

Dam Development Induced Displacement In India: A Humanitarian Approach

Dinoop K¹, Simi Joseph²

¹ Research Scholar, School of International Relations and Politics, Mahatma Gandhi University Kottayam, Kerala, India dinoopdas36@gmail.com,

² Research Scholar, School of International Relations and Politics, Mahatma Gandhi University Kottayam, Kerala, India joemaria.ann6@gmail.com

Abstract

This article aims to study the impact of dam-developed induced displacement. Displacement is characterised as the displacement of people from their homes and communities. It also exacerbates economic inequality, helplessness, and isolation rather than mitigates it. This may mean the loss of livelihoods and families in the economy. In India, people are still forcefully displaced, and achieving the goal of resettlement remains extremely difficult. The study found that sustainable growth aspirations, where people are better off than before relocation, are still a long way off. The Adivasi or tribal people make up 40-50 per cent of the displaced, despite accounting for just 8% of the total population. Women in this class suffer more. In India, resettlement policies and programmes have primarily remained gender-segregated, failing to account for women's unique experiences, rendering resettlement a challenging process for them. Compensation alone would not be enough to restore and boost the income levels of those impacted completely

Keywords: India, Dam development, Displacement, livelihood, Resettlement

Introduction

Development-Induced Displacement and Resettlement (DIDR) occur when individuals in a development-driven form of forced migration are forced to leave their homes. Development-induced displacement is a social phenomenon affecting various human organisation levels, from tribal and village populations to well-developed urban areas. In developed countries, progress is commonly regarded as an unavoidable step toward modernisation and economic growth; however, the end result is often the loss of livelihood and impoverishment for displaced people. The displacement problem is seen as a necessary evil to create "greater good" factories, infrastructures such as dams, mines, bridges, and power plants. The research will be limited to forced displacement in India. Due to the state's rising violence in the name of development projects in many parts of India. Primary" or "direct" displacement happens when people are displaced to make way for a construction project from their traditional lands or when people migrate towards a project to meet a new labour demand" (Judge, 1997)

Generally, primary displacement is predictable and can, therefore, be mitigated by preparation. "Secondary" or "indirect" displacement is the product of the construction project's environmental, geographical and socio-political effects, which take place over time and away from the initial project. This form of displacement is harder to predict and control. There are essentially two types of debates on this subject: those advocating for faster economic growth and those advocating for environmental

protection. In particular, massive undertakings, which are deemed vital for socio-economic development; however that are harmful to environmental and ecological problems, need to be understood

A distinction is also made between conflict-induced and disaster-induced displacement when researching forced or involuntary migration, often known as forced or involuntary displacement. Human-induced displacement is usually referred to as "caused by humans," while disaster-induced displacement is typically attributed to natural causes. The definitions of these terms are helpful, but their distinctions can be blurred in practice because disputes over natural resources can occur. Human intervention can cause natural disasters like landslides. A forcibly displaced person is also known as a "forced migrant," a "displaced person" (DP), or an "internally displaced person" if they are displaced within their own country (IDP). Forcible displacement is a development issue as well as a humanitarian issue. Around 77percent of refugees have been forcefully displaced for even more than five years, and the vast majority of refugees and internally displaced people reside in developing nations (Parasuraman, 1999).

Host groups, too, need assistance. Forcibly displaced people are often forced to live in impoverished areas in developed countries, struggling to achieve their own development goals. The rapid influx of large numbers of newcomers poses a challenge for host governments, placing added strain on their ability to provide essential services and infrastructure. As a result, forced displacement is a growing problem as well as a humanitarian issue. Today's displacement circumstances are becoming more protracted, with nearly 16 million living in exile for more than five years. There is a need for a more long-term and sustainable approach to supporting the displaced and their hosts.

Methodology

This paper applies the qualitative research methodology. To answer the questions as to how the dam development affect the lives of marginalised people. This study was mainly based on the various secondary data from the World Bank, Internal Monitoring Displacement Centre, and various India's reports. Based on the available data, we made a descriptive analysis.

History of displacement in India

Displacement is characterised as the displacement of people from their homes and communities. It also exacerbates economic inequality, helplessness and isolation rather than mitigates it. This may mean the loss of livelihoods and families in the economy. Dams and other infrastructure projects have displaced a large number of people, but perhaps the actual number is contentious (Gellert & Lynch, 2003). According to a World Bank study, every new large dam project being built displaces on an average about 13000 residents. According to this calculation, over 39 million people will be displaced by more than 3000major dams. According to a comprehensive analysis of 54 large dams conducted by the Indian Institute of Public Administration in Delhi, the total number of displaced by a large dam is 44182 inhabitants. According to a World Bank report, each new large dam currently under construction relocates an average of 13000 people. According to this report, about 39 million people will be displaced by over 3000 large dams (World Bank, 2020). As stated by Walter Fernandes, the number of displaced people must have surpassed 40 million; the Hirakund dam in Orissa displaced only 1,00,000 people (Fernandes, 2001).

Displacement and its impact on India

India does have one of the world's biggest development displacements. With over 3600 large dams and another 700 under construction, India is the world's third-largest dam-building country. In the last 50 years, dams have been the most important cause of habitat loss and human relocation. Himanshu Thakkar, an environmentalist with the Narmada Bachao Andolan (NBA), In his presentation to the World Commission on Dams (WCD), mentioned the World Bank-funded projects account for 26.6 per cent of the world bank funded projects total causing displacement. This resulting displacement causing displacement accounts for 62.8 per cent of the total number of people displaced. It is also clear that the project's administrators do not regard relocation and recovery issues as critical components. Instead, technology requirements and the advantages of electricity and irrigation are the primary concerns. In this situation, concerned authorities seldom perform comprehensive and systematic surveys of the displaced population. This makes determining the exact number of displaced people extremely difficult.

However, there seem to be no reliable official estimates of the number of individuals who have been internally displaced as a result of India's rapid growth. According to official figures, India had roughly 15.5 million internally displaced persons by 1994, with the government acknowledging that another 11.5 million were awaiting rehabilitation. One of the most significant causes of development-related displacement is dam construction. According to a survey, some 3,300 significant reservoirs have been installed in India during the last fifty years. Many of them have resulted in the forced displacement of disadvantaged communities on a wide scale. The plight of the tribal people is of critical relevance since they constitute 40 to 50% of the total affected people. There has been a large proportion of displaced people since the colonial era. Land wealth, river systems and mineral bases have always been the most enticing zones for construction projects and have displaced many sections of Indian society. Furthermore, the bulk of construction projects are in tribal-populated areas in the more backwards regions (Negi & Ganguly, 2011)

In India, people are still forcibly relocated, and the resettlement mission continues exceedingly complex to achieve. Furthermore, sustainable growth aspirations, where people are better off than before relocation, are still a long way off. It seems incorrect to see this issue simply as a financial issue. Compensation alone will not completely restore and boost the income levels. In the nineties, development-induced displacement became a key concern amongst Indian social scientists and also an impediment. The problem arose because of the rapid increase in infrastructure projects and urban expansion in the 1980s, spurred by dam building and urbanisation and catastrophic reintegration experiences (Siddiqui 2012).

Project authorities have been well known that often include lower displacement estimates in proposal documents than are the case to illustrate a desirable cost-benefit ratio to funding agencies and thereby obtain approval for the project (Gellert & Lynch, 2003). According to a World Bank study of the state of displacement and reconstruction, project preparation failed to account for the displacement of up to 0.6 million people across 192 projects. At least one time, the number of people displaced surpassed the number mentioned in the project documents seven times. The number of people affected by the Hirakud dam was estimated to be between 1.1 lakh and 1.6 lakh, though

official estimates only show 1.1 lakh. According to unofficial estimates, 1.8 lakh people have been displaced as a result of the Hirakud dam.

In 1979, the Sardar Sarovar Reservoir was forecasted to have displaced a little over 6000 families. It reached a peak of 12000 in 1987. And it reached 40000 families in 1992. In India, people are still forcefully displaced, and achieving the goal of resettlement remains extremely difficult. Furthermore, sustainable growth aspirations, where people are better off than before relocation, are still a long way off. It appears that interpreting this problem exclusively as a financial problem is wrong. Compensation alone would not be enough to restore and boost the income levels of those impacted ultimately.

Since the 1960s, livelihood loss and displacement have been recurring in Madhya Pradesh's Singrauli district, primarily due to dam construction, electricity generation, and mining. In the Singrauli area, displacement began first in the 1960s with the Rihand dam and Govind Sagar Reservoir. Nearly 300 villages have been impacted by the Sardar Sarovar initiative, with 163,000 displaced and tribal communities seriously affected (Sharma & Singh, 2009). In the 1990s, displacement caused by development become a prominent issue and a challenge among Indian social scientists. The problem occurred because of the rapid increase in infrastructure projects and urban expansion in the 1980s, fueled by dam building and urban development coupled with devastating resettlement experiences. The Upper Krishna irrigation project displaced around 300,000 people. The sole requirements have been to draw personal investors and income. The coercion is used to expel people from their homes and territories, where they could have lived unfair and barbaric for centuries. In a genuinely democratic context, it could not be justified.

The government appears to be hell-bent on defending and fighting for the small business sector's interests on this topic. India's government admitted that several million people were displaced by dams, mines, industries, power plants, etc., and still 'awaiting rehabilitation', a very conservative figure by most independent researchers. The significant projects often are presented as development for the betterment of the country. The people who have sacrificed their livelihoods for the sake of the so-called "greater good" and national interest were doing it for the benefit of the entire country. Involuntary displacement occurred due to the necessity to build dams, transportation, power generation, and urban growth, among other things. Such ventures, it is believed, create jobs and develop services. Notwithstanding, this displaces individuals from their property, culture, and cultural identity and poses significant social justice and equality issues (Cernea, 1996).

The colonial Land Acquisition Act of 1894 has displaced at least 50 million people since the country's independence. And they didn't rehabilitate any of these people. Since independence, the rehabilitation services have failed terribly. Human population displacement from protected areas is affected by people's socio-economic conditions, also known as wildlife protection. The majority of these people, who live in urban shantytowns across India's major cities, are challenging to track down. Despite decades of protests and marches on displacement and recovery, no advancement has been achieved in reducing the victims' suffering (Siddiqui, 2011).

India has yet to devise a national recovery programme, despite the magnitude and scope of the displacement trauma. The lack of rehabilitation in a significant number of projects is a substantial contributor to the DPs' suffering and marginalisation. The lack of rehabilitation in many projects

contributes to the Displaced People (DPs') poverty and marginalisation. Just about a fifth of the displaced people has been relocated. Many projects do not provide rehabilitation. And if it is included in the schedule, it is finished after the project has begun. People affected by the Tungabhadra dam in Andhra Pradesh, for example, were resettled five years later. After a decade of displacement, the Displaced People of the joint Orissa-Andhra venture Machkund dam is resettled. Since India lacks a national rehabilitation policy and law, displaced people (DPs) and Project-Affected People (PAPs) cannot claim compensation or demand relocation due to Development Induced Displacement. How displaced people can make a living has not been a concern for Project planners (Ray, 2000).

In most cases, the Land Acquisition Act is used to compensate Patta-holders with a symbolic cash payment. The landless and those who depend on CPRs are not paid. Since their DPs/PAPs fought against the project or because the World Bank funds it, projects like the Sardar Sarovar and Upper Krishna have rehabilitation plans. This is why, in the 1970s, Gujarat had no rehabilitation plans for the Ukai dam, but it now has one of the most progressive rehabilitation plans for the Sardar Sarovar oustees. These packages are referred to as Resettlement and Rehabilitation (R&R), but they are two distinct programmes. Rehab is a long-term operation, while resettlement is a one-time physical relocation. Rehabilitation laws are only in place in Maharashtra, MP, and Karnataka. Policies exist in Orissa and Rajasthan (Siddiqui, 2012).

Project developers have not been concerned about how displaced individuals would make a living. The available data on a few high-profile initiatives only highlights the magnitude of government bodies' callousness and apathy toward DPs and PAPs. For example, 25 years after the Bhakra-Nangal dam was built, only 730 of the 2108 households evacuated in Himachal Pradesh in the early 1950s had been displaced. The bulk of the project's oustees were women, such as the Hirakud Dam in Orissa and the Rihand Dam in Uttar Pradesh. The case of the Pong dam evictees in Himachal Pradesh, who were displaced in the late 1960s, is especially poignant. About 16,000 out of the 30,000 households were confirmed to be liable for compensation. Only 3756 were relocated thousands of miles away to a completely different cultural, linguistic, and ecological zone in Rajasthan. Perhaps, Some of the lands they were intended to occupy had already been settled, and the rest was uncultivable. As if that wasn't enough, the host villagers were unprepared for their entry. More than 75 per cent of them quickly succumbed to Himachal to meet little help in re-establishing themselves. Instead, they started to migrate across Northern India, most of whom were in various stages of destitution (Ray, 2000).

Financial compensation for forcibly obtained individual properties, mostly land or homes, is the only substantive reparation for displaced persons guaranteed by statute. The way the law is written and interpreted, on the other hand, means that the displaced property owner or house owner is still the loser. In 1982, Lokayan recorded the suffering of the 21,094 families who lived in the 100 villages submerged by the Srisailem project in Andhra Pradesh. The supposed market value of land and houses is accounted for rather than the replacement value. To deliver just one example, the Srisailem Project Fact-Finding Commission (1986) determined that one acre of dry land was worth roughly Rupees 5000, and one acre of wetland was worth around Rupees 13,800. Inside each case, the total compensation (including solatium) was only Rupees 932 and Rupees 2,332, respectively. The committee discovered a likewise disparity in the amount of money charged as compensation for

houses. In their study, the villagers valued the value of a stone house at Rupees 11,564 and a hut at Rupees 2,500. The government, on the other hand, paid an average of Rupees 5,561 per stone home. The state valued and paid Rs. 645 per hut, or one-third of the projected value of the residents (Bisht, 2009).

Perhaps more dangerous for rural evictees is the requirement that any resettlements paid in cash rather than in kind. The majority of rural people, chiefly tribal people, have no experience with cash. Several studies have documented how oustees deplete cash compensation in short periods, by theft, for repayment of old debts, in liquor, and inconspicuous consumption (Hemadri et al., 1999)

The villages' escape was executed together with callous indifference to the residents' feelings, who were understandably befuddled and disturbed at being ejected from their homes. Furthermore, the locals were not fully informed about the evacuation details: some had no idea where to go once they were told to evacuate. Indigenous peoples face the same issues as other rural people, and they're far more reliant on forests and common property resources; their recorded legal rights to cultivable lands are even shakier; their ability to manage cash transactions in a market economy is even more unstable, and their skills for diversified livelihoods that are not centred on forests or land are even more primitive. Thus, it is unsurprising that tribal evictees have less access to any recovery services offered by project authorities than non-tribal evictees (Ray, 2000). According to Fernandes, studies show that only 15.18% of Maharashtra's 10,147 tribal families were granted land, compared to 31.4 per cent of non-tribal families. However, the respondents' indebtedness dramatically increased in the post-relocation period; a large amount of cash compensation was apparently used to service loans, thus reducing investment in agricultural production and features (Fernandes, 2001).

Some research has shown how displacement disproportionately impacts women and kids. For example, granting compensation in cash directly disempowers women because they are less likely to select how the money is invested inside the family. However, all of the case studies have in common that they all come to the same conclusion. Women are marginalised on the labour market as they lose access to traditional sources of livelihood, such as property, forest, sea, river, pasture, cattle, or saltpan land. Furthermore, women's economic status is only partly restored as land and other sources of income are replaced (Gellert & Lynch, 2003).

No study of large dams in India would be complete without consideration of local opposition to such projects. This resistance was intermittent, localised, and disorganised in many projects, especially the earlier ones, reflecting the spontaneous discontent and frustration of those who were to be displaced. In recent decades, such opposition has become more organised and sustained

The inability of host communities to recognise resettled oustees in their midst is an often overlooked yet severe issue. The issue is that vast unoccupied areas are seldom accessible for the relocation of evictees (and such as exist are unsuitable or degraded lands). There will inevitably be competition for scarce resources and jobs where they are settled among established settlements. For example, indigenous peoples in Nepal have lost their land and livelihood due to a dam on the Kaligandaki River, and they have allegedly been under-compensated. In the few cases where displacement is unavoidable, the informal economy must be recognised and quantified to which most populations from the poorer parts belong. To address the livelihood of displaced people, compensation must go beyond market value (Internal Monitoring Displacement Centre 2010).

Forced population displacement and resettlement is one of the world's most challenging and contentious development challenges today. Regardless of how well-planned, relocation is almost always a disaster, a breeding ground for unanticipated repercussions and poverty risks. Affected individuals, international organisations, governments, entrepreneurs, consultants, and civil society have acknowledged the dangers of poverty associated with resettlement. Multiple factors, such as regulation, reimbursement, recovery and restoration trends, planning, databases, and management, contribute to effective resettlement. China has the world's most significant number of people who have been resettled. Various excellent practices have been developed since the 1980s, but few have gained recognition (Choi, 2015).

Although the conflict has relocated approximately 25 million individuals globally, development projects are likely to have displaced much more people. A study in 1994 found that just over half of all World Bank-assisted development projects involving population displacement from 1986 to 1993 were in the transportation, water supply, and urban infrastructure fields. Using World Bank data to extrapolate global statistics, the study found that in the early 1990s, the building of 300 high dams (above 15 metres) per year displaced four million people. Every year, six million more people are displaced as a result of urban and transportation infrastructure programmes (World Bank, 2020).

The number of programmes creating forced population displacement is likely to increase rather than decrease as industrialisation, electrification, and urbanisation processes continue. Water supply (dams, reservoirs, irrigation); urban infrastructure; transportation (roads, highways, canals); electricity (mining, power plants, oil exploration and extraction, pipelines); agriculture expansion; parks and forest reserves; and population relocation schemes are some of the causes or categories of development-induced displacement (Internal Monitoring Displacement Centre 2010)

Impact of risk associated with displacement

Cernea has identified eight possible risks associated with displacement that are interconnected. Landlessness: Expropriation of land ruins people's agricultural processes, economic operations, and livelihoods. Joblessness: For those working in businesses, utilities, or agriculture, the threat of losing wage jobs is quite large, both in urban and rural displacements. Creating new work, on the other hand, is complicated and expensive. Homelessness: For many people being resettled, losing their shelter is only a temporary situation, but for others, homelessness or a deterioration of their housing conditions is a long-term problem. In a broader cultural context, the loss of a family's existing house and a group's cultural space tends to result in estrangement and status deprivation. Marginalisation: When families lose economic strength, they become impoverished and spiral down a road of "downward mobility." Many people cannot use their previously learned skills in their new location; human capital is lost, inactive, or obsolete. The San Roque Dam construction in the Philippines threatens the livelihood of an estimated 35,000 indigenous Ibaloi people. Burmese Mon, Karen, and Tavoyans are likely among the worst-off, having been displaced by major infrastructure projects and subjected to forced labour and military abuses

Economic exclusion is often followed by social and psychological exclusion. Food Insecurity: People are more likely to fall into temporary or chronic undernourishment due to forced uprooting, which is characterised as calorie-protein intake levels below the minimum required for average growth and function. We increased Morbidity and Mortality. Social stress and psychological distress

caused by relocation and the use of polluted water and improvised sanitation systems increase susceptibility to epidemics and chronic diarrhoea, dysentery, and parasitic and vector-borne diseases like malaria and schistosomiasis. Loss of Access to Common Property Loss of access to common property properties belonging to relocated communities (pastures, forest lands, water bodies, burial grounds, quarries, and so on) has a significant impact on poor people's income and livelihood. Social Disintegration: Displacement causes current social patterns to unravel to a great degree. This unravelling takes place on several levels. When people are forcefully relocated, manufacturing structures, life-sustaining informal networks, trade links, and other infrastructure are demolished. Other threats include a lack of access to public services, a loss of education for school-aged children, and a loss of civil rights or violation of human rights, such as property loss without just compensation, security force brutality, or communal violence risks resettlement areas. Indigenous peoples and ethnic minorities, according to studies on the social effects of development projects, are disproportionately affected. These communities also ignore and destitute because they come from economically oppressed and deprived strata of society (Bisht, 2009).

Discussion

Does the displacement affect human livelihood? Displacement caused by development is indeed a humanitarian issue that affects people and organisations from tribes and village communities to developed urban areas. Generally, development is seen as an inevitable step towards modernisation and economic growth in developing countries; however, the result is often setback of livelihoods and poverty for the displaced. Compensation and rehabilitation policies aimed to reduce the impact of displacement are often inadequate. This is primarily caused by the corruption of the state bureaucracy, undervaluation of the resources, the inability of planners to recognise the complexity of the existing social and economic systems of the displaced, and the lack of participation in the displaced planning process. Land compensation is often insufficient in terms of scale, location, and natural resources. Communities and individuals usually only receive monetary compensation without adequate mechanisms to resolve their complaints or political backing to enhance their livelihoods.

Conclusion

Humongous development activities are known for significant population displacement. Displacement causes not only physical dislocation but also a loss of control for people. In India, the Adivasi or tribal people make up 40-50 per cent of the displaced, despite accounting for just 8% of the total population. Women in this class suffer more. In India, resettlement policies and programmes have primarily remained gender-segregated, failing to account for women's unique experiences, rendering resettlement a challenging process for them. India currently does not even have a resettlement policy for the country.

References

1. Bisht, T. C. (2009). Development-Induced displacement and women: The case of the Tehri Dam, India. *Asia Pacific Journal of Anthropology*, 10(4), 301–317. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14442210903271312>
2. Cernea, M. M. (1996). Public Policy Responses to Development-Induced Population Displacements. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 31(24), 1515–1523.
3. Choi, N. (2015). *Development-Induced Displacement and Resettlement*. Routledge. https://www.google.co.in/books/edition/Development_Induced_Displacement_and_Res/jZkGCAAQBAJ?hl=en&g

Dam Development Induced Displacement In India: A Humanitarian Approach

bpv=1&dq=Satiroglu,+I.,+%26+Choi,+N.+(Eds.).+(2015).+Development-induced+displacement+and+resettlement:+New+perspectives+on+persisting+problems.+Routledge.

4. Fernandes, W. (2001). Development induced displacement and sustainable development. *Social Change*, 31, 87–103.
5. Gellert, P. K., & Lynch, B. D. (2003). Mega-projects as displacements. *International Social Science Journal*, 55(175), 15–25. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2451.5501002>
6. Hemadri, R., Bandh, B., Samiti, S., Harsh Mander, I., & Nagaraj, V. (1999). *Contributing Paper Dams, Displacement, Policy and Law in India*. <http://www.dams.org>
7. Internal, M. D. C. (2010). *Activity Report 2010*.
8. Judge, P. S. (1997). Response to dams and displacement in two Indian states. *Asian Survey*, 37(9), 840–851. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2645701>
9. Negi, S., & Ganguly, S. (2011). *www.ssoar.info Development projects vs. internally displaced populations in India: a literature based appraisal Zur Verfügung gestellt in Kooperation mit / provided in cooperation with: SSG Sozialwissenschaften, USB Köln*. www.esf.org/conferences/10328.
10. Parasuraman, S. (1999). The Development Dilemma - Displacement in India. In S. Parsuraman (Ed.), *Macmillian Press Ltd. Macmillian Ltd.* [https://www.google.co.in/books/edition/The_Development_Dilemma/QUO_DAAAQBAJ?hl=en&gbpv=1&dq=Parasuraman,+S.+\(2016\).+The+development+dilemma:+Displacement+in+India.+Springer.&pg=PR12&printsec=frontcover](https://www.google.co.in/books/edition/The_Development_Dilemma/QUO_DAAAQBAJ?hl=en&gbpv=1&dq=Parasuraman,+S.+(2016).+The+development+dilemma:+Displacement+in+India.+Springer.&pg=PR12&printsec=frontcover)
11. Ray, P. (2000). Development Induced Displacement in India. *South Asian Refugee Watch*, 2(1), 1–8.
12. Sharma, R. N., & Singh, S. R. (2009). Displacement in Singrauli region: Entitlements and rehabilitation. *Economic and Political Weekly, Displacement in Sin...*, 62–69. https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/25663915.pdf?casa_token=0ATxuO8h184AAAAA:xHIO-4DVvfm9nOAApTZH8CjYWF0sVR5uaUCyEj7Iocl-UAQGAHw1Wdvu9R-nK1w8xZOOplc5RoQ8V3Vundr30LOQft48-7su04VazccGIVJA06YCrwo5
13. Siddiqui, K. (2012). Conference Series OPEN ACCESS To cite this article: Kalim Siddiqui. *J. Phys.: Conf. Ser*, 364, 12108. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/364/1/012108>
14. World Bank. (2020). *Forced Displacement*. <https://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/forced-displacement>