Forced Migration and Global Politics

Alexander Betts

Forced Migration and Global Politics

This book is dedicated to the memory of my father,
John Hamilton Betts (31 March 1940–25 January 2008),
who committed much of his life to teaching and publishing books that
made academic work accessible to students.

Forced Migration and Global Politics

Alexander Betts

Contents

Acknowledgments

The content of this book is based on the graduate course on "International Relations and Forced Migration" that I teach at the Refugee Studies Centre, at the University of Oxford. It was in preparing the syllabus for the course that it occurred to me that there was a significant gap in the literature. Despite the important relationship between forced migration and global politics, there was no single textbook that applied the concepts of International Relations to the empirical context of forced migration. Given the growing number of graduate courses that touch upon aspects of this relationship between forced migration and global politics, it seemed like a worthwhile project to write up my lectures into a resource that other people might be able to use. I am particularly indebted to three colleagues in Oxford who have played a significant role in enabling this book to come into existence. Matthew Gibney, as the director of the MSc in Forced Migration, gave me the opportunity to design and teach the course on which this book is based, and offered invaluable advice on the content and structure of both the course and the book. Gil Loescher, as my long-time mentor in International Relations and Forced Migration, has been an endless source of inspiration and guidance. Andrew Hurrell, first as my doctoral supervisor and then as a colleague, has shaped my understanding of International Relations more than anyone else. The fact that this book covers such a broad conceptual terrain is testimony to his teaching and longstanding critical engagement with my work.

A number of other colleagues in Oxford have been a great source of inspiration and have contributed to the development of some of the ideas in the book. Oxford truly is the most appropriate place in the world to write a book such as this, which attempts to bridge the divide between two areas in which Oxford excels. Not only am I blessed with having excellent colleagues in the Department of Politics and International Relations but Oxford also represents a world-class hub for the study of migration in general and

Introduction

Forced migration has been a major feature of the twentieth and early twenty-first centuries. Around the world, people have been forced to flee their homes as a result of political persecution, conflict, and natural and man-made disasters. The two world wars, the colonial liberation wars, the proxy conflicts of the Cold War, a range of internal conflicts in the Balkans, Africa, and the Caucasus in the aftermath of the Cold War, occupation in Afghanistan and Iraq in the context of the "War on Terror," state partitions and national-ist claims to territory in South Asia and the Middle East, authoritarian regimes, human rights violations, large-scale development projects, and envi-ronmental disasters resulting from hurricanes, tsunamis, and climate change have all contributed to people leaving their own communities in search of protection elsewhere. Most notably, refugees have been displaced across international borders, fleeing political persecution by traveling into neigh-boring states or moving long distances to states in other continents in search of international protection. Other people have been displaced across borders as stateless or environmentally displaced people. In addition to refugees and other people who have crossed an international border, an even greater number of people have been displaced from their homes but have remained within their country of origin as internally displaced persons.

What these categories of people have had in common is that, as a result of an existential threat, they have faced significant constraints in their abil-ity to remain within their home communities. They have consequently been compelled to seek access to rights and entitlements, or "protection," outside their home community. Whether it involves the crossing of international borders or not, forced migration lies at the heart of global politics. Refugee movements are inherently political – involving the competing interests and rights of citizens and non-citizens – and inherently international – involving the cross-border movement of people. However, even internal displacement has dynamics that place it squarely within global politics. There has been

increasing recognition that where an individual's country of origin is unable or unwilling to ensure his or her access to a certain set of basic rights, then there is a wider international responsibility to ensure that such individuals or groups receive protection. Debates on issues such as humanitarian intervention, humanitarian assistance, and the so-called "responsibility to protect" have been closely intertwined with internal displacement. Whether forced migration involves displacement across borders or within a state, its causes, consequences, and states' responses to it have been inextricable from global politics.

Despite the political and international nature of forced migration, issues relating to refugees and internal displacement have rarely been addressed by scholars of International Relations. The discipline of International Relations has expanded its empirical focus beyond analyzing war and peace and issues relating to military security to address a range of areas such as the global economy, environment, human rights, and international trade. However, it has paid relatively little attention to the international politics of forced migration. Where it has done so, the work has emerged in relatively isolated pockets. These have mainly concentrated on analyzing the relationship between forced migration and security and providing historical accounts of the emergence of the global refugee and IDP (Internally Displaced Persons) regimes. Yet the study of forced migration has enormous relevance for IR. It touches upon issues relating to international cooperation, globalization, global public goods, ethnicity and nationalism, sovereignty, international organizations, regime complexity, security, the role of non-state actors, interdependence, regionalism, and North–South relations, for example. Making the study of forced migration part of the mainstream study of International Relations has a potentially wide-ranging theoretical contribution to make to the discipline.

Meanwhile, the discipline of Forced Migration Studies has rarely drawn upon the tools offered by International Relations to inform its analysis. Forced Migration Studies has predominantly drawn upon disciplines such as anthropology, sociology, geography, and law to analyze the causes and consequences of human displacement. It has generally offered a "bottom-up" perspective which places displaced people at the center of its analysis. Although exploring the perspective of forced migrants is crucial, and should not be neglected, there is also a need for a "top-down" level of analysis in order to understand the macro-level structures that influence states' responses to forced migration. This is crucial because it is often the choices of states and other political actors that determine outcomes for the displaced. Bringing the tools of International Relations into the field of Forced Migration Studies therefore has an important contribution to make to the study and practice of forced migration.

This volume therefore attempts to close the gap between Forced Migration Studies and International Relations. For the first time, it brings together the literature on International Relations and the literature on Forced Migration and integrates them within a single volume. It explores what International Relations theory might offer the study of Forced Migration, and vice versa. The main aim of the book is to offer an analytical tool kit for studying the politics of forced migration, and to explore what potential IR has for understanding states' responses to forced migration.

The book has been written primarily as a textbook for undergraduate and graduate courses in International Relations and Forced Migration. However, it is also intended to make a broader academic contribution to International Relations. It attempts to set out a research agenda for how International Relations can approach the study of forced migration and integrate an awareness of forced migration into broader work relating to a range of other areas such as international political economy, security, and international cooperation. Applying IR's core debates to a relatively uncharted empirical terrain also offers an opportunity to push those debates in new directions and to explore them in an applied context. The book represents an opportunity to engage in applied International Relations and explore how a number of the discipline's core concepts can be operationalized in a specific empirical context.

The approach of the book is to take a series of the main topics within International Relations and to apply their core concepts to the study of forced migration. The topics are not intended to be exhaustive. Rather, they are used to highlight and question the relevance of some of the core aspects of the subject for understanding the international politics of human displacement. The concepts that are included in the book are particularly chosen for their ability to shed light on how states respond to forced migration. While it is also important to understand the behavior of other actors and also the underlying causes of displacement, the concepts that are chosen are primarily those that address how states respond to human displacement. The topics covered represent a range of the most relevant aspects of contemporary International Relations for forced migration.

Each chapter sets out a number of key concepts and debates in International Relations and explains their relevance to the international politics of forced migration. It goes through a number of areas: IR Theories, Statehood and Sovereignty, Security, International Cooperation, Global Governance, North–South Relations and the International Political Economy, Globalization, and Regionalism. The chapters then attempt to integrate the concepts drawn from International Relations with the wider Forced Migration literature through a number of case studies involving the politics

of contemporary human displacement. Since refugees have the most obvious relevance for international politics due to crossing international borders, most of the case studies relate to the politics of asylum and refugee protection. However, examples are also used that relate to conflict-induced internal displacement, development-induced displacement, and environmental displacement.

This introduction contextualizes the book. Firstly, it offers an overview of forced migration. Secondly, it explains the relationship between forced migration and global politics. Thirdly, it examines how International Relations and Forced Migration Studies have so far addressed questions relating to the international politics of forced migration. Finally, the introduction concludes by explaining the content and approach of the book.

Categories of Forced Migration

The study of forced migration is premised upon the distinction between forced migration and voluntary migration. The separation of these categories emerges largely from policy categories designed to distinguish between and prioritize the rights of different groups of people. Forced migration is often assumed to have a political basis, being based on flight from persecution or conflict; voluntary migration is generally assumed to be underpinned by economic motives. However, in practice, this distinction is problematic; it is not possible to distinguish sharply between volition and coercion, and they exist on a spectrum. In practice, most migration has elements of both coercion and volition, and is likely to be motivated by a mixture of economic and political factors. All migrating individuals face structural constraints and all retain a degree of agency to choose between different options. For example, while refugees face severe political constraints, they often retain choice over a range of options about where and when to move. Similarly, even "economic migrants" often face serious structural constraints as a result of, for example, a lack of livelihood opportunities in their home country.

Nevertheless, even though the forced/voluntary distinction represents a spectrum rather than a clear dichotomy, which is inadequately captured by existing policy categories, it remains an important and useful distinction for analytical purposes. This is the case for two reasons. Firstly, despite the problematic nature of the dichotomy, and the challenge of knowing "where to draw the line," there are certain categories of people whose basic rights their own states are unwilling or unable to provide, and who are therefore compelled to leave their homes. Secondly, because existing policy categories are based on the distinction, the international politics of forced migration is

generally distinct from the politics of other aspects of human mobility. This book is therefore premised upon the idea that it makes some sense to distinguish analytically between forced and voluntary migration but acknowledges the problematic nature of the distinction. It takes forced migration to be defined by movement that takes place under significant structural constraints that result from an existential threat.

Academic concern with forced migration has been notably concentrated within what has been termed Forced Migration Studies. The traditional concern of Forced Migration Studies has been refugees as people who, owing to a well-founded fear of political persecution, leave their country of origin. However, with time, there has been a growing recognition that, aside from people who cross international borders for reasons of political persecution, there are other groups of people who can legitimately be considered to be forced migrants, even if they have not crossed an international border or may be fleeing for reasons other than those that define refugee status. This section briefly outlines the main categories of forced migration that are addressed by this book.

Refugees

The most high profile and highly researched category of forced migration is refugees. Refugees are defined as people who "owing to a well-founded fear of persecution, on the grounds of race, religion, nationality or membership of a social group, find themselves outside their country of origin, and are unable or unwilling to avail themselves of the protection of that country" (Article 1a of the 1951 Convention on the Status of Refugees). Because they flee persecution and conflict, and cross international borders, they are often colloquially referred to as "human rights abuses made visible," and the number of refugees fleeing a country is often taken to be a proxy measure for the degree to which that country respects human rights. In 2007 there were 11.4 million refugees of concern to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR 2008). They are most frequently hosted in camps or settlements in countries that neighbor their country of origin. For example, the most prominent refugee situations include Somalis in Kenya, Burundians in Tanzania, Afghans in Iran and Pakistan, Burmese in Thailand, Iraqis in Syria and Jordan, and Sudanese in Chad and Uganda. In addition, there were estimated to be around 5 million Palestinian refugees in the Occupied Territories and the Middle East (Dumper 2008).

In contrast to other areas of forced migration, there is a clearly defined international regime governing states' responses to refugees. The 1951 Convention on the Status of Refugees sets out a definition of a refugee and the rights to which refugees are entitled. The original 1951 Convention was

confined to geographical Europe but its scope was made universal through the 1967 Protocol to the Convention. The core principle underpinning the regime is *non-refoulement*, which prohibits states from forcibly returning an individual to a country in which he or she faces a well-founded fear of persecution. Responsibility for monitoring and overseeing the implementation of the 1951 Convention lies with the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). Under the Office's 1950 Statute UNHCR has explicit supervisory responsibility for ensuring that states party to the Convention comply with its obligations. Refugee protection is the only area of forced migration which has historically had a specialized UN agency. The refugee regime has been supplemented by a series of regional agreements on refugee protection, such as the 1969 Organization of African Unity (OAU) Convention, the 1984 Cartagena Declaration in Latin America, and the 2004 European Council Directive. As well as international refugee law, sources of refugees' rights (and hence states' obligations towards refugees) can also be found embedded in other areas of law such as international human rights law, which offers a complementary source of legal protection for refugees.

The international politics of the refugee regime represents the main focus of this book, and the majority of case studies used to illustrate the international relations concepts introduced by the book relate to refugee protection. This is because refugees have been a central part of world politics. Because they cross international borders and so have implications for state sovereignty, because they symbolically serve to discredit or legitimate certain Governments by allowing people to "vote with their feet," and because refugee protection has been subject to regulation by international institutions, refugees have a clear and obvious relationship to international politics. The combination of cross-border movement and the political motives for that movement have made refugees a central part of global politics during the twentieth and early twenty-first centuries. The way in which states have selectively engaged with refugees has been a barometer of wider political trends during the inter-war years, the Cold War, the aftermath of the Cold War, and the so-called "post 9/11 era."

However, although refugees are the central empirical focus of this book, they are by no means the only group of forced migrants who are central to world politics. Indeed, the academic and policy-level focus on refugees has been claimed to highlight an exilic bias. In other words, the refugee regime and the focus on refugees serves to hone attention on those forced migrants who have crossed an international border, to the detriment of focusing on other categories of forced migration such as internally displaced persons (IDPs). While IDPs and other categories of forced migrant may not have

been such a prominent part of modern international political history, they nevertheless also have significant political implications that can be explored using the tools of International Relations.

Conflict-induced internal displacement

During the latter part of the twentieth century, there was increasing recognition that people could be "in a refugee-like situation" and be in need of international protection without having crossed an international border. People facing political persecution or fleeing conflict might move to a different part of their own state rather than travel across an international border. IDPs can be defined as "persons or groups of persons who have been forced or obliged to flee or to leave their homes or places of habitual residence, in particular as a result of or in order to avoid the effects of armed conflict, situations of generalised violence, violations of human rights or natural or man-made disasters, and who have not crossed an internationally recognised State border" (*Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement*, Introduction, para. 2). There are currently around 25 million conflict-induced IDPs in the world, in countries such as Colombia, Sudan, Iraq, Uganda, and Chechnya (Weiss and Korn 2006).

Yet until the end of the twentieth century, there was very little awareness of, or international response to, the situation of IDPs. From the early 1970s, UNHCR began, on an *ad hoc* basis, to provide some protection and assistance to IDPs when doing so was inextricably linked to refugee protection, the work fell within the Office's expertise, and the Office had the permission of the host state. Over time, however, a growing body of academic work and advocacy campaigns began to focus on IDPs and to argue for a more predictable and comprehensive international response to internal displacement. In 1992, the UN Secretary-General appointed the Representative of the Secretary-General on Internally Displaced Persons in order to contribute to awareness of the plight of conflict-induced IDPs and to work towards the development of a legal and normative framework for the protection of IDPs. This culminated in 1997 in the creation of the so-called "Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement" which, drawing upon states' existing obligations under international human rights law and international humanitarian law, created a soft law framework, defining states' obligations towards IDPs (Bagshaw 2005; Phuong 2004).

Following the creation of these principles, an international institutional framework has begun to emerge. Initially, UN agencies attempted to coordinate their responses to IDPs through a so-called "collaborative" approach in which they would jointly engage in IDP protection under the aegis of the UN's humanitarian assistance coordinators. In 2006, this division of responsibility

was made less vague and the so-called "cluster" approach was created. Under this, different UN agencies share responsibility for responding to different aspects of the needs of IDPs. Since 2006, UNHCR has taken responsibility for IDP protection in conflict situations, while the WFP (World Food Programme) takes responsibility for IDPs' food and nutrition and UNICEF for child protection, for example.

Since the creation of the Guiding Principles, states are showing an increasingly significant commitment to IDP protection. The "soft law" principles have been incorporated into the municipal law of some states and the African Union (AU) has pioneered an attempt to develop the world's first "hard law" international legal framework on internal displacement. However, IDP protection continues to be politically controversial. Foreign states engage selectively in IDP protection, in practice only being able to assist IDPs with the permission of the host country. In the context of Chechnya, for example, there has been little means to address internal displacement in the absence of support from the Russian Government. Although internal displacement does not involve those fleeing conflict or persecution crossing a border, it nevertheless has significant implications for state sovereignty. An international response necessarily requires international actors – whether states, international organizations, or NGOs – crossing an international border. In other words, because the displaced do not cross the border, international actors often have to cross the border in the other direction instead. IDP protection therefore lies at the heart of debates relating to state sovereignty and the circumstances under which outsiders have a responsibility to protect individuals whose own governments cannot ensure their safety.

Development-induced displacement

Development-induced displacement and resettlement (DIDR) occurs when, as a result of a change in land use, people are forced to leave their homes either because of direct physical displacement or because of indirect livelihood displacement. DIDR results from a large range of different development projects. The most common source of DIDR is the construction of large dams which submerge villages in rural areas in order to provide irrigation and hydroelectric power needs. However, other development projects such as extraction, conservation programs, urban development projects, and transportation projects have also led to the forced displacement of people. The reason large-scale development projects often lead to displacement is that governments use the principle of "eminent domain" to assert a legal claim over land which is needed for "the collective interest" (de Wet 2006; Khagram 2004).

The majority of DIDR takes place in the developing world. The World Bank conducted a large-scale survey in 1993 and estimated that 80–90 million people were displaced by development projects between 1986 and 1993. It also estimated that, on average, 300 new large dams displace around 4 million people each year. India has historically had the most numerically significant DIDR, displacing between 1951 and 1990 an estimated 20 million people, 16.4 million of whom were displaced by large dams (World Bank 1994). China's development projects such as the Three Gorges Dam on the Yangtze River have also been implicated in causing massive displacement. Such projects, and the displacement they cause, are frequently justified as being in the "national interest" and necessary for "national development." However, while a simple cost-benefit analysis may indeed suggest that displacement is justified by the economic benefits of the project, this ignores the political economy of DIDR. In practice, DIDR has redistributive consequences, generally redistributing resources from the marginalized to the powerful. DIDR places costs disproportionately on politically and economically marginalized groups such as indigenous populations, and its benefits, while often justified as being in the "national interest," frequently accrue to elites and the private sector (Roy 1999).

DIDR takes on a range of international political dimensions. Because many large-scale development projects are funded by international development organizations or regional development banks, these bodies play an important role in regulating how states address DIDR. Development agencies' lending guidelines have become the main means of mitigating the most serious consequences of DIDR and of ensuring that, where people are displaced, they receive rehabilitation and compensation. The World Bank in particular has been heavily criticised for funding projects that led to significant displacement, and, in response, has developed a series of operational guidelines and directives based on its in-house "Impoverishment Risks and Reconstruction Model" (Cernea 2000). The World Bank's lending criteria on DIDR have also shaped the lending conditionality of other development agencies and regional development banks, compelling borrower governments to adopt appropriate reconstruction and resettlement plans. In the absence of an alternative way to enforce human rights guidelines relevant to DIDR – compiled by the UN Commission on Human Rights in its "Comprehensive Human Rights Guidelines on Development-Based Displacement" – these lending criteria represent the dominant "soft law" framework that regulates how states respond to DIDR (Barutciski 2006).

Furthermore, DIDR involves a range of trans-national non-state actors in displacement. Private sector actors have frequently been involved in the development projects that have led to displacement. For example, a number of US and Europe-based MNCs (Multinational Corporations) have held

contracts in relation to large-scale dam projects that have led to displacement in the developing world. Furthermore, DIDR has implicated trans-national civil society. Many of the development projects that have led to displacement have inspired significant resistance. In response to the high profile Sardar Sarovar Dam in India, for example, the so-called Narmada Bachao Andolan (NBA) resistance movement has organized strategic non-violent resistance. The NBA has mobilized support, publicity, and funding for its campaigns through trans-national civil society, leading to the creation of, for example, The Friends of River Narmada and Narmada Solidarity Society movements.

Environmental displacement

A new and emerging category of forced migration is that of environmental displacement. With climate change and the possibility of sinking islands in the Pacific Ocean such as Kiribati, and increased risks of flooding in countries such as Bangladesh, there has been growing speculation about the implications of climate change for human displacement. At the extreme end of the spectrum, where islands disappear and resettlement is required, it may be possible to attribute displacement to climate change. However, beyond the stark examples of sinking islands, attribution may be less clear cut. Indeed, environmental change is more likely to represent a multiplier for other sources of human mobility than a source of forced migration in its own right. As environmental change takes place, it may exacerbate other factors that underlie the movement of people. For example, it may combine with other causes of movement by affecting access to livelihoods, competition for resources, and conflict. Estimates of the impact of climate change on human displacement are contested and vary radically but it is clear that it will be both a source of forced migration in its own right and, more significantly, a multiplier for other underlying causes of forced migration (Myers 1997; Piguet 2008).

On a related theme, natural disasters such as the tsunami in Southeast Asia in December 2004 and Hurricane Katrina in the US in 2006, also frequently compel people to move. Sometimes countries are able to address the human consequences of these disasters in isolation. At other times, an outside response is required. Sometimes assistance is gladly accepted – as in Sri Lanka and Indonesia post-tsunami – and at other times it is resisted – as in Burma in 2008. Increasingly, UNHCR and other humanitarian actors are being drawn into addressing humanitarian crisis and displacement created by serious natural disasters. There is consequently a growing recognition that the environment and human displacement are closely related and that there is a need to address this relationship on an international political level.

The Relationship Between Forced Migration and Global Politics

Forced migration lies at the heart of global politics. The relationship between forced migration and global politics can be identified on three different levels: the *causes* of forced migration, the *consequences* of forced migration, and *responses* to forced migration. On each of these three levels, the concepts of International Relations have a contribution to make to understanding forced migration and forced migration has a contribution to understanding world politics. This section explains each of these levels at which the relationship exists.

Causes

The underlying causes of forced migration are highly political. Analytically, if displacement is seen as a dependent variable, political factors represent important independent variables in explaining displacement. The causes of human displacement are closely connected with trends in the international system, geopolitics, and the global political economy. These broader macro-level trends may in turn shape the country conditions that lead to human displacement. For example, wider inter-state relationships between countries of origin and great powers or former colonizers may sustain oppressive, authoritarian governments that persecute their populations; environmental trends at the global level may mean people are compelled to leave their homes; an international demand for raw materials or commodities such as diamonds may fuel or mitigate conflicts that lead to displacement; the role of multinational corporations may contribute to the type of development project that leads to displacement. In other words, in order to understand why forced migration occurs, it is likely to be insufficient to look at trends within the country in which displacement takes place. Instead, there is a need to also look at global political trends. A number of these relationships can be explored.

Oppressive regimes may be supported or installed by major powers or former colonizers. Internal conflicts, which lead refugees to cross international borders or IDPs to move to other parts of the country may be connected to wider international political issues. They may be triggered or exacerbated by military intervention, occupation, colonialism, or the global political economy. During the Cold War, the proxy conflicts of the 1970s, in which the superpower rivalry between the US and the USSR was played out in the developing world, led to massive displacement in, for example, the Horn of Africa, Southern Africa, Indo-china, and Central America. Today,

the involvement of large powers such as China in Sudan and the US in Iraq and Afghanistan indirectly contributes to human displacement. Colonialism has a relationship to displacement. The postcolonial regimes installed in countries like Rwanda, the Cote d'Ivoire, and Zimbabwe have contributed to social conflicts that underlie forced migration. Meanwhile, economic links between developing countries and developed countries have often contributed to creating the conditions for displacement. The diamond trade from Sierra Leone or oil in Angola have been factors underlying conflicts that have led to both internal displacement and refugee movements.

The consumption and production choices of consumers and corporations may also have a significant relationship to displacement. Environmental change within one state may result from the emissions of other states. For example, greenhouse gas emissions in the developed world may ultimately underlie displacement in the developing world by submerging islands in the Pacific or by radically changing livelihood opportunities on Sub-Saharan Africa. Meanwhile dams and major development projects may result from the foreign direct investment of multinational corporations. Many of the large-scale development projects that have led to human displacement in states in Asia and Africa have been funded by MNCs or through international development organizations. The World Bank and North American and European MNCs have been implicated in large dam-building projects in India and China.

Consequences

It is not just the case that scholars and policy-makers with an interest in forced migration should be concerned with understanding its relationship to global politics. Forced migration may also have an impact on other areas of international politics. In other words, human displacement may be an important independent variable in explaining other issues within global politics. It may, for example, be one factor amongst other variables, that has a significant effect on conflict, peace-building, state-building, terrorist recruitment, sources of foreign direct investment, trans-national crime, or even interest group formation and voting patterns in domestic politics. Some of these relationships are explained below.

Forced migration has an important and inextricable relationship with conflict. During the Cold War, refugees were often supported by the superpowers to fight or offer support to combatants in the proxy conflicts in the developing world. Similarly, the colonial liberation wars were often waged by nationalist groups in exile. The Rwandan Patriotic Front (RPF) in Uganda from the 1970s until the early 1990s, the African National Congress (ANC) in other parts of Southern Africa in the 1970s and 1980s, the Nicaraguan

Contras in Honduras in the 1980s, for example, highlight the role that exiles and refugees play in developing opposition movements that engage in fighting the government in the country of origin. In the Cold War context the phrase "refugee warriors" was frequently used to describe the relationship between guerrilla movements and refugees in the Cold War proxy conflicts. Refugee camps often serve as sanctuaries and bases for combatants. For example, following the Rwandan genocide, many of the Hutu *interahamwe* implicated in the genocide sought refuge in the camps of Eastern Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC). Furthermore, refugees have often been identified as potential "spoilers" in peace deals. The repatriation of groups in exile, the existence of refugee camps that serve as rebel bases, and cross-border smuggling facilitated by refugee camps, can all undermine the prospects for peace. Refugees and returnees have, for example, been regarded as "spoilers" in attempted peace-building in West Africa and the Great Lakes region.

Furthermore, refugees and displaced people are frequently part of trans-national networks in ways that have significant cross-border effects. Refugee camps and protracted refugee situations are potential sources of radicalization and terrorism. With few prospects for education, livelihood opportunities, or freedom of movement, young people in protracted refugee situations may represent a pool of potential recruits for terrorists. The refugee camps that host Palestinian refugees in the Middle East or Somali refugees in East Africa or Afghan refugees in Pakistan, for example, have been identified by Western governments as sources of Islamic radicalization and sources of recruitment for terrorist cells.

In other areas, the trans-national networks created by refugee movements, and their links with diaspora groups, may have significant political effects. For example, in many cases refugees represent a significant source of foreign direct investment. Refugees frequently engage in remittance sending which, for countries under stress such as Somalia, represents one of the biggest sources of overseas income. Refugee flows are also associated with other trans-boundary movements such as organized crime and the demand for trafficking and smuggling networks. These types of trans-national networks, whether positive or negative in their effects, can feed into domestic politics by defining voting behavior, influencing the perception held by electorates of foreigners in general, and introducing a focus on asylum, immigration and trans-nationalism to the domestic political process.

Responses

Beyond seeing forced migration itself as either a dependent or independent variable in global politics, there is also a need to understand how states