

Land-Based Economic Displacement and Livelihood Reconstruction: A Survey of Literature

Mustapha OKYERE, Eric Paul TUDZI and Bernard KUMI-BOATENG, Ghana

Keywords: Land-Based Economic Displacement, Livelihood Reconstruction, Large Scale Land Acquisitions, Mining

Summary

The debate as to how land-based displacement should be compensated for during large-scale development or mining projects still remains an unresolved issue within the resettlement practice and the literature. While such projects can have a significant impact on the livelihood of many, economic displacement is often regarded in the resettlement planning process as an afterthought leading to the poor management of land-based livelihood strategies mostly to the detriment of the poor in developing countries. This paper, which is part of a major study, is a literature review of land-based economic displacement with the view to identifying the associated impacts and the effective approach that could be employed to achieve a sustainable land-based livelihood restoration post-displacement. The outcome of the review reveals that while the proportion of impoverishment risks associated with land loss in large-scale development projects is between 10-20%, its impact on the affected households is dire, especially for rural livelihoods. Development-induced land-based displacements have consistently led to the risks of landlessness, reduction in land sizes for agriculture pursuits, reduction in crop yield and other agriculture output, loss of human and social capital, joblessness, and heightened food insecurity. Given the devastating impact of land loss on land-based livelihood, resettlement researchers and international safeguarding instruments are unanimous about the provision of replacement land to compensate for land and land-based livelihood lost to development projects. The paper therefore concludes that land-based compensation and livelihood restoration need to move beyond the quantification of just the value of the affected land as a physical asset and provide robust mechanisms to remedy the loss of human and social capital, reduction in agriculture output, loss of income during transitional period, potential food insecurity and stress and shocks that threatens the sustainability of land-based compensation and livelihood options. This study provides a conceptual framework for sustainable land-based compensation and livelihood restoration that serves as a focused guide to project sponsors, resettlement practitioners, and researchers in the design and evaluation of resettlement projects.

Land-Based Economic Displacement and Livelihood Reconstruction: A Survey of Literature

Mustapha OKYERE, Eric Paul TUDZI and Bernard KUMI-BOATENG, Ghana

INTRODUCTION

Development projects such as dams, railways, urban expansion, and mining investments are necessary for the socio-economic development of various economies. Nonetheless, the general benefits of these development projects implemented by the state in conjunction with foreign investors often come at a cost to specific communities in the form of displacement and resettlement of various land users including peasant farmers, herders, and fishermen (Cernea, 1997b; Terminski, 2012, 2013). These multiple disruptions displacement and resettlement have on the economic, social, and ecological structures of people raise a lot of political-ecological questions. The loss of productive lands and other relevant environmental resources is considered the most visible loss associated with development-induced displacement and resettlements(DIDR)(Cernea, 1997b; Downing, 2002). This encapsulates the loss of lands and other landed resources not only within the project-affected communities but also includes the high cost of productive lands in the host communities. On a more general level, land loss emanating from involuntary resettlement represents between 10-20% of impoverishment risks (Downing, 2002). In view of this, where the risks of development-induced landlessness are not properly handled, this often culminates in the perpetual decapitalization and pauperization of economically displaced communities (Cernea, 1997). In the history of land displacement and resettlement, several compensation models have been proposed. According to Rowan (2017), cash compensation in the form of a lump sum has been adopted throughout history with their respective challenges and opportunities. Owing to the management difficulties regarding the cash compensation option, conversations both within policy and academic circles have been on the need to adopt a periodic payment model where the compensation for displaced persons is staggered over time. This proposition stems from the intergenerational nature of land ownership in most countries especially Africa, where land is held under the belief that “land belongs to a vast family of which many are dead, a few are living, and a countless host yet unborn”(Pomevor Maha-Atma, 2014, p. 2). In Africa, land based investment is regarded as an effective means of minimizing extreme poverty, especially among the rural population(Cernea, 1997b).

Owing to the risks displaced persons are sometimes exposed to, the issues of conflict and contestations over access to land and land resources sometimes arise between and within project implementing agencies and local resource users(Purwins, 2022). In light of these, resettlement practitioners such as Michael Cernea and other international finance institutions such as the World Bank and the International Finance Cooperation(IFC) have advocated for land-based compensation as the preferred model for compensating land-based displacements(Cernea (1997)(IFC, 2012; World Bank, 2017). According to these propositions, land-based compensation is a more effective option of compensating for the land loss and is capable of restoring the productive base of the displaced persons. In line with these, most

resettlement studies have often studied land-based displacement and reconstruction by merely noting the number or size of lands that have been affected and calling for a replacement of the land. They however fail to identify the land relations or ownership, mode of agriculture production, and soil quality associated with these lands(Wilmsen et al., 2019). Moreover, the planning of land-based resettlement fails to identify different categories of displaced persons based on their gender, age, ethnicity, and social class which are critical in the planning of the compensation and establishing the land-based livelihoods of the displaced. Displaced persons are usually not a homogenous group of people, but rather a group of actors with different social classes, modes of agriculture production(crop farming, livestock, fishing), different land relations, gender, and ethnicity who have differential interests and unequal power relations. These factors account for the differential displacement experiences and capacities to negotiate new strategies for their survival. The consideration of displaced persons as an undifferentiated class of people often creates winners and losers in the resettlement planning process instead of a win-win outcome for all classes of actors. This is because the implementation fails to capture the broader social, economic, political, and ecological issues by highlighting how the different social classes, age groups, gender, ethnicity, and other land rights holders relate to the land. In view of this, this study adopts a political ecology approach in conducting a review of land-based economic displacement and livelihood reconstruction. It therefore extends the land-based compensation discourse and creates a conceptual framework for linking development-induced displacement and resettlement, political ecology, and sustainable livelihood aimed at broadening the scope of land-based displacement and compensation studies while ensuring grassroots participation and equity.

POLITICAL ECOLOGY FRAMEWORK

This study argues that adopting a political ecology approach in understanding the risks and opportunities associated with land-based displacement and resettlement helps avoid overgeneralization of resettlement outcomes and thus provides a more targeted, participatory, and equitable approach in dealing with resettlement issues. Access to land and other land resources is a fundamental issue of concern in development-induced displacement and resettlement discourse. Differential power relations among different actors and their impacts on the capacity to negotiate access to land resources and other benefits during the resettlement process are central to the theory of political ecology. Political ecology as defined by Panjab (2016) is the study of the relationship between politics and environmental phenomena such as land. The conceptualization of political ecology began in the 1970s and 1980s within the field of geography and anthropology based on cultural ecology and development studies tradition(Panjab, 2016; Roberts, 2020). One of the earliest works on the concept of political ecology and the first use of the term was by Eric Wolf in 1972(Walker, 2005) through his seminal article “Ownership and Political Ecology” (Wolf, 1972) in response to the necessity to cause an integration between land use and global political economy(Peet & Watts, 1996). Since then, the field of political ecology has seen a slow development within research scholarship in other fields(Bryant & Bailey, 2005). Following the gradual development, there has been a widespread empirical application of the political ecology approach, in several disciplines. At the moment, there is no universally accepted definition for political ecology as the field has expanded in so many directions(Walker, 2006). However, political ecologists are generally

more concerned with social justice and disparate experiences accompanying development and social change(Hausermann, 2018). In its application as a research analytical tool, Political ecology refers to “empirical, research-based explorations to explain linkages in the condition and change of social/environmental systems, with explicit consideration for relations of power”(Walker, 2006, p. 391). Political ecology therefore looks at the dynamic of power relations between actors and how this influences access to environmental resources including land and land resources(Bryant, 1998). As an interdisciplinary field, political ecology combines the concerns of ecology with political economy involving the constantly changing politics between society and land resources(Walker, 2005). In the context of neo-liberalisation, political ecology as a field is mostly linked to the studies of environmental change, livelihood loss and local dispossession emanating from transnational mining, agricultural conversion, and nature conservation in the global south(Roberts, 2020).

Under the environmental conflict and exclusion theses of political ecology, Paul Robbins indicates that, rising scarcity of resources through enclosures and or appropriation by state authorities, private firms, or social elite accounts for the increase in conflicts between groups(gender, age or ethnicity)(Robbins, 2012). In this instance, some groups gain control over communal resources at the expense of others through leveraging management interventions by the state or private firms. Thus an important aspect of political ecology is to seek an understanding of how the lessening of inequality of gender, social class, race, and ethnicity empowers the underprivileged in society(Rodríguez-labajos & Martínez-alier, 2015). In Ghana, one of the most recent works that sought to explore power relations among disparate stakeholders in the project development process is that of Hausermann (2018). Hausermann (2018) examined the critical discourse that undergirds the Bui dam construction and the lived experiences of the affected population and concluded that hydropower development shapes inequality among actors and creates new injustices. Andrews (2018) also adopts the accumulation by dispossession theory with a political economy framework in assessing communities' perspectives on dispossession and marginalization in Ghana's mining sector. In his studies, he identified how capitalist accumulation accounts for differential community experiences between the masses and the traditional authorities. The theory of political ecology is very useful for understanding the strata-based issues of development projects and investments, and their associated displacement by highlighting the disparate power relations between the various actors at multiple scales and the capacities influencing decisions during investment or development projects that affect them.

While some have argued for political ecological analysis to be restricted to local land users, other political ecologists have suggested for analysis to address politics of all types of environmental(land) issues at various levels (international, national, and local), as the restriction to local land users limits the usefulness of political ecology(Bryant & Bailey, 2005). Political ecology therefore involves questions such as 1. Who has the power to undertake a dam or mining project? 2. Who has the authority to grant permission for the construction of a dam or mining project? 3. Who is going to benefit from the project as well as who has to be displaced economically or physically to make way for the project? and 4. Who should be part of the resettlement planning process, and what type of land rights or access should be given to whom and at what location? At the community level, the approach is to examine the political

ecology questions based on socioeconomic characteristics such as class, ethnicity, and gender as indicated by Bryant & Bailey (2005). Through political ecology analysis, various social stratification, in the form of rich/poor, ethnic majority/minority, and men/women power differentials, competing interests, and access to land resources and their impacts by the displacement and resettlement process will be highlighted. Situating the study within the political-ecological theory provides a relevant benchmark in assessing how unequal power relations affect and are affected by resettlement processes. It further provides a groundwork for informing policymakers on the complexities in land access and land resource exploitation and examines how unequal power relations among actors impact decision-making on land-based displacement and compensation.

THE IMPOVERISHMENT RISKS AND RECONSTRUCTION (IRR) MODEL AND LAND-BASED COMPENSATION

One of the earliest and the most comprehensive works on development-induced displacement and resettlement is Michael Cernea's Impoverishment Risks and Reconstruction (IRR) Model. Writing in the 1990s, Michael Cernea, who was the Senior Social Policy Advisor of the World Bank developed the IRR model based on a review of a series of the Bank's assisted projects related to displacement and resettlement studies that had been conducted across the globe (Downing, 2002). The IRR model currently serves as a great source of reference for most involuntary resettlement-related studies (Cernea, 1997b) and has provided a solid foundation for the development of international safeguard instruments such as the World Bank's Environmental and Social Standards as well as the IFC Performance Standards on Environment and Social Stability (Owen & Kemp, 2015). The IRR model is a tool that serves diagnostic, research, planning, and performance evaluation functions on involuntary displacement and resettlement-related activities. According to the model, development-induced displacement and resettlements present several risks to the displaced which if not managed properly, can lead to perpetual impoverishment of the affected persons. Cernea identified eight risks associated with displacement; landlessness, joblessness, homelessness, marginalization, increased morbidity, food insecurity, lack of access to common property, and social disarticulation, which are variables of poverty and universal to most development projects. Cernea notes that landlessness is the most severe risk resettlers face when displaced by development projects. The other remaining risks are all direct consequences of the risks of landlessness and thus where landlessness is appropriately addressed, the severity of the other risks will be lessened.

Land expropriation for development projects eliminates the strategic bedrock upon which people's productive systems, commercial activities, and livelihood strategies are built (Cernea, 1997b). Several studies (Dao, 2016; Koenig, 2002; Maitra, 2009; Wilmsen, 2011) have produced a consistent outcome about the negative impact of development projects on land ownership and land-based livelihood strategies. These mainly include decreasing access to land as the sizes of land parcels held by households reduce, reduction in crop yields, reduction in livestock size, and most severely increase in the number of landless households (Cernea, 1997b). Cernea proposes the concept of land-based reestablishment where the displaced persons are resettled back on cultivable land as a way of reconstructing the livelihood of the land-based economically displaced persons. This is particularly essential given the land-based

nature of most livelihoods in rural communities within the global south(Hilson & Banchirigah, 2009). Although very comprehensive, the IRR model has been criticized on several fronts. In the view of Wilmsen et al. (2019), the IRR model directs the researcher or practitioner to focus on only specific types of questions. For instance, the model encourages the practitioner to quantify the number of lands that have been lost and plan for how much land is required to compensate for such loss, thus does not account for other losses such the agricultural modes of production, specific land tenure arrangements or land relation, and the quality of land.

In most rural regions, however, the exact land use and land rights of people are at times very difficult to determine due to what Robbins(2012) refers to as the “ordinariness” of daily actions. According to Robbins (2012), it is quite challenging to ask, land users about what they do on the land on a daily basis, coupled with the unwritten and oral nature of these land rights which makes it difficult to articulate. Individual’s access, use, and relations to the land are often distinct from other members of the community and thus are impacted differently by development projects or land enclosures. In his analysis of large-scale land transactions in Ghana, Kuusaana (2017) found that land enclosures by multinational companies and concomitant displacements lead to winners and losers. He found that the disparate experiences of land enclosures were influenced by the unequal power relations among different actors in the community. Similarly, Robbins(2012) points out that, “development is by no means a win-win outcome for locals, and therefore portends conflict”. This phenomenon was discussed by Cernea who acknowledged that different categories of actors such as women and children are impacted differently by displacement and resettlement(Cernea, 1997b). The understanding of the patterns and processes of the differential power relations among actors and how these were birthed are critical in examining displacement and resettlement. The identification of these differential impacts takes place within a framework vacuum and thus fails to capture all the diverse experiences and how to adequately address these disparate impacts.

ANALYSIS OF DIDR IN GHANA IN THE LIGHT OF THE IRR MODEL

While the IRR model provides a general prognostic model for DIDR, the risks may differ from one project to the other and from country to country. In view of this, the study reviewed relevant literature on DIDR in Ghana implemented since the early 1950s with the view of identifying the major risks emanating from DIDR in the country. The outcome of this review is highlighted below.

Landlessness, Joblessness, and Food Insecurity

Given the rural nature of most development-induced displacement and resettlement especially those caused by dam construction and mining operations, most of the livelihoods impacted by displacement are land-based including crop farming and livestock(Obour et al., 2016; Owusu et al., 2017). Access to land is therefore indispensable to the livelihood restoration effort of the displaced persons within the resettlement communities. Given the different legal regimes with which dam and mining project takes place, the issue of land take and compensation for lands differ markedly between these two major categories of development-induced displacement. In all the three major dam-induced displacement and resettlement areas(Akosombo, Kpong, and Bui) Ghana has experienced, replacement land has often been provided to affected persons

especially those engaged in land-based livelihoods before resettlement (Adu-gyamfi, 2020; Kyei-Dompreh, 2012). The risk of landlessness is a major risk in mining and dam-induced resettlement communities in Ghana although in varying degrees (Adu-gyamfi, 2020; Korah et al., 2020; Reisenberger, 2010). In dam-induced resettlement communities, landlessness manifests itself mostly in the drastic reduction in the size of land offered to affected persons. Such a situation accounts for the inability of the resettlement households to engage in shifting cultivation, a farming practice that is essential in helping the once-cultivated lands regain their fertility (Akabzaa & Darimani, 2001). This is compounded by the limited productive potential and fertility of the farmlands (Kyei-Dompreh, 2012) often received by the displaced persons, consequently affecting the crop yield and jeopardizing the ability of the land-based economically displaced persons to re-establish their livelihoods through farming (Hausermann, 2018; Obour et al., 2016; Wilmsen et al., 2019). Most of the farmlands often provided to the resettled households are those that had for a very long time been cultivated by members of the host communities with very little productive capacity to support agricultural production which adds to the risks of impoverishment of displaced households (Wilmsen et al., 2019).

With respect to mining, before the enactment of the Minerals and Mining Act, 2006 (Act 703) and its subsidiary legislation the Minerals and Mining (Compensation and Resettlement) Regulations 2012 (L.I 2175), the legal regime that existed under the Minerals and Mining Law, 1986 (P.N.D.C.L. 153) made no provision for either cash or land compensation for deprivation of land use (Kidido et al., 2015). This is because, the legislative framework vests all minerals found in the land in its natural state in the President on behalf of the state (Aboagye, 2014; Korah et al., 2019). Given the challenge of land scarcity in mining areas, the risk of landlessness is mostly intensified in mining-induced displacement and resettlement communities. This issue of landlessness is a common experience in mining-induced resettlement communities in the Western and the Ahafo regions as observed by Reisenberger (2010) and Korah et al. (2020) respectively. These often decapitalize the affected households which potentially accounts for their joblessness, food insecurity, and impoverishment (Cernea (1997a)

Loss of Access to Common Property

Ghana's development-induced resettlement experiences are sometimes characterized by a complete decapitalization or limited access to common properties such as forests and water bodies that serve as the productive base for the livelihood of the displaced (Hausermann, 2018; Korah et al., 2019). In both of the major development-induced displacement; the dam- and mining-induced resettlement areas, major common properties that provide a critical base for communities' livelihoods are significantly impacted. In most dam-induced displacement and resettlement and sometimes in mining-induced areas, the challenge often experienced are loss of access to the valuable and healthy portions of the water bodies where they could draw water for domestic use and enjoy sustained bumper harvest. (Hausermann, 2018; Kyei-Dompreh, 2012). This is a widespread phenomenon across all the dam-induced resettlement areas including the Akosombo, Kpong, and Bui Dam areas since fishing usually forms part of the economic mainstay of these communities. The lack of access or proximity between resettlement communities and the valuable portion of water bodies exacerbates the plight of the displaced in terms of water security for the resettled. In his study of the antipolitics development and livelihood implication for the Bui resettlement community, Hausermann

(2018) noted that “*Limited water availability poses enormous difficulties for resettled families and puts pressure on women and children, who are largely responsible for water collection*”(p. 643). The loss of access to water bodies that provide numerous services to the displaced has enormous implications for re-establishing their livelihoods and largely contributes to the pauperization of the displaced at the resettlement sites. In the mining-induced displaced areas, the decrease or a complete loss of access to water bodies is compounded by loss of access to forest resources from which households obtain their fuel wood, hunting, and other services(Korah et al., 2019; Reisenberger, 2010). These experiences increase the level of planned and actual out-migrations from the resettlement communities mostly by the youth in search of greener pastures elsewhere leading to the abandonment of the resettlement sites(Akabzaa & Darimani, 2001; Obour et al., 2016)

Social Disarticulation

Except in rare cases, the risks of social disarticulation are very pervasive even though in different forms across the development induced-resettlement communities in Ghana. In mining and dam-induced displacement and resettlement communities, there is a breakdown of community-level structures that existed before resettlement. Owing to this, there is often disregard for the existing norms and customs within the resettlement communities(Akabzaa & Darimani, 2001; Hausermann, 2018). Furthermore, the reciprocal help phenomenon where fisherfolks for instance exchange fish for foodstuffs and where farmers would help each other on their farms in the pre-resettlement community has often been dismantled in resettlement communities. These take away the social dependence that was enjoyed by community members in the pre-resettlement communities. Furthermore, there is a social fragmentation across most of the resettlement communities where some community members have neighbors and relatives relocated further away from them(Korah et al., 2019; Wilmsen et al., 2019). These breakdowns in social capital and networks make it extremely difficult in the livelihood re-establishment process given the resettlers' loss of natural capital. These experiences in dam and mining induced resettlement areas seem to be in contrast with the observations in coastal development-induced resettlement especially those implemented in the case of the Keta Sea Defence Resettlement Scheme. In this instance, the resettled population demonstrates a high level of satisfaction with some degree of reservation for the resettlement scheme which promotes social cohesion and minimizes social disarticulation (Danquah et al., 2014). While the factors influencing these disparate experiences are not too obvious, one could say the risks of landlessness and limited access to common resources in the dam and mining-induced resettlement communities would be highly influential in explaining this.

Homelessness

The risk of homelessness is not a predominant challenge that characterizes development-induced displacement and resettlement in Ghana. Since the early 1960s through to the 1990s especially for dam and mining-induced displacement and resettlement, all affected households have often been provided with replacement houses, sometimes based on room-for-room bases(Kyei-Dompreh, 2012; Miine, 2014). The analysis of the evolution of resettlement practices in Ghana reveals a continuous improvement in the quality and design of houses offered to displaced persons in both dam and mining-induced resettlement communities. In 1965, within the Akosombo dam resettlement communities, an inadequate one-room core

house with other building materials was offered to each affected household based on a self-help approach. This practice improved significantly to more modern residential facilities with kitchens and washrooms at the Bui dam resettlement community which depicts a great improvement in the housing provisions within dam-induced resettlement areas.(Hausermann, 2018; Obour et al., 2016). Nonetheless, a critical issue of concern in this area is the resettler's lack of perceived and legal tenure security over the houses owned due to the absence of a land title certificate evidencing ownership of the houses. In a study by Miine (2014), he found that resettlers could not express their sense of ownership and control over their new resettlement homes. The experience is quite similar for mining-induced displacement and resettlement areas. In the 1990s, within the Tarkwa (Teberebie) resettlement community, the resettlement houses provided were found to be inadequate to accommodate the large size of displaced families(Reisenberger, 2010). Subsequent resettlement activities have therefore revealed a major improvement in housing provision within resettlement communities. In Kenyase and Ntotroso, the houses provided came with a kitchen and bathroom which were absent in previous resettlement practices in the area of mining(Korah et al., 2019). Similarly, recent resettlement houses at Cape Town in the Tarkwa area symbolize a continuous improvement in the housing provisions in resettlement practice in Ghana. Conspicuously there is a higher level of satisfaction among resettled households for houses provided by recent development project implementers than before(Korah et al., 2019; Reisenberger, 2010). The provision of housing provides a formidable basis to improve the lives and livelihoods of the resettlers while mitigating impoverishment and this must be well planned and executed in a participatory manner.

Loss of Infrastructural Facilities

Access to infrastructural facilities is an essential indicator for improved livelihoods. The development-induced resettlement experiences in Ghana indicate a consistent provision of improved infrastructural facilities in the dam, mining, and other development-induced resettlement communities which mostly includes the development of improved and modern health facilities, educational facilities, road networks, and electricity (Danquah et al., 2014; Korah et al., 2019). The availability of these facilities facilitates an enhanced lives and livelihoods of the resettlers since most of these facilities are often non-existent in the pre-resettlement communities.

SUSTAINABLE LIVELIHOOD APPROACH

In their analysis of sustainable livelihood concepts, Chambers & Conway (1992) provide a breakdown of the different constituents of sustainable livelihoods and the necessary conditions that need to exist to make livelihood sustainable for the present and future generations. They emphasize the concept of social and environmental sustainability of livelihoods which are seen to be very critical in maintaining and ensuring continuity of decent livelihood. According to Chambers & Conway (1992) livelihood is the “capabilities (eg, ability to make use of livelihood opportunities), assets (including both social and material resources) and activities required for a means of living” (p. 6). Sustainability as a concept has seen some evolution over time. The past four decades have seen different conceptualizations of sustainability based on the background of the authors(Kotob, 2015). The most familiar definition was that given by the Brundtland World Commission Report of 1987 which defined Sustainability as “the development that meets the needs of the present generation without compromising the ability

of future generations to meet their own needs” (Kotob, 2015, p. 3). Chambers & Conway (1992) also refer to sustainability as self-sufficiency and an ideology of long-term self-restraint and self-reliance. The underlying principle of sustainability is therefore multifaceted and this includes social, economic, environmental, and ethical principles. The disagreement on the definition of sustainable livelihood emanates from the plethora of interpretations proffered by a host of practitioners in response to the call of Chambers & Conway (1992), where they called for a discussion to elaborate the concept (Hilson & Banchirigah, 2019). The initial advocacy for sustainable livelihood was towards a development approach that is “people-centered” and emerges towards an understanding of rural development from local perspectives (Hilson & Banchirigah, 2019, p. 4). Sustainable livelihood also refers to the process of maintaining and enhancing the security of ownership and access to resources, assets, and income as well as ensuring there is an adequate stock of food and cash to meet basic needs (Anima, 2015). A livelihood is therefore recognized as sustainable if it can cope with and recover from stresses and shocks, maintain or enhance its capabilities and assets, and provide sustainable livelihood opportunities for the next generation (Chambers & Conway, 1992; Mar 2020). Thus, for a compensation package to be able to effectively reestablish the livelihood of the economically displaced, such an option needs to possess the characteristics of a sustainable livelihood option.

Livelihood is said to be socially sustainable if it can cope with stress and shocks and retain its ability to continue and improve. It refers to whether a household can gain, and maintain an adequate and decent livelihood (Chambers & Conway, 1992). On the other hand, the environmental sustainability of livelihood involves the external implication a livelihood has for other livelihoods (Chambers & Conway, 1992). The concept of social and environmental sustainability hence provides an opportunity for not only the current generation but also the future generation to earn a living which aligns very well with the rationale behind land-based compensation and livelihood reconstruction approach. Environmental sustainability focuses on how livelihood can enhance or deplete the environment through various processes such as soil erosion, desertification, and deforestation (Chambers & Conway, 1992). Both of these dimensions of sustainable livelihoods are essential in looking at the sustainability of the land-based compensation and livelihood options employed in reconstructing the land-based livelihoods of persons displaced by development projects. Moreover, critical to the concept of sustainable livelihood are the principles of equity, sustainability, and capability. The loss and gain of land, common properties, and infrastructure among others impact the assets and capabilities of people thus affecting their ability to achieve sustainable livelihoods.

The principle of equity is mostly concerned with the equal distribution of assets, capabilities, and opportunities. Assets and capabilities are essential building blocks for sustainable livelihood. Household assets relevant to sustainable livelihoods include natural, human, public financial, and social capital and other relevant household valuables (Anima, 2015). In a political ecological sense, where there is no equity, the less powerful and marginalized will be pushed onto more marginal lands which will lead to over-exploitation of those areas and their degradation. It is therefore essential for resettlement researchers and consultants to identify differential classes of people, and assess their differential capabilities and power relations which impact their ability to negotiate for a decent livelihood. From the review of the DIDR in Ghana, however, it could be observed that, the analysis of the risks and opportunities emanating

from the resettlements are not differentiated among groups, and therefore it is quite difficult to examine the disaggregated impacts necessary to ensure equity. This study creates a nexus between land-based displacement and resettlement, sustainable livelihoods, and political ecology approach in creating a framework for the design of land-based compensation and livelihoods of the economically displaced. A political ecology approach is therefore an essential tool in helping identify the different classes of persons impacted by displacement who have unequal power relations and capabilities to access and earn a living from land resources.

A CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK FOR EXAMINING LAND-BASED COMPENSATION AND LIVELIHOOD RECONSTRUCTION

While there have been several studies on land-based economic displacement, impoverishment risks, political ecology, and sustainable livelihoods, these studies have often been disjointed (Bryant & Bailey, 2005; Cernea, 1997b; Chambers & Conway, 1992). In view of this, this review conceptualizes the political ecology of land-based economic displacement and livelihood reconstruction by creating a strong linkage between political ecology, land-based displacement and resettlement, and sustainable livelihood as indicated in Figure 1. This is intended to provide a guide for implementing land-based compensation and livelihood reconstruction among communities to achieve an inclusive, and equitable redistribution of land resources to the different categories of actors. As Asiama et al., (2017) note, access to land and tenure security is a prerequisite for socio-economic growth and provides the foundation for the land-based livelihood reconstruction process. Although development-induced displacement and resettlement which is an outcome of political, economic, and ecological interactions, sometimes lead to positive outcomes, they often produce the risks of joblessness, homelessness, marginalization, increased morbidity, food insecurity, loss of access to common property and social disarticulation all of which have strong linkages with the risks of landlessness. The implementation of the land-based compensation and livelihood reconstruction process requires the consideration of sustainability principles by emphasizing the ability of the land and the livelihood provided to be able to withstand the stresses and shocks as identified by Chambers & Conway (1992). These processes however need to take into account the economic, political, and social concerns accompanying the land-based displacement and reconstruction which is critical to the political ecology framework.

Economic displacement creates differential risks and opportunities among the different categories of community-level actors who have different attachments to the land as an environmental resource as well as unequal power relations. In this regard, this conceptual framework stresses the need for proper identification, participation, and inclusiveness of the different social groups at the community level in the planning and implementation of a sustainable land-based livelihood reconstruction through a political ecology approach. Land-based livelihood reconstruction process needs to emphasize class-level participation and inclusiveness where the different social groups have equal representation through a bottom-up approach rather than based on a top town dominance of the most powerful in the planning process (Boateng et al., 2023). This provides an avenue for a proper representation of the interests and paves the way for common grounds of negotiation and access to land resources by the various shades of actors that are satisfactory and prevent winners and losers while

achieving win-win outcomes(Asiama et al., 2017; Kuusaana, 2017). The principle of equity as used in the concept of sustainable livelihood implies less inequality in the distribution of assets, capabilities, and opportunities and improving those of the less privileged (Chambers & Conway, 1992). The land-based compensation and livelihood reconstruction processes therefore need to be undertaken through a careful analysis of the impact on all the varying groups of actors and ensuring fair or equitable land-based compensation. This is essential because, each group of actors has a different attachment to land and land resources and hence, the implementation of the land-based compensation needs critical accounts of this in the planning process.




Figure 1: Framework for Land-Based Compensation and Livelihood Reconstruction

Source: Authors' Construct

CONCLUSION

Land-based displacement and resettlement are often associated with associated opportunities and risks. These risks include joblessness, food insecurity, social disarticulation, marginalization, and loss of common resources, while the opportunities often come in the form of housing provision, and job opportunities, among others. These opportunities and risks are however unequal and differ among the various categories of actors at multiple scales especially the local level due to differences. Issues of the differential mode of production, ethnicity, age, social class, land right, or property relation account for the differential experience due to the associated differential power relation among these actors. This study therefore proposes that land land-based compensation planning approach should move beyond the mere quantification of the value of land that has been lost and replaced with a similar quantity. Assessment of how the different modes of production, land relations ethnicity, age, and social classes have been impacted is critical while ensuring equity and participation of these actors to ensure a sustainable livelihood.

REFERENCE

- Aboagye, S. (2014). Mining and resettlement of communities in Ghana: Exposing the harm caused by forced displacement and relocation. *Mining Watch*, 1–10. www.miningwatch.ca
- Adu-gyamfi, A. (2020). Involuntary Resettlement in Ghana : Implementation , Planning and Management of Social Impacts in Hydropower Projects. *Developing Country Studies*, 5(14), 44–58. <https://www.iiste.org/Journals/index.php/DCS/article/view/23799>
- Akabzaa, T., & Darimani, A. (2001). Impact Of Mining Sector Investment In Ghana : A Study Of The Tarkwa Mining Region. *A Draft Report Prepared for SAPRI*, 1–71.
- Andrews, N. (2018). Land versus livelihoods: Community perspectives on dispossession and marginalization in Ghana's mining sector. *Resources Policy*, 58, 240–249. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resourpol.2018.05.011>
- Anima, P. A. (2015). *Effects of the Construction of the Bui Dam on the Livelihoods of the Surrounding Communities*.
- Asiama, K., Lengoiboni, M., & Molen, P. Van Der. (2017). In the Land of the Dammed: Assessing Governance in Resettlement of Ghana's Bui Dam Project. *MDPI*, 6(September), 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.3390/land6040080>
- Boateng, D., Bloomer, J., & Morrissey, J. (2023). *Where the power lies : Developing a political ecology framework for just energy transition*. June. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gec3.12689>
- Bryant, R. L. (1998). Power , knowledge and political ecology in the third world : a review. *Progress in Physical Geography*, 22(1), 79–94.
- Bryant, R. L., & Bailey, S. (2005). *Third World Political Ecology*.
- Cernea, M. M. (1997a). African involuntary population resettlement in a global context.

- Environmentally Sustainable Development, The World Bank, February 1997*, 1–53.
http://www-wds.worldbank.org/servlet/WDSContentServer/WDSP/IB/1997/02/01/000009265_3980728144037/Rendered/PDF/multi_page.pdf
- Cernea, M. M. (1997b). The Risks and Reconstruction Model for Resettling Displaced Populations. In *Social Development in the World Bank*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-57426-0>
- Chambers, R., & Conway, G. R. (1992). Sustainable rural livelihoods: practical concepts for the 21st century. *IDS Discussion Paper*, 296.
- Danquah, J. A., A., J. A., & Ankrah, J. S. (2014). Assessment of Residential Satisfaction in the Resettlement. *International Journal Civil Engineering, Construction and Estate Management*, 2(3), 26–45.
- Dao, N. (2016). Political Responses to Dam-Induced Resettlement in Northern Uplands Vietnam. *Journal of Agrarian Change*, 16(2), 291–317.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/joac.12106>
- Downing, T. E. (2002). *Avoiding New Poverty : Mining Induced Displacement and Resettlement*. 58, 3–29. <https://pubs.iied.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/migrate/G00549.pdf>
- Hausermann, H. (2018). “ Ghana must Progress , but we are Really Suffering ”: Bui Dam , Antipolitics Development , and the Livelihood Implications for Rural People. *Society & Natural Resources*, 31(6), 633–648. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08941920.2017.1422062>
- Hilson, G., & Banchirigah, S. M. (2019). Are Alternative Livelihood Projects Alleviating Poverty in Mining Communities? Experiences from Ghana. *The Journal of Development Studies, Taylor & Francis (Routledge)*, 45(2), 172–196.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00220380802553057> .
- IFC. (2012). *Performance Standards on Environmental and Social Sustainability*. https://www.ifc.org/wps/wcm/connect/c02c2e86-e6cd-4b55-95a2-b3395d204279/IFC_Performance_Standards.pdf?
- Kidido, J. K., Ayitey, J. Z., Kuusaana, E. D., & Gavu, E. K. (2015). Who is the rightful recipient of mining compensation for land use deprivation in Ghana ? *Resources Policy*, 43, 19–27. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resourpol.2014.10.004>
- Koenig, D. (2002). *Toward local development and mitigating impoverishment in development-induced displacement and resettlement* (Issue 8).
- Korah, P. I., Matthews, T., & Osborne, N. (2020). Assembling Accra through new city imaginary : Land ownership , agency , and relational complexity Assembling Accra through new city imaginary : Land ownership , agency , and relational complexity. *Habitat International*, 106(November), 102277.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.habitatint.2020.102277>
- Korah, P. I., Nunbogu, A. M., Cobbinah, P. B., & Akanbang, B. A. A. (2019). Analysis of livelihood issues in resettlement mining communities in Ghana. *Resources Policy*, 63(November 2018). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resourpol.2019.101431>
- Kotob, F. (2015). *What Is Sustainability?* (Issue November 2011).
- Kuusaana, E. D. (2017). Winners and losers in large-scale land transactions in Ghana - Opportunities for win-win outcomes. *African Review of Economics and Finance*, 9(1), 62–95.
- Kyei-Dompreh, F. (2012). *Management Of VRA Resettlement Towns: Case Study, West*

- Kpong Resettlement Town* [Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology].
<https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Management-of-VRA-Resettlement-Towns%3A-Case-Study%2C--Dompreeh/1b32530d4fe1029e78d696d7e91d2e41b82df084>
- Maitra, S. (2009). Development induced displacement: Issues of compensation and resettlement experiences from the Narmada valley and Sardar Sarovar project. *Japanese Journal of Political Science*, 10(2), 191–211.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S1468109909003491>
- Mar, C. (2020). *Redevelopment of Slum Area in Jakarta : Case Study The Impact of Gender Inequality on The Sustainable Livelihood Assets Post Resettlement from Kampung to Modern Apartment Style*. <https://doi.org/10.4108/eai.12-11-2019.2293533>
- Miine, L. K. (2014). *Sustainability of Bui Resettlement Scheme in Ghana* [Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology].
<https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/sustainability-of-bui-resettlement-scheme-in-ghana-miine/da0708f1076acb9a77a46d256b1cf24193d43150>
- Obour, P. B., Owusu, K., & Agyeman, E. A. (2016). The impacts of dams on local livelihoods : a study of the Bui Hydroelectric Project in Ghana. *International Journal of Water Resources Development*, 32(2), 286–300.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/07900627.2015.1022892>
- Owen, J. R., & Kemp, D. (2015). Mining-induced displacement and resettlement : a critical appraisal. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 87, 478–488.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2014.09.087>
- Owusu, K., Obour, P. B., & Nkansah, M. A. (2017). Downstream effects of dams on livelihoods of river-dependent communities : the case of Ghana ’ s Kpong Dam. *Geografisk Tidsskrift-Danish Journal of Geography*, 7223, 1–10.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00167223.2016.1258318>
- Panjab. (2016). Political Ecology. *International Journal of Research and Scientific Innovation (IJRSI)*, III(Ix), 102–103.
- Peet, R., & Watts, M. (1996). *Liberation Ecology* (pp. 1–45).
- Pomevor Maha-Atma, S. (2014). *Customary land tenure practices and land markets in Ghana*.
- Purwins, S. (2022). Bauxite mining at Atewa Forest Reserve , Ghana : a political ecology of a conservation-exploitation conflict. *GeoJournal*, 87(2), 1085–1097.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10708-020-10303-3>
- Reisenberger, B. (2010). „*Gold Rush in Ghana. The Case of Teberebie*.“.
- Robbins, P. (2012). *Political Ecology*.
- Roberts, J. (2020). Political Ecology. *Cambridge Encyclopedia of Anthropology*, October.
<https://doi.org/10.29164/20polieco>
- Rodríguez-labajos, B., & Martínez-alier, J. (2015). *Political ecology of water conflicts*. 2(October). <https://doi.org/10.1002/wat2.1092>
- Rowan, M. (2017). Aligning resettlement planning and livelihood restoration with social impact assessment : a practitioner perspective. *Impact Assessment and Project Appraisal*, 5517, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14615517.2016.1271541>
- Terminski, B. (2012). Mining-Induced Displacement and Resettlement: Social Problem and Human Rights Issue (a Global Perspective). *SSRN Electronic Journal*.

- <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2028490>
- Terminski, B. (2013). Development-induced displacement and resettlement: Theoretical frameworks and current challenges. In *Development* (Vol. 10, Issue May).
[https://dlc.dlib.indiana.edu/dlc/bitstream/handle/10535/8833/Bogumil Terminski, development-Induced Displacement and Resettlement. Theoretical frameworks and current challenges.pdf](https://dlc.dlib.indiana.edu/dlc/bitstream/handle/10535/8833/Bogumil%20Terminski,%20development-Induced%20Displacement%20and%20Resettlement.%20Theoretical%20frameworks%20and%20current%20challenges.pdf)
- Walker, P. A. (2005). Political ecology : Where is the ecology ? *Progress in Human Geography*, 29(1), 73–82. <https://doi.org/10.1191/0309132505ph530pr>
- Walker, P. A. (2006). Political ecology : where is the policy ? *Progress in Human Geography*, 30(3), 382–395.
- Wilmsen, B. (2011). Progress, problems, and prospects of dam-induced displacement and resettlement in china. *China Information*, 25(2), 139–164.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0920203X11407544>
- Wilmsen, B., Adjarthey, D., & Hulthen, A. Van. (2019). Challenging the risks-based model of involuntary resettlement using evidence from the Bui Dam , Ghana. *International Journal of Water Resources Development*, 0627, 1–19.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/07900627.2018.1471390>
- Wolf, E. (1972). OWNERSHIP AND POLITICAL. *Jstor*, 45(3), 201–205.
- World Bank. (2017). Environmental and Social Framework Report. In *World Bank*.
www.worldbank.org

CONTACTS

Mr. Mustapha Okyere
University of Mines and Technology
Geomatic Engineering Department
P.O Box 237
Tarkwa
Ghana
+233 541725669
mustaphaokyere@gmail.com

Dr. Eric Paul Tudzi
Kwame Nkurmah University of Science and Technology
Land Economy Department
PMB, University Post Office
Kumasi
+233 201645117
erictudzi@yahoo.com

Prof. Bernard Kumi-Boateng
University of Mines and Technology

Geomatic Engineering Department
P.O Box 237
Tarkwa
Ghana
+233 262817778
kumi@umat.edu.gh

Land-Based Economic Displacement and Livelihood Reconstruction; A survey of Literature (12492)
Mustapha Okyere, Eric Paul Tudzi and Bernard Kumi-Boateng (Ghana)

FIG Working Week 2024

Your World, Our World: Resilient Environment and Sustainable Resource Management for all
Accra, Ghana, 19–24 May 2024