

RESEARCHING INTERNAL DISPLACEMENT

Working Paper No. 23

How Urban Are IDPs? Between Forcibly Evicted Urban Poor and Conflict IDPs

Rebecca Enobong Roberts
Technische Universität Berlin

May 2022



Abstract

Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) who are forced to move to urban areas are commonly portrayed as urban IDPs, this definition negates the existence of indigenous urban poor populations who are susceptible to forced evictions; also fitting into the categorization of 'urban IDP'. The existing frame and terms of definition assumes unilateral characteristics of who an urban IDP is, thus, aids the formation of generalized perceptions which could inhibit appropriate policy interventions for conflict-IDPs who move to urban areas. The emerging unique vulnerabilities facing this group mandates a review on the think-tank literature on the term urban IDPs. This working paper contends that pre-existing equity that the urban poor who become displaced within the city possesses presents a core divergence point between them, thus, the definition of the urban IDP does not fit the IDPs who are forced to move to cities. Using case studies from Colombia and Nigeria, it argues that conflict IDP due to their pre-existing vulnerabilities and being the outsider in cities are different; necessitating the need for differentiation to better inform urban planning, policy, and humanitarian response for both groups of displaced people in cities.

Keywords

Internal Displacement; Forced Eviction; Urban IDPs; Urban Poor.

Author Details

Email: rebeccaenroberts@gmail.com

This paper was written by the author during her Summer Fellowship on Internal Displacement at the Internal Displacement Research Programme at the Refugee Law Initiative. The Fellowship was supported by the Arts and Humanities Research Council, on behalf of the UKRI Global Challenge Research Fund, as part of the funded project “Interdisciplinary Network on Internal Displacement, Conflict and Protection” (AH/T005351/1)

1. Introduction

In recent times, cities around the world have witnessed dramatic population increase due to migration. Such rapid expansion has been chiefly attributed to urbanization (IOM, 2015). The primary reason for such inflows has for long been for economic reasons (Seto, 2011). Yet, more recently, migration push factor for mass migration to urban areas is becoming multifaceted. Several reports pronounce the mass inflow of IDP to urban areas. Presently, approximately half of the globally estimated 82.4 million displaced persons live in cities (UNHCR, 2020), this population are commonly referred to as urban displaced. The term “urban IDP” covers the internally displaced people who live in such urban areas. But it does not differentiate them or imply a generalization between the IDPs who move into cities from rural areas and the indigenous urban population who become displaced by virtue of forced eviction within the city. Generally, eviction is referred to the process of ejecting an occupant from their home. The concept of “eviction” is closely related to the process of displacement.¹ However, forced eviction in this paper, refers to displacement, in the context of the intra-urban displacement² in which occupant households or groups are forcefully evicted³ from their dwelling places.

The term “displaced” refers to a dislocation of individuals, households, or communities from a place and involving forced movement to another place. Displacement comprises more than just a physical change in environment. It also impacts factors such as survival mechanisms and power dynamics in the new environment. It is a process that could reoccur; therefore, it can be regarded as a process (Sánchez Mojica, 2016). Hyndman (2000) argues that displacement by its definition induces involuntary migration as it involves a strong factor of deterritorialization of the victim. It occurs within the confines of national borders where victims are referred to as being internally displaced or involuntarily migration across international borders at that point becoming refugees. Therefore, displacement could be said to fall under three main categories, IDPs, refugees and the forcefully evicted locals who become displaced within their own city. While displaced persons who cross international borders are admitted by a state and subject to rights and international protection, IDPs who migrate have no jurisdiction, while forcefully evicted locals tend to have stronger roots by virtue of locality.

The theory, policy and practice of urban displacement is presently perceived as intellectually and practically narrow. Development agencies and scholars are locked into a definitive bureaucratic perspective and unable to see across the institutional and informal boundaries that consist of the term urban IDP. Despite being solidly ingrained in the academic and international, there is a question as to whether it is a term of theorization of an impractical concept. Emerging from this is the need to think if the term urban IDP only refers to displaced populations who migrate to

¹ Displacement is the act of displacing, or the state of being displaced

² Intra-urban displacement refers to when victims are displaced within a city out of a specific locality

³ Forced evictions refers to a putting out of place while eviction is eviction (the act of evicting).

urban areas or if it consists of the urban poor who are often susceptible to forced evictions. The high prevalence of forced evictions and the rapidity of IDP migration to urban areas mandates the reconsideration of what this term means and who it refers to. Exploring these issues are not merely academic or theoretical exercises, but in so doing, contributes to the discourse on how both core populations can be supported by policies and humanitarian interventions in urban areas. Comparative analyses between displaced persons who become refugees and those living in humanitarian settings are a more common perspective in displacement studies. Refugee refers to when the displaced crosses international borders, admitted by a foreign government, at that point assuming refugee status. To salvage the vulnerabilities associated with displacement, national governments often set up humanitarian camps with assistance from international communities; this group is commonly referred to as camped-IDPs or encampment within the concept of displacement studies.

Presently, within this field of studies, the concept of encampment and refugees are the most explored, while displaced persons who seek self-solutions outside of this framework and their urban poor counterparts within the intra-urban context who become displaced because of forced evictions within the city are largely excluded. Although displacement experts and scholars commonly refer to both categories as urban IDPs; conceptualizing a homogeneous definition, this paper is a comparative analysis between both groups of IDPs living in cities.

Drawing on a multidisciplinary body of work on urban poverty, forced evictions, conflict induced internal displacement and migration of the latter to cities from Colombia and Nigeria, this paper seeks to frame its core arguments around the difference between conflict IDPs found in urban areas and forcefully evicted urban poor. It begins with definition of terms between both categories, the Guiding Principles on human rights protection for both IDPs and victims of forced eviction, their challenges and survival strategies to establish points of divergence.

The case studies are selected to reflect different contexts of urban poor forced eviction victims and conflict based IDPs in two very similar nations. The overall aim is to draw similarities and differences between both experiences of displacement in varying contexts. For instance, is the experience of internally displaced persons within the city different from the internally displaced persons displaced by war and have had to move to the different? Can the conflict IDPs be referred to as “urban IDPs” or are they a more vulnerable group within the same context. What are the points of similarities and divergences of those moving within the city and those moving from other areas to cities? To proceed, there is a need to separate IDPs who move to cities from the forcefully evicted indigenous persons within the city who become displaced in the city. Doing so will classify conflict based internal displacement which induces internal migration within national borders and urban poor who are forcefully evicted locals in a city who then become displaced and have to move within the city.

2. Between Nigeria and Colombia: A Volatile Mix

Nigeria is the most populated nation in Africa and among the highest globally. Following almost sixteen years of military rule, in 1999, a new constitution was adopted in a peaceful transition to civilian government. The main challenge since independence has been a daunting task of transforming a natural resource reliant economy (Khan, 1994), whose economy has been marred with corruption, mismanagement, and poor institutionalization of democracy (Uwaifo, 2018). In addition to these challenges, Nigeria has a longstanding battle with ethnic and religious tension (Agbibo, 2013), which has in the last two decades been a prevalent factor inducing conflict based internal displacement (Sulaiman, 2016).

Meanwhile, Colombia is the fourth largest country in Latin America (World Population Review, 2022). Colombia has undergone almost five decades long conflict between the government and anti-government militancy groups (International Crisis, Group, 2007). This principally involved an insurgency by the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC), a militia group mainly funded by illicit drug gangs which escalated during the early 1990s. An estimated of thirty-one thousand paramilitaries⁴ had been demobilised by the end of the year 2006 (Schneider, 2016) and that was the beginning of the end of most paramilitaries in Colombia. However, in the wake of these paramilitary demobilization, other gangs and criminal groups began to emerge which were mainly made of the former paramilitary entities. Although these groups are technically unable to overthrow the Colombian government, these groups have continually attacked civilians and large regions are under the influence of such groups, for example, the Guerrilla influence and in contention with national security forces. These activities have led to severe conflict-based displacement in Colombia. Both countries are middle income nations with high levels of poverty, inequality, high and long-standing insecurity crisis leading to mass internal displacement, human rights disputes, land conflicts leading to forced evictions and rapidly growing insecurity inducing high levels of internal displacement.

3. Who are the Urban Poor?

Approximately 60% of the global population is estimated to live in urban areas (World Bank, 2018) with a projection of significant increase doubling from the current 3.9 billion in 2014 to 6.4 billion by the year 2050. This is largely attributed to rapid urbanization (UN, 2018). Most of this rapidity is occurring in countries of the global south (Dennis, 2015) where the demand for public goods and services such as adequate housing, basic infrastructure far outweigh the supply. As such, many urban dwellers live in slums and informal settlement, for example, a 2019 United Nations Development Data Statistics on sustainable cities and communities, projects that, the

⁴ Oxford dictionary defines paramilitary as an informally organized military force that is not part of a country's national military unit

definite number of slum dwellers has grown by over 1 billion with 80% of that attributed to three regions globally: South-east Asia, Sub-Saharan Africa and Central and South Asia.

Slum dwelling often implies a representation of the lowest socioeconomic class in urban areas: the dwellers (Gilbert, 2009) are deemed unable to afford safe shelter (Khan, 2015), thus, their precarious lifestyle is said to create a poverty trap which they may never be able to overcome. Dissimilar to rural poverty, urban poverty is complex and multifaceted (Wratten, 1995) as it stretches beyond the frailty of income or consumptions, specifically, it relates to dimensions of vulnerabilities the poor are often susceptible to due to inadequate access to safe housing, basic goods and services, social and legal protection, empowerment, formal and secure livelihood stream, and very weak access to land tenure security. Therefore, the urban poor could be described as a person with volatile access to basic goods and services whose basic human rights are unprotected.

Generally, this group has no rights to land and where they lay claim to individual or communal land ownership are often without legal title documents to formally protect themselves against land grabbers or forced evictions. Many of this group live in existing slums because of housing unaffordability or access to free land and set up their makeshift shelter. This is commonly done in public areas or environmentally unsafe areas such as train tracks, dumpsites, or sewage systems (Kimani-Murage, 2007), they are often considered illegal squatters and at risk of forced evictions due to their lack of land titling documentation.

4. Forced Evictions

The 2008 United Nations Human Rights office of the High Commissioner (OHCHR) defines forced evictions as the permanent or temporary forced removal of individuals, families and communities from their homes and land without the provision of human dignity and appropriate resettlement. Forced evictions in urban areas may be due to varying situations and causal factors. It has deep and long-term impacts including psychological trauma, socio-economic regression (du Plessis, 2005) and it is often accompanied by violence as a result of the use of force (Agbola and Jinadu, 1997). It consists of the clearly stated violations ranging from national to internationally recognized human rights and treaties such as the right to adequate housing and other socio-economic related human rights as well as the concept of right to the city. When conducted forcefully, a lack of due process is abetted, thus, could be related to the loss of human rights to health, food, livelihood, and freedom. The leading cause of forced evictions in cities could be grouped into four main general categories: city development, for example gentrification or infrastructural expansion), ethnic or communal conflict and state and private sector organized activities (du Plessis, 2005) mainly around land disposition or grabbing because of tenure insecurity (Agbola and Jinadu, 1997). Forced eviction is a universal phenomenon ensuing in emerging nations. The most common victims of forced evictions in cities are the urban poor who

often settle on indigenous lands or settlers in slums and informal settlements due to poor access to affordable and decent housing in urban areas.

Many such occurrences result in victims which are counted in hundreds of thousands. In the last two decades, global mass evictions occurred in the following places:

- In the year 2000, 1.2 million people were forcefully evicted in Rainbow Town in the city of Port Harcourt, Nigeria Ocheje (2007)
- In Brazil an estimate of 250,000 slum dwellers were forcefully evicted to make way for the hosting for the 2014 FIFA world cup and the 2016 Olympic games (Marinho, Campagnani, Cosentino, 2014)
- In 2005, over 700,000 people lost their houses and livelihood due to government induced projects, resulting in mass forced evictions (Amnesty International, 2011). The process of doing so resulted in extreme violence, victimization, and illegal arrest of up to 30,000 people were met with extreme violence leading to victimization and arrest (du Plessis, 2007).

4.1 Forced Evictions in Nigeria

In many cities of the Global South, the governance framework is geared to better respond to financial capital as opposed to the needs of its citizens (Purcell, 2006). It is this framework that has for decades been the driving force for many city governments in emerging nations in pursuing urban regeneration (Fields, 2017; Olatunde et al, 2021). The focus is to create mechanisms to create profitable opportunities for internal revenue generations (Harvey, 2003). Lawanson and Omoegun (2018) propose that this is the precepts upon which the building of megacities in Africa is based. In Nigerian cities, extreme poverty, high urban population increase, land tenure insecurity, unaffordable and housing shortages are the highest contributing factors to prevalent slums and informal settlement proliferation (Agbola and Jinadu, 1997). As such, in Nigerian cities, forced evictions are a clear display of exclusive and oppressive city planning and management that often sees the poorest being sacrificed in what Agbola (1997) refers to as in `Public Interest` for who and at what cost. This section analyzes two cases of forced eviction in one in Lagos, Nigerian and one in Bogota, Colombia all of which occurred between the year 1990 and 2017.

The city of Lagos has an estimated population of 21 million, by population, Lagos is not only the biggest city in Nigeria, it is the most populous city in Africa and one of the highest urban populations globally (Filani, 2012; Citymayors.com, 2014). It is the former capital city of Nigeria. It sits on 18,558 hectares of land of which 88.7% is metropolitan areas, it has 20 Local

Government Areas (LGA) of which 16 are in the metropolis areas. Eti-Osa LGA is one of the 16 metropolis LGA in Lagos, it is surrounded by luxurious neighborhoods and proximity to the economically robust business district of Ikoyi, Lekki and Victoria Island. The precepts of forced evictions in Lagos are related to urban regeneration. The aim is to transform Lagos into a mega-city and Africa's model city that is 'sustainable, organized, liveable, and economically viable (Lagos State Government Ministry of Physical Planning and Urban Development 2012, cited in (Adama, 2020). This mega-city approach implies that there is no place for the city's poor in this model mega-city. Therefore forced evictions are frequent in the city and the Maroko community eviction was one of the most brutal in Nigeria's history.

Maroko was a community made up of a majority made up of early fishermen and women indigenous groups, commonly known as the Egun⁵ people located by the Lagos lagoon in an area known as Victoria Island. Although historical documentation of the history of Maroko community is hard to come by, a report for Business Day Newspaper by Nathaniel Akhigbe (2015) suggests that Maroko was made up of 30 constituent villages in three divisions. All these villages were independent entities with traditional communal leadership. It was an indigenous community with village heads and traditional rulers seen as the co-owners of the land, hence, there were no exclusive individual rights, but rather, it took a communal land ownership structure. As the city of Lagos developed and expanded, Maroko by virtue of being a waterfront area became attractive as a prime location for luxurious development. The first eviction notice was given to the people of Maroko by the British colonial government in Nigeria between the years 1958 - 1960, when the colonial administration evicted nearby informal settlements to make way for the development of diplomatic residence for the British governments in Nigeria.

Several accounts of events suggest that in July 1990, the Raji Rasaki led Lagos state government upon accumulating verbal threats and minor clearing that happened incrementally since the 1980s, evicting the residents of Maroko slum community, rendering an estimate of 300,000 indigenous people homeless. A press statement by the Social and Economic Rights Action Centers (SERAC) in 2008, suggests that this eviction was the largest forced eviction in Nigeria's history. In their analysis of the housing and socio-economic impact of forced evictions on Maroko evictees, Agbola (1997), suggest that the reasons stated by government as justification for this eviction were that the Maroko community are illegal squatters on government owned land, secondly, that the location of this community was liable to extremely flooding, which is a health hazard to the dwellers as well as prone to be submerged by the ocean. Other reasons included environmental and urban planning inconvenience, security risk due to high level of crimes and that demolishing this community was generally for the benefit of the greater and common good. However, this 1997 groundbreaking paper by Agbola, states that further probe into the circumstance surrounding these evictions suggests otherwise, implying that as the city of

⁵ Egun people are indigenous nomadic fishing tribe in West Africa found mainly in Nigeria, Benin Republic and Togo (Wikipedia, 2021)

Lagos was ground and expanding, Maroko, a waterfront community became exposed to threat due by virtue of being a waterfront prime land. This rationale holds true today, as then Maroko has since been transformed to an upscale location built for the wealthy with high rises properties, office buildings and hotels in Victoria Island Lagos. This study reveals that due to public pressure facilitated through engagements of the various communal heads in Maroko with the public and the media, the government eventually settled with resettlement and compensation of evictees who were landlords with proof of ownership prior to 1972. Various civil society organizations also played a key role, for SERAC versus Nigeria (2008).

Following SERAC (2008) versus Nigeria, the Lagos state ministry for housing facilitated a stakeholder's engagement on the eviction which included the state ministry of Justice, the state land Bureau, ministry of Physical Planning and Urban Development, the Environmental and Special Offenses Enforcement Unit as well as civil society organizations like the SERAC, Amnesty International and the World Bank. The aim of this was to examine the modalities carried out by the state in the process of the evictions. The outcome of these engagements estimates that of 41,776 landlords were forcefully evicted, about 2,933 were relocated to other areas and financially compensated for the loss. Agbola (1997) and SERAC (2008) cite gross irregularities with these compensation approaches, there was favoritism misconduct, implying that only indigenous groups with strong affiliations with local elites were prioritized in the process.

4.2 Colombia: Profiling Bogota

Similarly to Nigeria, in Colombia, the government is consistently one of the main violators of the housing rights and the dependence on land makes indigenous groups as the most susceptible victims of forced evictions in Colombia. For example, the Global Survey on Forced Evictions by Amnesty International (2014) records several violent forced evictions of indigenous groups by the Colombian government. The violent struggle for territorial control is mainly driven by economic, political and military reasons (Faguet et al, 2017), coupled with high levels of rural poverty (Lipton, 1980). Additionally, Lipton (1980) proposes that, in Colombia, rural poverty is a crucial driving force of rural to urban migration and like most cities in the Global South, the inability of cities to keep up with such population grow in turn causes a struggle for land and this has been the main cause of internal armed conflict in the last six decades in Colombia (Amnesty International, 2014). Such conflicts have been prevalent in the nation's capital, the city of Bogota.

The city of Bogota is the nation's sprawling capital city located on a high-altitude. It is often referred to as a cobblestone center marked with colonial-era features such as the neoclassical performance hall known as the Teatro Colón and the 17th-century Iglesia de San Francisco, it is a natural resources rich state with gold, cooper, salt, and emerald, therefore, mining is a core activity. Bogota is surrounded by forest and hills. It is also home to popular museums such as the

Museo Botero, home to classical South American art also displaying the pre-Columbian gold pieces. The eastern part of Bogota, commonly known as Eastern Hill, is a string of hills forming the eastern natural boundaries of the city. This area is home to popular national parks, luxurious architecture, and upper-class neighborhoods. Pre-colonial times, this area less densely populated with the highest population being the indigenous people of the Muisca⁶ tribe. Despite its historical nature, the eastern Bogota region is urban in nature (Gallini and Osorio, 2015) with a population estimate of ten million (Bogota.gov.co). Due to its natural resources richness, this region is prone to environmental challenges associated with mining activities, forest fires and frequent land-grabbing activities (Grajales, 2015) Presently, many Latin American governments, including Colombia have improved land tenure security systems through the regularization and legalization of squatter settlements on the basis of improving the right to housing (Payne and Durand-Lasserve, 2012). This is done to improve the protection of the fundamental human rights of vulnerable populations in accordance with the United Nations position on forced eviction; over the last five decades, forced evictions continue to plague Colombian cities, particularly Bogota (Vargas, 2017). This section will review the sporadic forced evictions that have occurred in East Bogota dating as far back as 1970.

As it was the case in Lagos, the prevalent causes of evictions vary, however, it follows the same pattern by typical relation to urban regeneration. In Bogota, the expansion and development of areas such as Chapinero Alto, one of the most luxurious estates in the city has displaced many over the years (Cernea, 1993). Just like in Lagos, victims are poor and indigenous people who are rarely given sufficient prior notice and are often left with trauma that spans many years. Everett (2001) reports that in the early 1970s, during the planning of a highway project, this spurred various eviction speculation with several attempts. By the 1980s, though this author reports poor documentation, many families were evicted. By the early 1990s another set of indigenous groups were displaced to make way for the Chapinero Alto upscale property. And over the years, the sustained pressure to forcefully evict dwellers from East Bogota has remained strong due to the resident's inability to defend themselves legally against the government. Everett (2001) reports that this uncertainty has prevented the upgrade of the area both by the locals and the government. More recently, in May 2020, several reports pointed to the forced evictions that rendered 700 poor families homeless and vulnerable during the COVID19 global pandemic in Altos de la Estancia in Bogota (Peoples Dispatch, 2020). This eviction was carried out by the local government authorities of the city.

⁶ The Muisca people were organized in a confederation that was a loose union of states that each retained sovereignty. The confederation was not a kingdom, as there was no absolute monarch, nor was it an empire, because it did not dominate other ethnic groups or peoples. It is hard to compare the Muisca Confederation with other American civilizations, such as the Aztec or the Inca empires. The Muisca Confederation was one of the biggest and best-organized confederations of tribes on the South American continent.
Source: Wikipedia

Like the previous case study, the city government is perpetuating the urban poor communities. The commonly cited reasons stated as security, environmental and urban renewal. The nature of these in both case studies is what Adeola (2016) refers to as development-based evictions. This form of displacement has been attributed as another form of refugee crisis (Emmel and Souza, 1999) happening internally within the city. As illustrated above, the forced removal of persons, households, and communities from their places of settlement in order to make way for the development of megacities are extremely common. Primarily, forced evictions are driven by the belief that informal settlements and slums are the causes of poverty in cities (de Soto, 2001). The rationale behind these actions is the perception that informality is illegal and bad for development (Noronha, 2005), as opposed to a symptom of poor planning and urban exclusion (El Ghmari and Zabadi, 2021).

4.3 Impact and Survival Strategies of Forced Evictions

When households and communities are forcefully removed from their dwellings, they lose not only physical properties but their community and social networks. Significant scientific research has been conducted on the impact of forced evictions on the affected population, evictions are the primary cause of socio-economic instability, thus, extremely vulnerabilities and poverty for the urban poor (Desmond, 2012). For example, both cases indicate loss of income for extended periods with direct effect on health and education for children. Further, Cernea (2000) proposes that involuntary evictions make the urban poor population extremely susceptible to food insecurity, joblessness, marginalization, and loss of social networks.

Secondly, there is a direct correlation between forced evictions and homeless. Investigating the correlation between homelessness and urban Eviction in the Badia East in the city of Lagos, Nigeria, Olatunde et al, (2021) find that forced evictions are the main cause of urban displacement. Overall, the nature of forced evictions is such that the victims become internally displaced within their own cities. As was the case in Maroko and Bogota, many of the evictees were homeless for extended periods of times, moving around temporary shelters. Regardless of the state of negative consequences of forced evictions, the affected population often devised a strategy to boost their survival. For example, women often relied on their social networks and families to cope with socio-economic stress associated with forced eviction (Oyefara and Alabi, 2016).

Lastly, in some instances, some forced evictions can get compensation and relocation with some positive outcome as a result. In Bogota, due to media outcry and public pressure, the city Mayor had to negotiate a resettlement plan for tenants and titleholders with a promise to public housing. The families were then moved to a temporary site whilst awaiting the construction of their new homes.

Some authors establish the significant role of social capital built through cultural and ethnic affiliations. This was established to be particularly useful for the urban poor who are displaced (Mpanje et al, 2018) For example, Everett (2001) proposes that although the promised resettlement by the Bogota city government never materialized, eventually many of the victims dispersed; losing their community unit, but were able to move into other informal settlements around the city. Echoing the role of social network theoretical underpinnings of Carver et al, (1989), Huntington and Nelson (1977), Jacobsen (2002) and Hansen (2006) all find that forcefully displaced groups in cities rely on their indigenous and ethnic affiliations, especially at the emergency points to gain access to their immediate basic needs. This was evident for the people of the Maroko community. Ayuba (2020) finds that by virtue of being a riverine slum community, another slum community known as Makoko has a high percentage of fishing resettlers previously evicted from Maroko community in 1990. This points to the fact that in both case studies of indigenous urban poor communities, the existing social equity is a useful capital aiding forced evictions⁷ reintegration into other communities. A capital where a displaced person who is forced to evacuate their original places of dwelling; forfeiting cultural, ethnic, and social ties may not be readily accessible for this demographic of the displaced within the city.

5. Internal Displacement and Movement of IDPs to Cities

Internal displacement refers to the forced uprooting of individuals, households, and communities from their places of dwelling. There are presently 82.4 million internally displaced persons globally. Within this core population, 25.9 million cross international borders and were admitted live as refugees, while more than half of this population at 41.4 million, remain within their internal borders. This group is referred to as the IDPs (UNHCR, 2021). By the end of 2020, the countries with the highest IDP populations were Colombia (8.3 million), Syria (6.7 million), Congo (5.2 million), and a sizeable number too in Nigeria (2.7 million) (UNHCR, 2020b). These reports account that 1 in every 95 persons are displaced because of conflict and insecurity.

Generally, when displacement happens, the national government with assistance from the international communities often sets up humanitarian camps to mitigate the vulnerabilities for the affected persons. In many countries, where the driving causes of displacement are increasingly prevalent, many of the victims of forced displacement live in a permanent state of uncertainty for extended periods of time without any concise timeframe or possibility of returns to their original places of habitation. Living in this state of ambiguity is what Crisp (2003) refers to as protracted displacement.

An examination of protracted IDPs trends in Afghanistan, Rwanda, Syria, Sudan, Congo and Kenya (Devictor, 2019) stipulates the average period of protracted-ness for the IDPs at 10 years

⁷ Evictees refers to victims of forced evictions

in 1993. In more recent times, Milner and Loescher (2011) indicate a 100% increase in this timeframe to 20 years. Although the focus on displacement remains on encampment⁸ new evidence are emerging which proposes that IDPs a large population of the IDPs are being prompted by the frustrations of protracted living (McLaughlin, 2020) and the poor living conditions in IDP camps (Human Rights Watch, 2016; Cotroneo, 2017) to move to urban areas in search of safety and security as well as opportunities to restart a new life (Huang, 2019). For example, the UNHCR 2020 report stipulates that 80% of the IDP population is presently living in urban areas, projecting that by the year, 2050, 17 million in Latin America, 40 million in South Asia and 86 million in Sub-Saharan Africa of the displaced will be living in cities within these regions. Alongside the urban poor who become displaced through forced evictions, this group of resettlers in cities is commonly referred to also urban IDPs. The movement of IDPs to cities is expanding the urban vulnerable population made up of mainly the urban poor.

The city with its compact socio-economic makeup and multiple actors, provides a diversified access point and opportunities for all groups and by virtue, it attracts all groups of migrants including the low economic from rural areas.

The driving factor of such mobility is to enhance their participation, socio-cultural cohesion and active citizenry potential that urban areas represent. In recent times, several scholarships are proposing that the internally displaced groups are moving from other areas into cities globally. This means that cities are now made up of two groups of displaced persons, the first established in the chapter above, the intra-urban group who are commonly the indigenous urban population, this chapter, focuses on the inter-urban displaced⁹ group who are displaced persons, forced to move from their original localities as a result of their forced displacement into the cities within the same national borders. Although there are several causes of internal displacement, this session uses the conflict induced displacement from Colombia and Nigeria as case studies.

In whatever capacity, displacement is accompanied with severe negative consequences for the displaced. At individual and household level, victims of internal displacement are faced with emotional and socio-economic impact (Siriwardhana, 2013) because of the loss of forced-uprooting. Displacement also impacts group identity, for example, both the indigenous urban poor and the nomadic farmers displaced by conflict from other regions within the same country are forced to cut off their custom and community and move to places strange to them.

Economically, displacement results in loss of capital, livelihood, and assets (Siddiqui, 2012). Such loss coupled with the fact that much of this population is commonly lowly educated (Lastra, 2011) implies that their chances of livelihood survival and achieving stability in their new

⁸ Encampment refers to IDPs who live within structural humanitarian camps

⁹ Inter-urban IDPs referred to displaced nationals forced to move from their original points of displacement into the city within the same country (Jacobsen, Horwood, 2021)

settlement areas are very low. The challenge of displacement forces the displaced to move from their original dwelling to other places in search of security and opportunity to rebuild their lives. In this context, survival means the displaced must negotiate space in places outside of their original jurisdiction. This implies a strong spatial metaphor in the displacement and forced migration context (Dejesus, 2018). Davidson (2009) argues that the loss of original dwelling (space) associated with displacement and forced migration brings to fore the critical role of the right to occupy a new space in new environments. Illustrating the impact of displacement and forced migration on conflict IDPs in Mozambique, Lunstrum (2015) argues that such movement severely pressures the local communities the `outsiders` (IDPs) move to. Crips, Morris and Refstie (2012) argue that local communities in these instances often see their role as temporary and overtime, the inter-urban IDPs are alienated and subject to extreme discrimination by the local communities.

5.1. Colombia

5.1.1. Conflict and Displacement in Colombia

Within the South American region, Colombia is reported to have the highest rates of internal displacement (Statista, 2021). At the end of 2020, it reportedly had over 8 million people displaced by conflict and violence (UNHCR, 2020b). Next to Syria, Colombia for decades remains the country with the highest number of IDPs in the world. The majority of this population was previously displaced in rural areas and is moving to urban areas where they live among the urban poor indigenous population. Conflict is the highest contributing factor to internal displacement in Colombia (Shultz et al, 2013). This is because of various illegal militia groups fighting for territorial control with the government agencies and the civilians are subjected to direct attacks and vulnerabilities that are associated with this war. IDPs in Colombia are officially assigned as under the 2011 the Law of Victims and the Restitution of Lands.¹⁰ This enables the formal registration of the IDPs wherever they go for identification and access to basic services. In Spite of this law, it is crucial to note that many of the IDPs are reportedly living under extreme vulnerabilities. Although conflict-based displacement is widespread in Colombia, the trends are more prevalent in some regions than others. For example, 16% of IDPs in Colombia are from 10 municipalities, while half of the entire IDP population is concentrated in 23 municipalities, mainly in cities such as Bogota, Medellin, Cali and Barranquilla (Carrillo, 2009). The majority of this group living in urban areas lives under the most precarious conditions. For example, a survey by the Internal Displacement Monitoring Center (IDMC) covering the years 2016 and 2019 reveals that Around 89% of the people we surveyed did not have access to

¹⁰ Victims Law: Ministry of Justice and Law. *Ley de Víctimas y Restitución de Tierras y sus Decretos Reglamentarios: LEY 1448 de 2011*. Republica de Colombia, Ministerio de Justicia y del Derecho. Justicia Transicional: Bogotá DC, Colombia, 2012. Available at: <http://www.leydevictimas.gov.co/documents/10179/19132/completo.pdf>.

education, 86% were not formally employed, and 53% had no access to vocational training and only about 34% benefit from social welfare interventions by the government, international communities and civil society.

5.1.2. Alienation of Conflict IDPs into the City Labor Market in Colombia

This section uses Lastra (2011) research as a case study to illustrate the lived experiences of IDPs who migrate internally in Soacha municipality in Bogota, Colombia. It uses conflict induced displaced population to present an argument for the need to specially target IDPs for intervention in urban areas. This study presents a comparative examination among three groups of vulnerable categories within the city. Specifically, it compares voluntary migrants (low-income groups), non-migrants (the urban poor) and IDPs who move to cities. Through the use of an analytical framework, it explores the gendered approach of urban integration, presenting a comparative analysis of household headship and livelihood approaches in the city labor market. This is with the overall aim of describing the impact of forced migration on the ability of the IDPs to adapt and integrate into urban communities. First, the gender and migration experience illustrate a dominant proportion of widows, high proportion of couples in formal unions and lower proportions of inter-marriages between IDPs and other groups. Furthermore, it reports that the urban poor population are commonly more educated than the IDPs and voluntary migrant groups, however, the variances between the IDPs and the urban poor is the highest. Additionally, it finds that the IDPs often suffer skills mismatch, for example, most were previously farmers without access to capital such land in new areas struggling more economically. This study proposes that this group is commonly susceptible to livelihood exclusion and marginalization, thus, are more economically poorer than low economic migrants and the urban poor. Primarily, this author argues that because IDPs forced to migrate due to conflict are generally taken unaware, thus, unprepared to move, therefore, they cannot be termed migrants in the same category as low-income migrants. This implies that the lack of planning accompanying such movement, lack of information, education and entrepreneurial skills required for urban survival places them at the lowest rank of survival chain in cities. Additionally, it suggests that this group often has strong local social networks and the difference in socio-cultural differences also plays a major role inhibiting successful urban integration for this group. Overall, these findings present IDPs as the most vulnerable group in cities and suggest labor integration as the most crucial component for the successful integration of IDPs in cities.

5.2 *Nigeria*

5.2.1. Conflict Based Displacement in Nigeria

Nigeria's internal displacement began over thirty years ago and has been consistently increasing since 2013 (Global IDP Project, 2015). It is a common consequence of Nigeria's inter-communal,

religious and political conflict and violence, climate change factors such as flooding, as well as forced evictions (IDMC, 2013; 2007; Olukolajo et al, 2014; Nwakanma and Boroh 2019; Crisis Group Africa Report, 2017). Regardless of the causal factors, the displacement crisis induces severe socio-economic impacts on millions of people globally.

The ongoing insecurity and insurgency crisis perpetuated by the various militia groups such as the Boko Haram and the Fulani Herdsmen are the major drivers of internal displacement (IDMC, 2007; Nwakanma and Boroh 2019; Crisis Group Africa Report, 2017). Such violence and insecurity is inducing intense humanitarian crises within this region, and the failure of government interventions is increasingly forcing more of the displaced to move to urban areas (Muggarh, 2014). For example, as at the year 2014, the Boko Haram terrorist group had gained territorial dominance covering 21,545 square kilometers in the north-east Nigeria region (Ibrahim *et al.* 2014).

This form of displacement is mainly happening in the north-eastern region of Nigeria (Olukolajo et al, 2014). Over the years, hundreds of thousands of people have been killed as a result and several hundreds of thousands have been forced to flee their original inhabitants. To mitigate the vulnerabilities that accompany displacement, IDPs are admitted in IDP camps which are mainly located within the same region where these displacements are happening. Scientific data on the exact number of displaced persons as well as the population migrating out of camps to cities remains difficult to ascertain (IDMC, 2013). Outside of the northern parts of Nigeria, there are no official IDP camps or assisted resettlement for the IDPs who move outside of this region (Cuadra, 2016). Although there are limited studies on conflict IDPs in Nigeria, examination of this demography by Barau (2019) estimates that approximately two million of them have migrated to nearby cities such as Yola, Kano, Kaduna and Maiduguri.

5.2.2. Survival Challenges of IDP Resettlers in Abuja, Nigeria

Using a case study by Adewale (2016), this session illustrates the challenges facing conflict IDPs living in the country capital of Abuja in Nigeria. Through a qualitative data examination, this study assesses the deteriorating lived experiences of 168 IDPs in peri-urban areas of Abuja and triangulates this with semi-structured data from stakeholder groups including civil society, police officers and a lawmaker. Primarily, this study seeks to link vulnerabilities of IDPs to policy failures. Finding shows that not only are the IDPs living in very precarious conditions. First, the majority of this group is subjected to hostility by their host communities, resulting in secondary displacement in the forms of forced eviction from land that they set-up as their dwelling places. Furthermore, such hostility was found to lead to conflict between the IDPs and their host communities, forcing many of the IDPs to leave the city of Abuja by migrating to other cities. Secondly, despite the domestication of the international charters on protection of IDPs and refugees such as the African Union charter Kampala Convention on the protection of the

displaced population, institutional prerequisite that mandates the jurisdictions of city government to provide for and protect this group is largely absent in Nigeria. Suggesting that the only support IDPs get in Abuja are largely from religious institutions and some civil society organizations at a very minimal level. This author implies that such neglect is prompting increasing sexual violence against IDP women and children. Overall this author concludes that IDPs although Nigerian citizens are treated as foreigners with extreme discrimination and violation of rights in comparison to the indigenous urban poor population in the city.

6. Between the Urban Poor Forced Evictees and Conflict IDPs

Drawing on the two categories of case studies, there are numerous similarities and differences between the two sub-categories within the urban IDP context. The main similarities between both groups are the commonality of being displaced by either inter- or intra-urban displacement and the concept of forced migration for both groups. However, the case highlights various differences between both groups.

First, the urban poor who becomes displaced could protected under the rights of the indigenous people¹¹ under the 2006 United Nations Rights of Indigenous people states that this group have the right to restitution of lands, territories, and resources which they traditionally owned or used; where this is forcefully taken or damaged under this jurisdiction, they have a right to compensation. These compensation could take different forms such as lands, territories and resources with legal status of ownership. This protection act provides room for continuous protection including when the indigenous group are in the urban areas. As illustrated in the forced eviction cases, it could be seen that the Egun people in Maroko, Lagos and the Muisca people in Bogota had more rights than the IDPs in Lastra (2011) in the city of Medellin, Colombia. This suggests that IDPs who move to areas outside of their original jurisdiction cannot be protected under this category.

Second, the spatial aspect of forced migration for outsider IDPs in urban areas entails that this group of urban IDPs are outside of original dwelling and must develop the socio-cultural equity to navigate a new space for resettlement; an equity which the urban poor could be assumed to have since they are indigenes of the city they have become displaced in. For example, Maroko people in Lagos, were readily able to get acceptance to move to other waterfront indigenous settlement in Lagos after their forced eviction. Per contrast, the case of IDP resettlers in Abuja points to exacerbation of hostility, resentment and discrimination from the host communities.

Furthermore, the United Nations' (1996) position on forced evictions is clear: where national governments fail to provide accessible, affordable, and safe housing for its citizens, it cannot

¹¹ Wikipedia defines indigenous people as a group of culturally and socially distinct populations with collective ties to the natural resources and land where they live, occupy or are from.

claim that the removal of illegal settlements is consistent with international law. This legal framework strongly condemns governments evicting its citizens in the name of urban regeneration, implying that in such instances, evictions are tantamount to scape-goating and denying victims their socio-economic rights. It could then be argued that for the urban poor there are jurisdictions of legalities protecting their rights. It is upon this precept, that the Maroko evictees under the SERAC vs. Nigeria (2008) case was built upon, resulting in the resettlement and compensation of some Maroko evictees in Nigeria. However, for the conflict IDPs in urban areas, the international protection and guiding principles remains vaguely definitive, thus, subject to various interpretations, as highlighted by the IDPs in Abuja case studies. Lastly, the labor market inequalities for the outsider conflict IDPs to Bogota in Colombia points to the fact that IDPs who move to cities are widely marginalized and discriminated against even in cases where they were in the similar categories as low economic migrants and the urban poor, IDPs are much more likely to be unemployed and face challenges penetrating the income generation in cities.

7. How Urban are Conflict IDPs?

Holistically, these factors are conspiring factors which creates vacuums of protection for conflict IDPs in comparison to their urban poor counterparts who become displaced. Evidently, the challenge of the term urban IDPs lacking clear definition, it is impossible for policy interventions targeting urban IDPs to thoroughly address the specific needs of both sub-units within the urban IDP category. Presently, the existing confusion in the definition of these terms exists whether or not the term `urban` is indicative of the place where forced eviction happens or as a place of arrival for conflict IDPs.

This paper tries to raise the prevailing challenges with the definition of urban IDPs` is mainly capturing the displacement occurring in urban areas where the indigenous urban poor who become displaced are inclusive of the IDPs who move to urban areas. It seeks to call for a need to thoroughly overview and the implication of the terminologies on understanding issues and the need for clarity. This is important because both categories are displaced, therefore, fit into the IDP status, however, the term `urban IDP` fails to clarify if the victim has moved from another region and into new territory or is an indigenous of the city.

The resounding theme of this paper proposes that this classification is important because, as illustrated by the case studies above on the two groups, when the urban poor become displaced, they tend to have existing social equity that enables quick recovery and establishment than their counterparts who are strangers in new areas. Such privileges are not accessible to the IDPs who would need time and capacity to establish, giving the urban IDPs an advantage not privy to the conflict IDPs.

Because the dynamics of displacement are complex and interconnected and the has spiraling implications that a phased out into unpredictable timeframe, for, secondary displacement because of forced evictions settlement city, does not mean that an IDP in urban setting will have the same recovered advantages possible for indigenous groups (for example, Maroko evictees versus IDPs in Bogota and Abuja).

In conclusion, to differentiate both groups of urban IDPs, there is a need to thoroughly understand the social landscape of both in their resettling communities as well as factors that harness or inhibit such resettlement.

Bibliography

Adeola, R. (2016). WHAT DOES DEVELOPMENT-CAUSED DISPLACEMENT LOOK LIKE IN AFRICA? Retrieved from <https://www.internal-displacement.org/expert-opinion/what-does-development-caused-displacement-look-like-in-africa>

Adewale, S. (2016). Internally displaced persons and the challenges of survival in Abuja. *African Security Review*, 25(2), 176–192. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10246029.2016.1154475>

African Commission on Human and People’s Right. (2008). *Social Economic Rights Action Center versus Nigeria*. Retrieved from <https://www.studocu.com/row/document/university-of-lusaka/human-rights/serac-v-nigeria-communication/6469023>

Agbibo, D. E. (2013). Ethno-religious Conflicts and the Elusive Quest for National Identity in Nigeria. *Journal of Black Studies*, 44(1), 3–30. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0021934712463147>

Agbola, T., & Jinadu, A. M. (1997). Forced eviction and forced relocation in Nigeria: the experience of those evicted from Maroko in 1990. *Environment and Urbanization*, 9(2), 271–288. <https://doi.org/10.1177/095624789700900214>

Akhigbe, N. (2015). Brief history of Maroko. *Business Day NG*. Retrieved from <https://businessday.ng>

Amnesty International. (2011). *PUBLIC STATEMENT STATE OF HOUSING RIGHTS AND FORCED EVICTIONS IN AFRICA*. Amnesty International International Secretariat. Retrieved from <https://www.refworld.org/pdfid/4eba7e912.pdf>

Amnesty International. (2014). *A Land Title Is Not Enough: Ensuring Sustainable And Restitution In Colombia*. Retrieved from <https://www.refworld.org/pdfid/54788a224.pdf>

Aysa-Lastra, M. (2011). Integration of Internally Displaced Persons in Urban Labour Markets: A Case Study of the IDP Population in Soacha, Colombia. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 24(2), 277–303. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jrs/feq054>

Ayuba, M. R. (2020). Development-Induced Displacements in Nigeria: Dissecting the Survival Strategies of the Victims in Lagos, Nigeria. *Research Gate*, 9–17. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/344166469_DEVELOPEMENT-INDUCED_DISPLACEMENTS_IN_NIGERIA_DISSECTING_THE_SURVIVAL_STRATEGIES_OF_THE_VICTIMS_IN_LAGOS_NIGERIA

- Ba-Ana-Itenebe, C. (2021). Understanding Structural Barriers and Coping Strategies of Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) in Nigeria's Federal Capital Territory (FCT), Abuja. *Academic Letters*. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/65352220/Understanding_Structural_Barriers_and_Coping_Strategies_of_Internally_Displaced_Persons_IDPs_in_Nigeria_s_Federal_Capital_Territory_FCT_Abuja
- Barau, A. S. (2018). *Boko Haram: protection issues for displaced and distressed women and children in Northern Nigerian cities*. International Institute for Environment and Development. Retrieved from <https://pubs.iied.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/migrate/10842IIED.pdf>
- Brun, C. (2003). Local Citizens or Internally Displaced Persons? Dilemmas of Long Term Displacement in Sri Lanka. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 16(4), 376–397. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jrs/16.4.376>
- Brun, C. (2016). Dwelling in the Temporary: The involuntary mobility of displaced Georgians in rented accommodation. *Cultural Studies*.
- Carrillo, A. C. (2009). Internal displacement in Colombia: humanitarian, economic and social consequences in urban settings and current challenges. *International Review of the Red Cross*, 91(875), 527–546. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s1816383109990427>
- Carver, C. S., Scheier, M. F., & Weintraub, J. K. (1989). Assessing coping strategies: A theoretically based approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 56(2), 267–283. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.56.2.267>
- Cernea, M. (1993). *The urban environment and population relocation: World Bank Discussion Paper* (152). Washington DC, United States: World Bank.
- Cernea, M. M. (2000). Risks, Safeguards and Reconstruction: A Model for Population Displacement and Resettlement. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 35(41), 3659–3678. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/4409836>
- Cotroneo, A. (2017). Specificities and challenges of responding to internal displacement in urban settings. *International Review of the Red Cross*, 99(904), 283–318. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s1816383118000164>
- Crisp, J. (2003). Conference Papers: 4. The Nature and Consequences of Protracted Crises No Solutions in Sight: the Problem of Protracted Refugee Situations in Africa. *Refugee Survey Quarterly*, 22(4), 114–150. <https://doi.org/10.1093/rsq/22.4.114>

Crisp, J., Morris, T., & Refstie, H. (2012). Displacement in urban areas: new challenges, new partnerships. *Disasters*, 36, S23–S42. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-7717.2012.01284.x>

Cuadra, C. (2016). *NIGERIA'S INTERNAL REFUGEES*. Goethe-Institut Nigeria. Retrieved from <https://www.goethe.de/ins/ng/en/kul/mag/20864912.html>

Davidson, M. (2009). Displacement, Space and Dwelling: Placing Gentrification Debate. *Ethics, Place & Environment*, 12(2), 219–234. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13668790902863465>

Dennis, E. (2015). Depicting Strongly Growing Urban Areas in the Global South. *L'Espace Géographique*, 44(4), 307–324. Retrieved from https://www.cairn-int.info/article-E_EG_444_0307--depicting-strongly-growing-urban-areas.htm

Desmond, M. (2012). Eviction and the Reproduction of Urban Poverty. *American Journal of Sociology*, 118(1), 88–133. <https://doi.org/10.1086/666082>

Devictor, X. (2019, December). *2019 update: How long do refugees stay in exile? To find out, beware of averages.* Development for Peace. Retrieved from <https://blogs.worldbank.org/dev4peace>

du Plessis, J. (2005). The growing problem of forced evictions and the crucial importance of community-based, locally appropriate alternatives. *Environment and Urbanization*, 17(1), 123–134. <https://doi.org/10.1177/095624780501700108>

du Plessis, J. (2007). *Forced Evictions-- Towards Solutions?: Second Report of the Advisory Group.*

el Ghmari, S., & Zabadi, A. (2021). Urban Informality: Its Genesis and Future beyond Stigma and Abolition. *African and Mediterranean Journal of Architecture and Urbanism*, 2(5), 53–59. Retrieved from <https://revues.imist.ma/index.php/AMJAU/article/view/26746>

Emmel, N., & Souza, L. (1999). Health effects of forced evictions in the slums of Mumbai. *The Lancet*, 354(9184), 1118. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0140-6736\(05\)76907-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0140-6736(05)76907-5)

Eweka, O., & Olusegun, T. O. (2016). Management of Internally Displaced Persons in Africa: Comparing Nigeria and Cameroon. *African Research Review*, 10(1), 193. <https://doi.org/10.4314/afrev.v10i1.15>

Faguet, J.-P., Sánchez, F., & Villaveces, M.-J. (2017). The paradox of land reform, inequality and development in Colombia. *ECONSTOR*, 17(181), 5–14. Retrieved from <http://www.lse.ac.uk/internationalDevelopment/home.aspx>

Fields, D. (2017). Urban struggles with financialization. *Geography Compass*, 11(11), e12334. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gec3.12334>

Gallini, S., & Osorio, C. C. (2015). Modernity and the Silencing of Nature in Nineteenth-Century Maps of Bogotá. *Journal of Latin American Geography*, 14(3), 91–125. <https://doi.org/10.1353/lag.2015.002>

Gilbert, A. (2009). Extreme Thinking About Slums and Slum Dwellers: A Critique. *SAIS Review of International Affairs*, 29(1), 35–48. <https://doi.org/10.1353/sais.0.0031>

Grajales, J. (2015). Land grabbing, legal contention and institutional change in Colombia. *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 42(3–4), 541–560. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2014.992883>

Hansen, K. T. (2006). Urban Africa: Changing Contours of Survival in the City (review). *Africa Today*, 53(2), 133–134. <https://doi.org/10.1353/at.2006.0075>

Huang, C., & Graham, J. (2019). *How Urban are IDPs and What Does that Mean for Their Economic Integration?* Center for Global Development. Retrieved from <https://www.cgdev.org/sites/default/files/HowUrbanAreIDPsAndWhatDoesThatMeanForTheirEconomicIntegration.pdf>

Human Rights Watch (HRW). (2016). *Nigeria: Officials Abusing Displaced Women, Girls Displaced by Boko Haram and Victims Twice Over*. Human Rights Watch. Retrieved from <https://www.hrw.org/news/2016/10/31/nigeria-officials-abusing-displaced-women-girls>

Ijjasz-Vasquez, E., Goga, S., & Hamilton, E. (2019, May 22). Refugees and internally displaced persons in cities – the “hidden” side of forced displacement. Retrieved from <https://blogs.worldbank.org/sustainablecities/refugees-and-internally-displaced-persons-cities-hidden-side-forced-displacement>

Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre (IDMC). (2016–2019). *The Last Refuge: Urban displacement in Colombia*. Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre (IDMC). Retrieved from <https://story.internal-displacement.org/colombia-urban/index.html>

Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre (IDMC) and Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC). (2020). *Displacement Data by the end of 2020*. Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre. Retrieved from <https://www.internal-displacement.org>

International Crisis Group. (2007). Colombia's New Armed Groups. Retrieved from <https://www.crisisgroup.org/latin-america-caribbean/andes/colombia/colombia-s-new-armed-groups>

International Organization for Migration. (2015). *WORLD MIGRATION REPORT 2015*. Retrieved from <https://worldmigrationreport.iom.int/2015>

Jacobs, C., Kubiha, S. L., & Katembera, R. S. (2020). The Upward Spiral Towards Local Integration of IDPs: Agency and Economics in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. *Refugee Survey Quarterly*, 39(4), 537–543. <https://doi.org/10.1093/rsq/hdaa022>

Jacobsen, K. (2002). Livelihoods in Conflict: The Pursuit of Livelihoods by Refugees and the Impact on the Human Security of Host Communities. *International Migration*, 40(5), 95–123. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2435.00213>

Jacobsen, K., & Horwood, C. (2021). Unsafe havens – displacement within and between cities. *Mixed Migration Review*. Retrieved from <https://mixedmigration.org/resource/mixed-migration-review-2020/>

Khan, A. S. (1994). *Nigeria: The Political Economy of Oil (The Political Economies of Oil Exporting Countries, 2)* (1st ed.). London, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.

Khan, M. A. U., Hossen, M. A., Sharmin, Z., & Kubra, T. J. (2015). Displacement and Deplorable Living Conditions of Slum Dwellers: With Special Reference to Sylhet City. *International Letters of Social and Humanistic Sciences*, 46, 51–64. <https://doi.org/10.18052/www.scipress.com/ilshs.46.51>

Kimani-Murage, E. W., & Ngindu, A. M. (2007). Quality of Water the Slum Dwellers Use: The Case of a Kenyan Slum. *Journal of Urban Health*, 84(6), 829–838. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11524-007-9199-x>

Lawanson, T., & Omoegun, A. (2018). *In transiting to Africa's model Megacity. . . Where is Lagos for everyday people?* Heinrich Böll Stiftung Nigeria. Retrieved from <https://ng.boell.org/en/2018/03/05/transiting-africa's-model-megacity-where-lagos-everyday-people>

Leckie, S. (2000). Housing and property issues for refugees and internally displaced persons in the context of return: key considerations for UNHCR policy and practice. *Refugee Survey Quarterly*, 19(3), 5–63. <https://doi.org/10.1093/rsq/19.3.5>

Lipton, M. (1980). Migration from rural areas of poor countries: The impact on rural productivity and income distribution. *World Development*, 8(1), 1–24. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0305-750x\(80\)90047-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0305-750x(80)90047-9)

Lunstrum, E. (2015). Green grabs, land grabs and the spatiality of displacement: eviction from Mozambique's Limpopo National Park. *Area*, 48(2), 142–152. <https://doi.org/10.1111/area.12121>

Marinho, G. (2014). Brazil. In M. Campagnani & R. Cosentino (Eds.), *World Cup for whom and for what? A look upon the legacy of the World Cups in Brazil, South Africa and Germany* (pp. 37–40). Retrieved from https://br.boell.org/sites/default/files/worldcup_forwhom_forwhat.pdf

McLaughlin, K. R. (2020). *Guiding Principle 28: The Unfulfilled Promise to End Protracted Displacement in Azerbaijan*. University of South Dakota. Retrieved from <https://red.library.usd.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1081&context=honors-thesis>

Mgbako, C. A., Gao, R. E., Joynes, E., Cave, A., & Mikhailevich, J. (2010). Forced Eviction and Resettlement in Cambodia: Case Studies from Phnom Penh. *Global Stud. L. Rev.*, 39. Retrieved from https://ir.lawnet.fordham.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1233&context=faculty_scholarship

Milner, J., & Loescher, G. (2011). Responding to protracted refugee situations: Lessons from a decade of discussion. *Refugee Studies Centre*, 6–13. Retrieved from <https://www.rsc.ox.ac.uk/files/files-1/pb6-responding-protracted-refugee-situations-2011.pdf>

Mitlin, D., & Satterthwaite, D. (2013). Urban Poverty in the Global South: Scale and Nature. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 38(1), 370–385. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2427.12137_6

Mohammed, I., Kosa, A., & Juhar, N. (2020). Economic linkage between urban development and livelihood of peri-urban farming communities in Ethiopia (policies and practices). *Agricultural and Food Economics*, 8(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40100-020-00164-2>

Mpanje, D., Gibbons, P., & McDermott, R. (2018). Social capital in vulnerable urban settings: an analytical framework. *Journal of International Humanitarian Action*, 3(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41018-018-0032-9>

- Muggah, R. (2014). Deconstructing the fragile city: exploring insecurity, violence and resilience. *Environment and Urbanization*, 26(2), 345–358. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956247814533627>
- Noronha, E. G. (2005). Informal, illegal and unfair: perceptions of labor markets in Brazil. *Revista Brasileira de Ciências Sociais*, 18(53), 111–129. Retrieved from http://socialsciences.scielo.org/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S0102-69092005000100009
- Ocheje, P. D. (2007). “In the Public Interest”: Forced Evictions, Land Rights and Human Development in Africa. *Journal of African Law*, 51(2), 173–214. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0021855306000209>
- Odhiambo-Abuya, E. (2003). Refugees and Internally Displaced Persons: Examining Overlapping Institutional Mandates of the ICRC and the UN High Commissioner For Refugees. *Singapore Journal of International & Comparative Law*, 7, 236–266. Retrieved from <http://www.commonlii.org/sg/journals/SGJIntCompLaw/2003/11.pdf>
- Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA). (2008). Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement. Retrieved from <https://www.unhcr.org/43ce1cff2.pdf>
- Olatunde, M., Agbola, B., Popoola, A., Adeleye, B., & Medayese, S. (2021a). Urban eviction in Badia, Lagos: A look at evictees wellbeing and environmental burden. *Zbornik Radova Departmana Za Geografiju, Turizam i Hotelijerstvo*, (50–1), 33–51. <https://doi.org/10.5937/zbdght2101033o>
- Olatunde, M., Agbola, B., Popoola, A., Adeleye, B., & Medayese, S. (2021b). Urban eviction in Badia, Lagos: A look at evictees wellbeing and environmental burden. *Zbornik Radova Departmana Za Geografiju, Turizam i Hotelijerstvo*, (50–1), 33–51. <https://doi.org/10.5937/zbdght2101033o>
- Orendain, D. J. A., & Djalante, R. (2021). Ignored and invisible: internally displaced persons (IDPs) in the face of COVID-19 pandemic. *Sustainability Science*, 16(1), 337–340. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11625-020-00848-0>
- Oyefara, J. L., & Alabi, B. O. (2016). Socio-economic consequences of development-induced internal displacement and the coping strategies of female victims in Lagos Nigeria: An ethno-demographic study. *African Population Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.11564/30-2-863>
- Paller. (2015). Informal Networks and Access to Power to Obtain Housing in Urban Slums in Ghana. *Africa Today*, 62(1), 31. <https://doi.org/10.2979/africatoday.62.1.31>

Payne, G., & Durand-Lasserve, A. (2012). “*Holding On: Security of Tenure - Types, Policies, Practices and Challenges.*” e Office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights in Geneva. Retrieved from <https://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Issues/Housing/SecurityTenure/Payne-Durand-Lasserve-BackgroundPaper-JAN2013.pdf>

Peoples Dispatch. (2020). Violent evictions in Bogotá, Colombia amid the coronavirus pandemic. Retrieved from <https://peoplesdispatch.org/2020/05/13/violent-evictions-in-bogota-colombia-amid-the-coronavirus-pandemic/>

Phuong, C. (2000). Internally Displaced Persons and Refugees: Conceptual Differences and Similarities. *Netherland Quarterly of Human Rights*, 13–19. Retrieved from <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/092405190001800204?journalCode=nqha>

Purcell, M. (2006). Urban Democracy and the Local Trap. *Urban Studies*, 43(11), 1921–1941. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00420980600897826>

Sánchez Mojica, B. E. (2016). A silenced exodus: intra-urban displacement in Medellín. In D. J. Cantor & N. Rodríguez Serna (Eds.), *The New Refugees: Crime and Forced Displacement in Latin America* (pp. 87–108). Retrieved from <https://sas-space.sas.ac.uk/6626/1/06sanchezmojica.pdf>

Schneider, M. (2016). Witnessing Colombia’s Peace. Retrieved from <https://www.crisisgroup.org/latin-america-caribbean/andes/colombia/witnessing-colombia-peace>

Seto, K. C. (2011). Exploring the dynamics of migration to mega-delta cities in Asia and Africa: Contemporary drivers and future scenarios. *Global Environmental Change*, 21, S94–S107. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2011.08.005>

Shittu, A. I., & Musbaudeen, A. M. (2015). Public Participation in Local Government Planning and Development: Evidence from Lagos State, Nigeria. *Covenant University Journal of Politics and International Affairs*, 3, 20–42.

Shultz, J. M., Ceballos, N. M. G., Espinel, Z., Oliveros, S. R., Fonseca, M. F., & Florez, L. J. H. (2013). Internal displacement in Colombia. *Disaster Health*, 2(1), 13–24. <https://doi.org/10.4161/dish.27885>

Siriwardhana, C., & Stewart, R. (2013). Forced migration and mental health: prolonged internal displacement, return migration and resilience. *International Health*, 5(1), 19–23. <https://doi.org/10.1093/inthealth/ihs014>

Sulaiman, K.-O. (2016). Religious Violence in Contemporary Nigeria. *Religious Violence in Contemporary Nigeria*, 29(1), 85–103.

T., V., Huntington, S. P., & Nelson, J. M. (1977). No Easy Choice: Political Participation in Developing Countries. *Population and Development Review*, 3(3), 334. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1971904>

United Nations. (2008). United Nations Declaration on the rights of indigenous Peoples. Retrieved from https://www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/documents/DRIPS_en.pdf

United Nations. (2018). 68% of the world population projected to live in urban areas by 2050, says UN. Retrieved from <https://www.un.org/development/desa/en/news/population/2018-revision-of-world-urbanization-prospects.html>

United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). (2020a). *Figures at a Glance: 82.4 million people worldwide were forcibly displaced*. Retrieved from <https://www.unhcr.org/figures-at-a-glance.html>

United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). (2020b). *Forced Displacement in 2020*. The UN Refugee Agency. Retrieved from <https://www.unhcr.org/flagship-reports/globaltrends/>

United Nations Human Rights Office of the High Commissioner (OHCHR). (2007). | United Nations Special Rapporteur Guidelines on forced Evictions. Retrieved from <https://www.ohchr.org/en/issues/housing/pages/forcedevictions.aspx>

United Nations Human Rights Office of the High Commissioner (OHCHR). (2008). OHCHR | Forced Evictions. Retrieved from <https://www.ohchr.org/en/issues/housing/pages/forcedevictions.aspx>

United Nations Statistics Division Development Data and Outreach Branch. (2019). *SDG Report on Goal 11: Make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable*. Retrieved from <https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/report/2019/goal-11/>

Urban growth and access to opportunities: A challenge for Latin America. (2017). Retrieved from <https://scioteca.caf.com/bitstream/handle/123456789/1091/RED2017-Eng-8ene.pdf?sequence=12>

Uwaifo, S. O. (2018). Corruption and Nigerian Society: Biblical Perspective. *Sociology and Criminology-Open Access*, 06(02). <https://doi.org/10.35248/2375-4435.18.6.190>

van Gelder, J. L. (2013). Paradoxes of Urban Housing Informality in the Developing World. *Law & Society Review*, 47(3), 493–522. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lasr.12030>

Wanninayake, S. (2021). Welcome guests: settlements of Sinhalese IDPs and local integration process in Sri Lanka. *Sri Lanka Journal of Social Sciences*, 44(1), 83. <https://doi.org/10.4038/sljss.v44i1.8049>

World Bank. (2018). World Urban Total Population. Retrieved from <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SP.URB.TOTL.IN.ZS>

World Population Review. (2022). Most Population Countries in Africa and Latin America. Retrieved from <https://worldpopulationreview.com/country-rankings/largest-countries-in-south-america>

Wratten, E. (1995). Conceptualizing urban poverty. *Environment and Urbanization*, 7(1), 11–38. <https://doi.org/10.1177/095624789500700118>