinery of refugee relief agencies’ (Hyndman 1997).

(4) **Designation as temporary locations/shelter** (irrespective of their actual longevity): an early UNREF document notes ‘there is no standard definition of “refugee camp” ... It would seem, however, that the term “refugee camp” designates a group of dwellings of various descriptions …which, mainly because of the poor conditions of the dwellings but also for other reasons, are meant to provide temporary shelter’ (UNREF 1958). Being considered temporary is both a characteristic of a camp and itself shapes policy responses regarding economic and social freedoms of refugees.

(5) **Population size and/or density:** this indicator, connected to questions of freedom of movement, planning, and economics, is also a useful definitional guide. Clark and Stein, in their detailed evaluation of UNHCR settlement history, refer to the key obstacle related to ‘settlements’ as overcrowding arising from the temptation to ‘fill up and over’, which turns them into camps or transit centres (see also Black 1998). Following the large-scale influx of Burundi and Rwandese refugees into Tanzania in the mid 1990s, a number of sites that were initially conceived on the model of the older rural refugee settlements of the 1970s were reduced in plot size and turned into camps in order to accommodate the increasing numbers of new arrivals.

**Websites:**
http://www.msu.edu/course/pls/461/stein/MNREXP1.htm

Summary of Goethert and Hamdi in the report of the shelter-project group at Cambridge, 1988
http://www.arct.cam.ac.uk/shelter/downld/drafts/reportdraft1.pdf
1.3.2 Key introductory texts and some methodological caveats

As far as there is a real debate about the alternatives of camps and organized and self-settlement, two different sets of debates are often mixed. One concentrates on the causal effect of different settlement patterns measured by a variety of social and economic indicators. The second is concerned with the factors that cause different settlement patterns. Most texts presented here shift back and forth between these two sets of causal analysis and for analytical purposes it is useful to be aware of the distinction.

Not many texts systematically compare the effects of camp and settlement situations on refugee welfare, host economies, and political structures, or general levels of security and conflict. This is partially due to both a lack of available research and its relatively slow consolidation. Another reason is the general tendency within refugee studies to eschew potentially problematic comparisons in favour of in-depth case studies. While this has much to do with refugee studies' disciplinary origins in anthropology, there are other methodological issues that make structured comparison difficult. These include, among others:

1. **Differences in population**: it is repeatedly the case that the most vulnerable and weakest stay within the camps and the more able refugees avoid them.

2. **Third variables**: success or failure of planned or self-settlement may be contingent on a variety of variables, such as familiarity with the host country and its population, the degree of hospitality encountered, and the economic resources and land generally available. Increasingly, studies that focus on refugee impact on local communities emphasize the importance of local context for success and failure of the pursuit of an ever-wider range of (refugee) policy aims.

3. **Interdependence of cases**: in many cases, refugees may live in different settlement patterns co-existing in the same host country, and linkages may exist between them. In such instances, refugees might be doubly based, using both the camp and the outside to ensure their personal or family livelihoods and/or survival (Hyndman 1997). There is indeed consistent evidence of this phenomenon even though its significance is understandably difficult to gauge.

Despite these limitations, the debate has continued, and recent key introductory texts and bibliographic references can be found in the websites below (also see Kibreab 1991). For an anthropological account comparing the evolution of refugees (in Tanzania) who lived in planned settlements with those who lived unofficially in a more urban context, see also Malkki’s by now well-known study *Purity and Exile* (1995).

Generally speaking, criticism of camp-based solutions is based either on arguments that emphasize questions of economic or social development, or that are rooted in a rights-based critique which takes as a starting point the many restrictions on socio-economic and political freedoms that accompany camp-based refugee assistance. Also, many studies deal with a combination of the two.

Where it focuses on questions of development or resource management, proponents of various forms of planned or self-settlement emphasize participatory approaches and call for a capacity-
based developmental model to replace the traditional ‘relief model’ (seen to underlie camps) which is said to encourage passivity and hopelessness. As Crowley (1991) notes, ‘Although the welfare model has long been discredited as paternalistic and self-serving in the context of development, it's still dominant in the ethos and practice of emergency relief.’ Especially in the past, concern with integrationist approaches to refugee assistance had this clear developmental focus (Betts 1984). Major attempts to introduce alternative approaches are put under umbrella terms such as Refugees and Development (RAD), Refugee Affected Area-Approach (RAA), and Integrated Rural Development (IRD), and emphasize zonal development and, increasingly, a range of participatory, community-based methods of assistance. Most recently, High Commissioner Ruud Lubbers revived some of these ideas when talking about the ‘four Rs’ (repatriation, reintegration, rehabilitation, and reconstruction) in his vision for ‘UNHCR 2004’.

Rights-based critiques tend to focus on the breaches of refugee rights, both political and socio-economic, that accompany various assistance methods and generally conclude that camp-based solutions undermine the rights refugees are supposed to enjoy as both refugees and as human beings.

In sum, camp critiques point to the way camp settings prevent integration of refugees and host populations, increase dependency on relief aid, and ignore the resources and capacities of refugees themselves, as well as neglecting the repercussions of a refugee influx on the host populations.

On the other hand, ‘defenders’ of camps emphasize their advantages in facilitating organized repatriation of refugees, attracting international assistance due to the higher visibility of impact, and their superior ability to monitor and target recipients and distribute aid faster and more effectively, especially in the short-run and in immediate emergency situations. They point out that in many refugee-hosting countries, international standards of assistance are most easily upheld in a controlled setting. This is in particular the case for curative health care and (primary) education facilities.

However, ‘in principle’ some basic agreement exists among both policy-makers and academics about the frequent undesirability of refugee camps (see the UNHCR Emergency Handbook). The crux of the debate is therefore about two questions:

1. How to evaluate the trade-offs between the recognized negative effects of camps and their advantages under a range of financial, political, and time constraints that prevent the pursuit of an ideal assistance programme.

2. The degree to which alternatives to camps are politically and financially feasible. Here the debate about camp or settlement solutions frequently ends in a common agreement on the undesirability of camp approaches, only to usher in a debate about their necessity for political and logistical reasons. This second aspect deals no longer with the effects of settlement patterns, but concentrates on the factors that initially cause and later sustain them. Most texts in this review deal at least implicitly with the second set of questions. There is in addition a small but increasing amount of studies that deal with the determinants of refugee policy and the way it is defined by host states and UNHCR as well as the role local, regional, and global factors play in shaping it.
Websites:
Forced Migration Review 2, May–August 1998
Articles by Barbara Harrell-Bond and Richard Black
http://www.fmreview.org/FMRpdfs/FMR02/fmr206.pdf
http://www.fmreview.org/FMRpdfs/FMR02/fmr201.pdf

Answers to camp debate by Crisp, Jacobsen, and Black

Letters by Corsellis and Verdirame

id21 media
Interview with Barbara Harrell-Bond and Jeff Crisp

University Press.
http://www.sussex.ac.uk/migration/publications/final/

Karen Jacobsen's comprehensive overview
http://www.jha.ac/articles/u045.pdf

Forced Migration Online
http://www.forcedmigration.org/

2 Camp and settlement issues
2.1 Historical overview
Human settlements appear as a relatively natural form of human life, both during peacetime and
war. The origins of (refugee) camps are more difficult to trace. Malkki (1995), for instance, has
traced their lineage within the international refugee regime to the very origins of the latter, that is
the camps for the displaced in post-war Europe.

In Africa, where the debate between proponents of both self-settlement and planned settlements as
well as relief-type camps has been most vocal in the past, historical debates about the mechanisms
and methods of refugee assistance can be traced through a number of landmark conferences and events.

Many observers credit the 1967 conference on the Legal, Economic, and Social Aspects of the
African Refugee Problems, which was convened in Addis Ababa under the auspices of the UN
Economic Commission for Africa, the Organization for African Unity (OAU, now the African
Union or AU), the UNHCR, and the Dag Hammarskjöld Foundation, with providing the first big
step towards an integrated approach to refugee assistance. The desire to link refugee assistance to
the development needs of the host country was implicit in the final recommendation, which called
for a zonal development approach based on the sharing of responsibility by host governments, UNHCR, UNPD, and non-governmental organizations (NGOs).

However, Integrated Rural Development (IRD) as a model for refugee assistance preceded Addis Ababa: Betts (1981) describes similar projects set up in Kivu, Zaire, and Burundi, which were based on close cooperation between the UNHCR and the International Labour Office (ILO) and, in Burundi, the League of the Red Cross and the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). The Zairan project was administered as a joint initiative of UNHCR and ILO, as the main agency showed some signs of economic success, but fell prey to political disturbances that caused the death of the two main administrators. In Burundi the lack of expertise that was required for long-term planning as opposed to emergency relief posed problems. Overall, Betts concludes that these early attempts at IRD failed because of poor definition of ultimate objectives, general project mismanagement, discontinuity created by rotation of personnel, and the deteriorating political situation in 1972. Whatever the reasoning, it is at this stage that Pitterman observes a more fundamental move in UNHCR’s budget, from an emphasis on rural settlements to emergency relief (Pitterman 1984).

Despite setbacks, the idea of linking refugee relief explicitly with the overall social and economic dynamics of the host countries survived in small circles and was to become an issue again. In line with the recommendation of an internal UNHCR Seminar held in 1976, the Pan-African Conference on the Situation of Refugees in Africa, held in Arusha, Tanzania, in 1979, reiterated the themes evoked in Addis Ababa and came out in favour of spontaneous rather than formal settlement.

The first International Conference on Refugees in Africa (ICARA I) was eventually convened in 1981 by UNHCR, the UN Economic Commission for Africa, and the OAU Committee of Fifteen on Refugees. But only with ICARA II in 1984 were integrationist projects given something of a new boost. ICARA II was called for partly because ICARA I had not raised enough funds for infrastructure projects (Kibreab 1991). Its purposes were defined as threefold: (1) to thoroughly review the results of ICARA I; (2) to consider providing additional international assistance to refugees and returnees in Africa for relief, rehabilitation, and resettlement; and (3) to consider the impact imposed upon the national economies of the concerned countries and to provide assistance to strengthen their social and economic infrastructure to cope with the burden of refugees and returnees.

All such attempts were based on the belief that the provision of relief based on large-scale administration to refugees in camps or settlements isolated from the host societies was an inappropriate form of assistance, and that refugees could serve as resources of development. At ICARA II, 128 different RAD project proposals were presented, requesting a total amount of US$362 million. Most project proposals focused on large infrastructure projects (Clark and Stein 1985). However, issues that loom high in the camp–settlement debate today, such as the rights to employment, security of status, and other socio-economic and political rights, were not discussed.

ICARA II stands as the last large and visible attempt to organize concerted action for RAA. Among the reasons for its failure, Kibreab notes the actors' divergent interpretations of the ultimate aim of developmental refugee assistance and a failure to guarantee the principle of additionality
(‘additionality’ refers to the idea that any investment in RAD should be supplementary instead of substituting for development aid) as guidelines for pledges made for ICARA II projects. Furthermore, divisions and rivalries among the assistance agencies, NGOs, and host-government departments, as well as a failure to set out a framework for their co-ordination, played a role (Kibreab 1991). Gorman also points out that great famine in sub-Saharan Africa converged to focus donor and media attention on emergency relief (Gorman 1987).

**Websites:**
Sphere Project: Humanitarian Charter and Minimum Standards in Disaster Response
http://www.sphereproject.org/handbook_index.htm

UNHCR Handbook for Emergencies
http://www.unhcr.org/cgi-bin/texis/vtx/home/+7wwBmTe9c_dwwwccwwwwwwwhFqhT0yfEtFqnpxcAFqhT0yfEcFq1nMnGtmDqon5arwDmxdADzmxwww1FqmRbZ/opendoc.pdf

UNHCR State of the World's Refugees (Chapter 6)
http://www.unhcr.org/cgi-bin/texis/vtx/publ/opendoc.pdf?id=3ebf9baf7&tbl=MEDIA

Barry N. Stein, ‘Returnee aid and development’
http://www.unhcr.org/cgi-bin/texis/vtx/home/opendoc.htm?tbl=RESEARCH&id=3bd40fb24&page=research

Jeff Crisp, ‘Mind the gap! UNHCR, humanitarian assistance and the development process’
http://www.unhcr.org/cgi-bin/texis/vtx/home/opendoc.pdf?tbl=RESEARCH&id=3b309dd07&page=research

Bonaventure Rutinwa, ‘The end of asylum? The changing nature of refugee policies in Africa’
http://www.unhcr.org/cgi-bin/texis/vtx/home/opendoc.pdf?tbl=RESEARCH&id=3ae6a0c34&page=research

Barry N. Stein, ‘Regional efforts to address refugee problems in the developing world’
http://www.msu.edu/course/pls/461/stein/region-1996.htm

Addis Ababa document on refugees and forced population displacements in Africa
http://www1.umn.edu/humanrts/africa/REFUGEE2.htm

Shelterproject.org history about camps
http://www.arct.cam.ac.uk/shelter/home/home.asp

Forced Migration Online
http://www.forcedmigration.org/

Bakhet, O. (1981) ‘The basic needs approach (BNA) to self-sufficiency in rural refugee settlements’
http://www.forcedmigration.org/
2.2 Rights and legal standards

As far as legal aspects are concerned, scholars have focused on the way in which camp settings themselves are conducive, or not, to the maintenance of refugee rights. Some observers maintain that camps can provide both security and effective material assistance to refugees, thereby not only assuring the most basic of rights, the right to life, but also facilitating the monitoring of protection issues (Jacobsen 2001). Jamal in particular has made a strong argument that ‘camps strengthen asylum by encouraging hosts to accept the presence of refugees’. (Jamal 2003:4) This argument is based on the belief that ‘host fatigue’ in many refugee-hosting countries is only held in check through the material presence of refugee camps. Camps are thus part of international ‘burden sharing’.

Critics argue that the maintenance of camps does not only involve direct breaches of basic human and refugee rights, but also creates situations in which other rights are more likely to be endangered. For instance, in its campaign on refugees launched in 1997, Amnesty International (AI) attacks primarily the restrictions on freedom of movement that some camps represent (Amnesty International 1997). Human Rights Watch (HRW), on the other hand, has written on the problems emerging especially for women in refugee camps. A more recent topic concerns the ways in which a variety of different and often parallel legal systems inter-relate in camp settings. These include so-called traditional courts and conflict-resolution mechanisms inside camps, the legal system of the host country, and lastly the international legal framework of the refugee, which is the frame of reference for UNHCR protection officers. Such debates are of course closely linked to debates about the protection mandate of the UNHCR and its relationship to the provision of material assistance.

Websites:

Human Rights Watch
http://hrw.org/campaigns/refugees/reports.htm
http://www<hrw.org/wr2k1/special/refugees.html

Lawyers Committee for Human Rights
http://www.lchr.org
Amnesty International
http://www.amnesty.org

Forced Migration Online
http://www.forcedmigration.org/

http://www.forcedmigration.org/

UNHCR
Conclusion No. 22 (XXXII) of the UNHCR Executive Committee on Protection of Asylum Seekers in Situations of Large-Scale Influx (Thirty-Second Session, 1981)

http://www.unhcr.org/cgi-bin/texis/vtx/home/+bwwBmewYZ69wwwwOwwwwwwwhFqh0kgZTtFqnnLnqAFqh0kgZTcFqew71rnmalqdnadhafBnG DwBodDwca7GdBnqBodDaoDaTw55afDhe1LeIG4rLnq1BoVnagdMMoBBnnaDzmxxwww1FqmRbZ/opendoc.htm

UNHCR Executive committee Conclusion 22 (XXXII), ‘Protection of Asylum Seekers in Situations of Large-Scale Influx’ (1981)
http://www.unhcr.org/cgi-bin/texis/vtx/home/+AwwBmeukZ69wwww3wwwwwwwhFqh0kgZTtFqnnLnqAFqh0kgZTcFqewxtrdDqc15odDa++aeNhBMkkfLe8mDeGT5ndBnqBodDadhaE5Oc1MaInnAnG5aoDaIoB1wBodD5adhaPwGtne2kfwwcnafDhec1Le55YSWK8WeZX3qmxwwwwww/opendoc.htm
2.3 Security

A common argument in favour of camp-based assistance is that it serves to contain the security problems introduced by refugees, to reduce conflict between host and refugees, and/or to control the potential of refugees from civil war to use their host country as a sanctuary from attack. Other security issues also include raids by rebel groups, pursuit of refugees by military forces of the country of origin, the importation of small arms, and generally increasing levels of ‘banditry’ and crime that are related to the current condition of refugee populations.

In Africa, many host states therefore justify control on the movement of refugees by citing Article 2(6) of the OAU Convention, which is interpreted as giving states full rights to decide on refugee settlement and the settlement patterns of the refugees. The article actually states that ‘for reasons of security countries of asylum shall, as far as possible, settle refugees at a reasonable distance from the frontier of their country of origin’. This contrasts with Article 26 of the Convention: ‘each state shall accord to refugees lawfully in its territory the right to choose their place of residence and to move freely within its territory, subject to any regulations applicable to aliens in the same circumstances’.

Especially since the 1990s, security-based arguments for encampment have been viewed with more scepticism. As Jacobsen puts it: ‘Camps do not solve security problems. They are in fact added sources of instability and insecurity … because they aggravate existing security problems and create new ones’ (Jacobsen 2001). These arguments hold that camps may create conflict between refugees and their hosts where refugees are perceived as privileged by the members of the host population, which is sometimes as poor as or poorer than the refugees. They also, as Durieux (2000) among others has pointed out, provide fertile ground for recruitment of young men and women for military activities by rebel groups. Bulcha (1988) shows moreover that more often the conflict within the refugee populations exceeds the potential conflict between them and their hosts. He specifies that, whilst differences of religion, ethnicity, and politics partially account for the latter conflicts, the most frequent causes are ‘relief-induced’, arising from frustration and idleness.

Websites:
Refugee Survey Quarterly special issue on camps and security
http://www3.oup.co.uk/refqtl/hdb/Volume_19/Issue_01/

UNHCR
Report by Ambassador Felix Schnyder on military attacks on refugee camps and settlements in Southern Africa and elsewhere
http://www.unhcr.org/cgi-bin/texis/vtx/home/+EwwBmesiZ69wuwZwuwuwuwFqh0kgZTtFqnnLrqAFqh0kgZTcFqewP-AnpdGBaxOaEMxw55wmdGa-ncoLalqrsDonGadDaMocoBwGOawBBwqA5adDaGnh1tnnaqwMps5awDma5nBBcnMnDB5aoD-ad1BrnGDaEhGoqwawDmanc5nirnGnDzmxwwwwww/opendoc.htm


Jeff Crisp, ‘A state of insecurity: the political economy of violence in refugee-populated areas of Kenya’

Karen Jacobsen, ‘A “safety-first” approach to physical protection in refugee camps’†

2.4 Health

For many, the professionalization of refugee assistance and the parallel development of today’s refugee camps is at its most basic level an answer to high mortality rates in Africa’s refugee crises. Refugee health is one of the most studied aspects of refugee assistance and encapsulates issues ranging from nutrition to reproductive health, mental health, and trauma treatment.

Immediately following a refugee influx, an initial emergency phase is identified by a crude mortality rate (CMR) of one or more deaths daily per 10,000 people. In general such mortality rates are at least double pre-displacement levels. ‘Most deaths result from preventable and treatable infections, often exacerbated by malnutrition, caused mainly by diarrhoeal disease, respiratory tract infections, measles, and malaria’ (Spiegel 2002:1,927). During this period the focus in on immediate life-saving interventions: ‘Acute refugee crises such as those that have occurred recently
in Goma, Bosnia, Somalia, Kosovo, East Timor, Angola, Sierra Leone, the Democratic Republic of Congo, to name but a few, are the emergency rooms of international public health’ (Waldman 2002).

A set of different questions emerge from an increasing awareness that many populations affected by complex humanitarian emergencies have been displaced for long periods, living relatively settled lives (Spiegel et al. 2000). Here especially, the range of issues involved in the health sector is ever-expanding, especially as public health concerns – as opposed to curative care – become important. Waldman (2001) has recently observed that more and more emergency health care is affected by ‘confusion on the issue of priorities’. In regards to the debate about forms of settlement the main health questions relate to:

(1) The effectiveness of emergency health care and how it is affected by different spatial settings.

(2) The changes necessary for post-emergency settings: ‘Humanitarian organisations often provide similar services in the emergency and post-emergency phases of complex humanitarian emergencies, despite increasing evidence and consensus that needs differ between phases’ (Spiegel et al. 2002:1,932).

(3) The proper way to manage health services for refugees in a variety of settings, namely via the establishment of parallel centres or attempts to work through local health systems.

In answering these questions, research is frequently hampered by real difficulties of measuring performance. This is so even where mortality rates are accepted as the prime dependent variable. A number of reasons for this exist, among them unavailability of accurate data due to poor record-keeping or underreporting of deaths in the camps. In addition, ‘data have mainly been obtained from the acute phase of complex emergencies, in which excess mortality as well as political interest, media attention, and funding is greatest. The post-emergency phase has been little studied, and no comprehensive programme guidelines exist for this phase’ (Spiegel et al. 2002:1,927). While there is much work done on health services in refugee camps, there are only a few treatments of refugee health care in more dispersed settlement situations (see notably Van Damme 1998).

With the above caveats in mind, there is wide-spread evidence that camps do indeed allow quick detection and treatment of health problems for refugees and that refugee camp health services are usually better supplied and organized than pre-existing services for the host population. Yet, inversely, adverse health effects of the camp environment can be numerous (see for instance Spiegel and Quassim 2003). The main factors causing epidemics and high mortality rates among displaced people are frequently: overcrowding in large settlements, poor access to water, and inadequate shelter. The effect of these conditions varies according to the condition in which refugees arrive, and the hardships they faced in their home countries and in flight.

At the extreme, based on research conducted in the Wad Sherifei refugee camp, Kassala, Sudan, during 1989, De Waal (1990, 1989) comes to conclude that refugee camps in countries such as Sudan provide one of the most pathogenic environments imaginable. Common deficiencies in refugee camps are protein and vitamins A and C. Camps which restrict movement and economic
and personal freedoms of the inhabitants in some cases encourage malnutrition arising from, as Wilson (1992) asserts, the principal shortcomings of the predominant current food distribution system. This includes insufficient quantity, erratic supply, insufficient micronutrient composition, and lack of variety and palatability (WHO 1988). Wilson concludes that much improvement in refugee nutritional needs could be obtained by removing constraints on the survival strategies often employed. These include the ability to trade food; make earnings through access to labour markets and/or the production of crafts and establishment of petty commerce; the gathering of wild foods; gardening; farming; or livestock-raising.

Overcrowding that occurs on camps as the result of massive refugee influxes or repeated regrouping is at the origin of many epidemic diseases (e.g. measles, cholera, dysentery, and meningitis) and avitaminoses occur mainly in camps where diseases such as beriberi, pellagra, and scurvy are still widespread (Van Damme 1995). Data on refugee health has shown a clear correlation between camps of increasing size and elevated mortality (NOHA 1994, but see Spiegel et al. 2002). Data collected by MSF on the 1991 pellagra epidemic in Malawi indicate in addition that camp populations, once infected, were more severely affected than self-settled refugees (Malfait 1991), despite the fact that health services established for refugees often far exceed the quality of health services normally available for local populations.

More recently a study of mortality data in fifty-one ‘post-emergency phase camps’ which focused on the associations between mortality and health indicators found mortality rates in more recently established camps to be higher than in longer-established ones. In addition, local health workers numbered fewer than in longer-standing camps. Water provision and rates of diarrhoea seemed to increase under-five mortality rates. Importantly, the study also shows an association between increased trauma morbidity in camps situated closer to the border or area of conflict than in those situated further away (Spiegel et al. 2002). The study concentrated on post-emergency phase camps in which refugees received outside food aid and health care. The authors note, however, other, very similar mortality data from rather different situations, namely where refugees no longer receive such services, either because they have integrated locally or for other reasons. At the very least this seems to indicate that simple mortality rates may not be the most informative measure of refugee health care in a post-emergency setting.

Before refugee camps became the dominant mode of refugee assistance, an integrative approach to refugee health care seems to have dominated. Yet little is known about the comparative effectiveness of such programmes. Van Damme et al.’s study deals with a rare contemporary case in which refugee health care was integrated into the local health care system. In Guinea, the resources of the refugee- assistance programme not only served the refugees but also significantly improved the local health system and transport infrastructure. The authors conclude that ‘the non-directive refugee policy in Guinea ... may be a cost-effective alternative to camps’ (Van Damme et al. 1998:1,609). Moreover, as Toole and Waldman (1993) have argued, mortality might have been lower because many refugees were self-settled, ‘avoiding the problems associated with crowded and unsanitary camps’.

**Websites:**
*The Lancet*
2.5 Social aspects
Immediately following a large-scale refugee influx, camps provide life-saving services, most clearly in terms of health care and food but also by focusing attention on a crisis situation. Yet where the goals of refugee assistance in camps are defined by ‘minimum standards’, ‘larger questions of needs and freedoms’ (Jamal 2003:5) may be ignored. The wider social and socio-economic consequences of different types of settlement have increasingly been the focus of concerns by academics and practitioners alike. In operational terms they have tended to be put under the somewhat uneasy label (and frequently vaguely defined sector) ‘community services’ (Bakewell 2003).

2.5.1 Dependency and coping mechanisms
In Somalia, Waldron observed that ‘almost every functional prerequisite of society is defined radically differently in the refugee camp as compared with the self-sustaining, kinship-based rural communities of the Somali and Oromo refugees’ (Waldron 1992). Pushing this argument further, Ryle (1992), in his observation of Somali Refugees in Ethiopian Camps, observes how ‘in compensation for the loss of skills as farmers and stockmen they have become skilled manipulators of the international welfare system’.

Success of refugee assistance and protection, especially in protracted refugee situations, encompasses at least the facilitation of ‘functioning communities’ and livelihoods. In this respect, two problems are often discussed in the debate about settlement patterns, that of dependency and the issue of ‘negative’ and ‘positive’ coping mechanisms.

The creation of passive dependency among refugees is often perceived as the real spectre of camps. In his well-documented State of the Art Review of Refugee Studies in Africa (1991), Kibreab notes the ‘general consensus in the literature that prolonged residence in camps fosters “dependency syndrome” among refugees’. From another angle, this has been echoed in arguments to move away from a provision of ‘minimum [emergency] standards’ towards the broader notion of ‘basic needs’ in protracted refugee situations. Both emphasize the need to expand the social and economic capacities of refugees in an assistance setting after the immediate emergency phase (UNHCR 2000).

This latter point is frequently taken up in the debate about ‘coping mechanisms’, a term that seems to be used to refer to all and any ways in which refugees organize themselves to sustain their livelihoods. As noted above, restriction associated with camp settings may foreclose economic opportunities for refugees. They may also lead to so-called ‘negative coping mechanisms’ such as prostitution or theft. One of the most obvious cases between ‘coping mechanisms’ and the logic of emergency assistance is that of food aid. The (mainly illicit) attempts by refugees to acquire second or increased rations is a frequent problem for the equitable distribution of resources, not to speak of
accounting issues. Similarly, agencies often see the sale and export of food aid as sign of excess when further study has frequently shown it to be a coping strategy to accommodate other material, cultural, or micronutrient needs that may come at a high cost to the energy content of their diet (Reed and Habicht 1998).

In a pointed reminder of the wider political problems that are part and parcel of the settlement debate, Malkki (1995) has studied the differences between Rwandan Hutu refugees that remained in refugee camps in Tanzania since 1972 and those who settled in an urban environment. She argues that there were substantial differences in a variety of social dynamics and wider quality-of-life indicators as a result of different types of settlement options. In addition, the first group of refugees, which remained isolated from their host community, created an imaginary and idealized image of the ‘Hutu Nation’ which they both incarnated and would eventually return to, preserving, justifying, and reproducing the antagonism between Hutu and Tutsi in Rwanda. Even though Malkki’s work has since been criticized, among other things, for a lack of focus on the political dynamics inside the camps and an underestimation of the linkages between both groups of refugees, it remains highly influential and one of the only studies of its kind.

2.5.2 Refugee women
When evaluating the broader social and economic effects of assistance patterns on refugees, longstanding concerns with ‘dependency’ have since the 1990s been joined by the realization of the considerable implications that modes of assistance have for refugee women and children. These issues have moved to the forefront at least partially because, as noted above, a larger proportion of assisted refugees tend to be women and children (Crisp 2002) and because increasing attention to their conditions has revealed a number of glaring cases of abuse and exploitation in camp settings. The public discovery of widespread sexual exploitation in the refugee assistance programme in Guinea had the dubious honor of pushing these issues to the fore, and similar cases have been documented in Tanzania and elsewhere. While there is ample evidence that the incidence of sexual and gender-based violence is not confined to camps – a study on the situation of refugees in Congo Brazaville in 1999 noted 1,600 cases of rape reported between May and December 1999 from the hospitals of Brazzaville, highlighting ‘the high prevalence of sexual violence directed against women and girls during migration’ (Legros and Brown 2001) – the perversity of a system of protection that undermines its very ambition has caused much debate within policy circles.

Moreover, while there is little documentation of the extent to which previously encountered gender conditions affect women's post-flight circumstances, it is broadly accepted that refugee women are highly vulnerable in camps, especially in regards to sexual exploitation. This is partly because family protection and traditional authority structures are less reliable, and new power-relations are created and sustained by the introduction of new rules and material relationships brought about by international relief. Even in camp situations where more participatory approaches have been tried, women tend to stay largely excluded from these supposedly democratic structures set up in ignorance of pre-existing social patterns. Hyndman's (1997) interviews in the Dadaab camps at the Kenyan border point to the correlated fact that, as a consequence, women often create their own community-based arrangements outside official circuits of (socio-economic) refugee participation and power-arrangements, which portray their own set of hierarchies and conflictive relations.
Again, it should be noted that the debate here is concerned not so much about the desirability of these circumstances, but about the appropriate means to change them. Maximalists will hold that a camp setting with its regulation and rules almost unavoidably creates the space for such ‘perverse effects’ of assistance programmes. Others believe that camp-based assistance can be improved up to a satisfactory or tolerable level and its advantages be made to outweigh their negative sides.

Websites:
Barry Stein on the refugee experience
http://www.msu.edu/course/pls/461/stein/MNREXP1.htm

UNHCR
www.unhcr.org/cgi-bin/texis/vtx/home/open-doc.pdf?id=3c7cf89a4&tbl=PARTNERS
Barbara Harrell-Bond, ‘Are refugee camps good for children?’
http://www.unhcr.org/cgi-bin/texis/vtx/home/opendoc.pdf?tbl=RESEARCH&id=3ae6a0c64&page=research
Simon Turner, ‘Angry young men in camps: gender, age and class relations among Burundian refugees in Tanzania’
http://www.unhcr.org/cgi-bin/texis/vtx/home/opendoc.pdf?tbl=RESEARCH&id=3ae6a0c38&page=research
Cindy Horst, ‘Vital links in social security: Somali refugees in the Dadaab camps, Kenya’
http://www.unhcr.org/cgi-bin/texis/vtx/home/opendoc.pdf?tbl=RESEARCH&id=3af66c884&page=research
Review of CORD Community Services for Congolese Refugees in Kigoma Region, Tanzania (Pre-publication edition)
http://www.unhcr.org/cgi-bin/texis/vtx/home/opendoc.pdf?tbl=RESEARCH&id=3d81ad774&page=research
Review of CORD Community Services for Angolan Refugees in Western Province, Zambia (Pre-publication edition)
http://www.unhcr.org/cgi-bin/texis/vtx/home/opendoc.pdf?tbl=RESEARCH&id=3d81b2924&page=research

http://www.unhcr.org/cgi-bin/texis/vtx/home/+PwwBmeMX269wwwwwwwwwwwhFqo20I0E2gltFqoGn5nwGqrAFqo20I0E2gltFqewyNzoDoM1MalBwDmwGm5awDma055nDBowcaNnnm5aoDa7GdBGwqBnma2nh1tnnaloB1wBodDeIG4taGnVoniadhaBnauNlg2a7GdtGwMMnáoDaQwA1MwCaQnDOwDzmxwwwww/opendoc.pdf

http://fletcher.tufts.edu/praxis/xviii/Bakewell.pdf

Forced Migration Online
Richard Reynolds, ‘Development in a refugee situation: the case of Rwandan refugees in Northern Tanzania’
2.5.3 Economic impact and development

The question of the economic impact of refugee populations on their hosts is deserving of a separate guide on its own, and it is very difficult to parse out the independent effect of settlement patterns in this respect. There is evidence that both camps and settlements have provided benefits as well as costs to their host countries. However, as Landau puts it: ‘… whether the aggregate effects on host populations and land are positive and negative … is next to impossible and would require an elaborate indices of gains and losses and considerable more longitudinal data than are typically available for the areas involved’ (Landau 2003:3). It is useful moreover to distinguish between short-term economic impact and long-term transformatory effect of the presence of both refugees and relief (Landau 2003).

Camps, which generally restrict the exercise of economic activities much more than self- or planned settlement options, tend to benefit host countries primarily through the temporary capital influx that comes from relief agencies running the camps. Phillips (2003) argues that the direct and indirect impact of this financial impact has remained largely unexplored. Her study shows that one of the reasons for this is doubtlessly the difficulties in tracing both material input and impact. Where refugee assistance is camp-based, a smaller economic impact is also felt through those refugees who manage to circumvent the restrictions placed upon them and engage in trading or work in the surrounding communities.

As far as the overall costs of refugee programmes are concerned (which are, at least in cash terms, mainly carried by the ‘international community’), the biggest costs of camps probably lie in the large funds that are required for food aid. Proponents of self-settlement schemes hold that these costs far exceed the funds needed for a regional economic stimulus package in refugee-affected areas that would increase local absorption capacity as well as benefit the hosts. Self-settlement or more open planned settlement, the argument goes, allow for a more long-term developmental, multiplier effect on the local economy (Zetter 1995). Some planned settlements have in the past been significant economic centres for surrounding villages, when they were integrated into a larger economic development strategy of the host country and when the economic potential of refugees was tapped into. Studies that show how self-settled refugees have positively impacted on sectors of the local economy range from the Afghan case to Zambia and Honduras, and are indicated in the bibliography below. Often a positive economic impact is only acknowledged after refugees leave an area. As Phillips (2003:16) notes: ‘While Afghan refugees were seen by many as a burden on the economy, their rapid repatriation from Pakistan, particularly from NWFP has caused a sharp downturn in the local economy, with many businesses recording severe losses and facing possible
closure after the massive exodus.’ This is echoed in parts of Tanzania as well as in other refugee hosting regions. It indicates the way in which an accurate assessment of the refugee impact is frequently complicated by the political and economic stakes of the actors involved.

**Websites:**
http://www.unhcr.org/cgi-bin/texis/vtx/home/opendoc.pdf?tbl=RESEARCH&id=3ae6a0c70&page=research

http://www.wits.ac.za/fmsp/landauwp.pdf

http://www.unhcr.org/cgi-bin/texis/vtx/home/opendoc.pdf?tbl=RESEARCH&id=3e71f7fc4&page=research

**2.6 Environment**
The impact of refugees on the environment and, inversely, that of different environmental conditions on refugees is part and parcel of any refugee situation. Refugees may exert additional pressures on environmental resources in a hosting area in a variety of ways, for example through poaching, deforestation (for fuel wood or purposes of farming), water use, and, when refugees own livestock, additional pollution and overuse of rangeland.

The specific effects of a refugee presence have also been seen as a function of the different types of settlement policies adopted. The environmental impact of camps is arguably more concentrated and therefore more easily amenable to policy intervention. Moreover, specialized agencies are frequently employed to limit environmental damage and set in place remedial measures. Yet it has been debated whether the impact of camps is therefore necessarily smaller or even more easily reversible (Jacobsen 1997).

**Websites:**
UNHCR special section on refugees and the environment
http://www.unhcr.org/cgi-bin/texis/vtx/home?page=PROTECT&id=3b94c47b4

Forced Migration Online
Richard Black, ‘Policy issues on the environmental impact of displacement of population during the emergency phase: expert consultation’
http://www.forcedmigration.org/

**3 Settlements**
**3.1 Planned settlements**
Planned rural settlements and camps often share the characteristic that they are placed in peripheral areas and on land that has not been used by the local population. This means they are badly placed to attain economic self-sufficiency (for a discussion of this notoriously imprecise term which seems more often than not defined by political and other non-economic criteria, see Kaiser 2000). In contrast to camps, settlements are intended to provide refugees with the opportunity to achieve some degree of self-reliance. Therefore, land characteristics are more important in the planning stage. This has in the past led to the relocation of settlements to increase their economic prospects.

Given the different economic base of settlements, which rely more on the productive potential of the refugees themselves and less on the impact of external relief items and infrastructure, the success of self-settlements relies disproportionately on a range of broader economic factors. Among these are local infrastructure and economic capacity, a local agro-ecological potential that allows for refugee integration into the economy, and the potential for refugee education and skill enhancement.

The link between refugees and the development prospects of their host is thus an essential feature of the ‘refugee problem’. As was recognized at the 1967 Conference on African Refugee Problems in Addis Ababa, refugee self-sufficiency at mere subsistence levels could not be considered conclusive. Formal development was required both to consolidate the refugee settlements and to integrate them into the local economic and social system. Furthermore, such development prompted by refugee presence should contribute effectively to the overall development of the country of asylum; thus, the surrounding population must be ensured an equal share of the advantage accruing (Betts 1984).

Camp-style food handouts have been criticized for ignoring the diversity of a refugee population and masking (or exacerbating) real inequalities in the camp. Yet planned settlement schemes do carry their own problems in this respect. Thus in the settlement schemes examined by Armstrong (1988) it was found that only a small number of the villages produced two-thirds of the crops marketed. In the Quala en Nahal settlement, unofficial land transfers resulted in the fact that only 36 per cent of the refugees still claimed the same amount of plot some time after initial, egalitarian distribution.

**Websites:**
Research report to the United States Agency for International Development, Refugee Policy Group, Barry Stein and D. Lance Clark, ‘Older Refugee Settlements in Africa’
http://www.msu.edu/course/pls/461/stein/FINAL.htm

UNHCR
Tania Kaiser, ‘UNHCR's withdrawal from Kiryandongo: anatomy of a handover’
http://www.unhcr.org/cgi-bin/texis/vtx/home/+XwwBmeAmJ69wvvwwwwwwwwwhFqo20I0E2gltFqoGn5nwGqrAFqo20I0E2gleFqVwDwBdMOadhwawwDmdVnGDzmxwwwwww/opendoc.pdf
Tom Kuhlman, ‘Responding to protracted refugee situations: a case study of Liberian refugees in Côte d’Ivoire’
3.2 Self- or spontaneous settlements

Despite the frequent absence of assistance for them, proponents of spontaneous settlement for refugees have claimed that self-settlement is the preferable option if long-term dynamics are taken into consideration. Moreover, they hold, self-settlements constitute the preferred option of refugees themselves, and that this is proven by the fact that most refugees self-settle. It may well be impossible to reach overarching conclusions about refugee choice in regards to their accommodation, and in some cases self-settled refugees (predominantly men) have expressed a greater feeling of insecurity than those in camps (Kibreab 1987). Kaiser (2000) has documented the way in which refugees in Uganda have resisted the handover of a refugee settlement to local authorities as they feared the loss of both protection and assistance.

Other authors, however, document widespread resistance to camps and settlements (Hansen 1992; Harrell-Bond 1986; Bulcha 1988; HRW 1999; Baker and Zetter 1995). This may be based on a variety of factors such as the reputation of camp administration, prior experience in settlements, and generalized fear to be forced to adapt to a camp lifestyle (Harrell-Bond 1986; Schelhas 1986; Kibreab 1991). Bulcha (1988) has closely related ‘maladjustment’ to a new situation with the loss of power and control expressed in refugee camps. This is often expressed through feelings such as paranoia, anxiety, suspicion, guilt, or general anxiety. Hansen’s study of Angolan refugees in Zambia implicitly confirms these findings when observing that generally camps were avoided due to ‘a reputation for disease and death, the fear of forced repatriation, and restrictions on social and residential patterns and mobility’ (Harrell-Bond and Voutira 1997).

As noted before, research on self-settled refugees is, for perhaps obvious reasons, much less available than that on camp-based assistance. The most well-known may be Hansen’s study of self-settled refugees in Zambia, which more recently were studied by Bakewell. Currently, only some host countries officially condone refugee self-settlement, whether in rural or urban areas. Among recent examples is the Ivory Coast (until recently ‘Guinea’). Many more do not enforce official restrictions on refugee movement.

A question that has attracted some attention is whether settlement patterns influence refugees’ reluctance (or desire) to eventually repatriate. Current evidence, while largely inconclusive, shows at a minimum that settlement patterns do not seem to be independent factors in this decision.
The fate of self-settled refugees is in many ways at the very heart of our understanding of the international refugee regime and its fundamental purpose. In the case of Guatemala, Cheng and Chuloba argue that the neglect of self-settled refugees was ‘one of the most striking shortfalls of the UNHCR response’. They add, ‘An organization cannot hope to effectively respond to a crisis without knowing with whom it is dealing. The shortfall undermines the agency’s credibility vis-à-vis the refugees, the host and the home governments, and the donors. In addition, it leads to the problem of adverse selection because the five per cent of the displaced population that ends up in the camps is probably the least mobile, the least skilled, and possibly also the least able to actively.’ Their position challenges both the current logic of refugee relief and those views that in extremis hold that refugees who avoid the purview of relief agencies and the frequently associated ‘encampment’ are actually better off than those who do not.

Websites:
Gaim Kibreab, ‘Displaced communities and the reconstruction of livelihoods in Eritrea’

UNHCR
Oliver Bakewell, ‘Refugee aid and protection in rural Africa: working in parallel or cross-purposes?’
http://www.unhcr.org/cgi-bin/texis/vtx/home/opendoc.pdf?tbl=RESEARCH&id=3ae6a0d04&page=research
Tania Kaiser, ‘A beneficiary-based evaluation of UNHCR’s programme in Guinea, West Africa’
http://www.unhcr.org/cgi-bin/texis/vtx/home/opendoc.pdf?tbl=RESEARCH&id=3b0a2a752&page=research
Naoko Obi and Jeff Crisp, ‘Evaluation of the implementation of UNHCR’s policy on refugees in urban areas’
http://www.unhcr.org/cgi-bin/texis/vtx/home/opendoc.pdf?tbl=RESEARCH&id=3c0f8bd67&page=research

Forced Migration Online
Gaim Kibreab, ‘Host governments and refugee perspectives on settlement and repatriation in Africa’
http://www.forcedmigration.org/
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