

The inadequacy of the Risk Mitigation model for the restoration of livelihoods of displaced people. *Case Study: The Cambodian Railway Rehabilitation Project*

Sharon Edington¹

ARTICLE INFO

Available Online August 2014

Key words:

Risk Mitigation Model;
Development-induced
Displacement.

ABSTRACT

Development-induced displacement (DID) affects millions of people per year, a human toll that is often considered the 'price of development' to be 'addressed' through Cernea's Risk Mitigation Model. The model, by its very name, seeks to mitigate the extent of DID and the negative effects thereof. However, this paper will demonstrate that the model is doomed to be inadequate in adequately restoring the livelihoods of displacees, as it leaves unquestioned the structural power imbalances that underpin the selection of development sites and the proposed displacees, who are themselves often already vulnerable and marginalised. Similarly the model imagines tokenistic participation as the only constructive engagement available to displacees, rather than involving the proposed displacees in the process of determining the shape and nature of 'development' in their area.

Main Text

Concern over the sharp rise in impoverishment caused by displacement in the 1970s and 1980s led to increased antagonism and popular resistance against development-induced displacement in the 1990s (Dwivedi 2002: 709-710). To address such concerns through enhanced planning and implementation of resettlement, the Risk Mitigation model was developed to 'protect and reconstruct' the livelihoods of those peoples affected by 'involuntary population resettlement' (Cernea 1997: 1,569). While this paper recognizes that the Risk Mitigation model has made an important contribution to understanding the links between displacement and impoverishment, it will be argued that the model is not adequate for restoring the livelihoods of displaced people for the following reasons: First, that due to its fundamentally 'modernist' and neoliberal assumptions, the model does not analyse and address the structural causes of impoverishment, exclusion and inequality which affect livelihoods. Second, as a result of these assumptions, the model conceptualises 'participation' simply as a key means to restoring livelihoods rather than advocating for a rights-based approach whereby communities have a role in determining which development projects should be undertaken in their area. This argument will be made with reference to the Cambodian railways project as the key case study, and will ultimately seek to highlight the necessity of a rights-based, rather than risk mitigation, approach to protecting livelihoods from the negative impacts of development-induced displacement.

What is the Risk Mitigation model?

During the 1970s and 1980s development-induced displacement² resulted in the resettlement of approximately 10 million people per year from dam and urban construction alone (McDowell 1996: 1), in what was often long-term and irreversible removal of peoples (Terminski 2013: 13). During this period, displacement planning was predominantly based on the cost-benefit model (Cernea 1997: 1578), which was criticized for its 'minimalist and inequitable approach due to its focus on the benefits of development projects and underestimation of the costs, resulting in "abandoning the displaced people to fend for themselves with little follow-up assistance after the project uprooting them is completed" (Cernia 1997: 1,579). The aforementioned 'costs' of displacement can be high, including severely detrimental effects on

¹ Queensland 4556, Australia. E-mail: S.Edington@student.bradford.ac.uk

² While this paper recognizes that there are various causes of displacement, including conflict and natural disaster, it focuses specifically on developed-induced displacement due to it being the focus of the Risk Mitigation model for planned resettlements.

livelihoods³ through loss of land and other natural resources. Such situations that can lead to multigenerational economic marginalization due to low occupational flexibility (Terminski 2013: 77), and place additional stress on less powerful members within each displaced community, particularly women (Mehta 2002: 3-4; Lin 2008: 120-122). Mehta (2002: 4) argues that displacement often places women in a 'double bind' where gender inequality is perpetuated both by gender biases within state institutions and structures undertaking resettlement on one hand, and male-dominated social hierarchies in resource allocation within their own communities on the other hand, which tends to silence women's interests within the displacement process and therefore compound its negative effects.

To counteract the negative effects of development-induced displacement (DID), the risk mitigation model was developed, and is now used by the World Bank, the Asian Development Bank and various other international institutions. For example, the 1990 World Bank Operational Directive (OD) 4.30 on Involuntary Settlement was based on Cernea's Impoverishment Risks and Reconstruction model, with the policy objective of ensuring that the displaced population benefited from the project which caused the displacement (World Bank 1990b). It was replaced by the World Bank OD 4.12 in 2001 (World Bank 2001b) which was recently updated in 2013. OD 4.12 aims to avoid or minimize resettlement when feasible and where not feasible, go ahead with resettlement in a consultative way focused on sustainable reconstruction of livelihoods (World Bank 2004: xxvii). Likewise, the ADB Resettlement Plan was based on the 1995 Involuntary Resettlement guidelines, which are themselves "based on the World Bank's policy on involuntary resettlement", being the aforementioned OD-4.30 released in 1990 (ADB 2009: 7).

The Risk Mitigation model originates in Cernea's Impoverishment Risks and Reconstruction model which identifies protection and reconstruction of the livelihoods of displaced people as the "central requirement for equitable resettlement" (Cernea 1997: 1569). Cernea positions his model in opposition to the previously dominant framework of CBA because while the risk model considers development projects "indisputably necessary" even when these cause displacement, the Risk Mitigation model acknowledges that such development projects have uneven benefits for different groups within a local population and that some relocations are avoidable and unjustified (Cernea 1997: 1,569-70; 1578-9). While recognizing that there are various impoverishment hazards, the model focuses on mitigating the eight hazards that Cernea considers most important, those being: landlessness, joblessness, homelessness, marginalization, increased morbidity, food insecurity, loss of access to common property and social disarticulation. The basis of the approach is the idea that risks of impoverishment can be 'reversed', whereby livelihoods of displaced populations are either restored or enhanced to a level not previously enjoyed (Cernea 1997: 1572-1576). Cernea's Impoverishment Risks and Reconstruction model has been very influential in resettlement research and is at the core of what this paper refers to as the 'risk mitigation model'. For example, the ADB Resettlement Plan was based on the 1995 Involuntary Resettlement guidelines, which are themselves "based on the World Bank's policy on involuntary resettlement", being the aforementioned OD-4.30 released in 1990 (ADB 2009: 7). Importantly, this model highlighted and drew attention to key ways that displacement can exclude populations at a physical, social and economic level, leading to impoverishment (Grabska and Mehta 2008: 3). This paper will now examine the adequacy of the model for restoring livelihoods with reference to Rehabilitation of the Railway in Cambodia project. This case study is illustrative, because causes of development-induced displacement (DID) that are not linked to dams have generally received less analysis (Oliver-Smith 2005, cited in Terminski 2013: 23; Turton 2002: 48). While dam construction accounts for the largest single cause of DID annually (Cernea 2006: 26), displacement related to re-urbanisation in Asian urban centers is on the rise even as DIDR related to dam construction in Africa and Latin America is decreasing (Terminski 2013: 99), making non-dam DID increasingly significant. Additionally, the relatively small number of displaced people as part of the Cambodia case study (see below) illustrates that the negative impacts from resettlement are not simply due to some displacees 'slipping through the cracks' but rather shows that the Risk Mitigation model is inadequate to restore livelihoods even when there are relatively few households being displaced by a project.

³ In this paper, the term 'livelihoods' is understood as comprising "the capabilities, assets (stores, resources, claims and access) and activities required for a means of living" (Chambers and Conway 1992: 7, cited in Solesbury 2003: 6), a definition which was the foundation of the 'sustainable livelihoods' approach (Solesbury 2003: vii). The concept is inclusive of not only the role of economic assets in livelihood production but also social and human networks, bonds and cooperation as well as environmental/natural resources (Solesbury 2003: 10).

Applying the Risk Mitigation model: The Cambodian Railway Rehabilitation Project

The objective of the project to rehabilitate Cambodia's railways was to strengthen national economic growth by improving access to markets through enhancing trans-border trade with Thailand via a rail link from the border to Cambodia's Sihanouk port (ADB 2014: 2). The Cambodian railway had been damaged and fallen into disrepair during the country's series of conflicts from 1970 to 1998, and as the railway line was no longer used, "mostly poor and vulnerable" people moved onto and around the 642 kilometer-long tracks to build small squatter shack homes and establish livelihoods involving selling food or groceries, mending fishing nets, or repairing goods (ADB 2014: 2). The rail rehabilitation project was planned from 2005, with the 2006 Resettlement Plan expecting a total of 11,288 people to be affected, including 822 households comprising 3,435 people who would need to be resettled (ADB 2006: 3). The number of displaced people is small in relation to the estimated total number of 15 million displaced per year in recent times (Terminski 2013: 32-33). While the numbers of displaced by the railway would be relatively low in comparison, part of the reason the number of affected households is as low as it is, is due to the 'Corridor of Impact' approach used by the ADB to calculate 'affected households' which extends only 3.5-5 meters from the train track centerline rather than the commonly used Right of Way measure which requires the resettlement of all populations residing 20-30 meters from the train track centerline. The COI measure was used to minimize cost of resettlement (BABC 2013). The ADB Involuntary Resettlement Guidelines stating that displaced people should be resettled at a level at least equivalent to their situation before displacement (ADB 1995:1). However, a recent ADB Compliance Review of the project-related resettlement found that "a substantial number" of affected Cambodian households are now "worse off and impoverished" following displacement. The Review found displaced persons are often subject to "increased indebtedness" including due to resettlement areas having no electricity, water and roads in place; there being distances of up to 30 kilometers between resettlement sites and original places of residence and livelihoods; and inadequate compensation being paid (ADB 2009: vi-vii, 3). For example, the ADB Compliance Review found that the drowning of two siblings from an "extremely poor and vulnerable" family displaced to the Battambang resettlement site was partly traceable to the "failure to provide a viable and regular source of potable water before people moved", with the community stating that the children went to the pond to "bathe, wash clothes, and collect water for drinking" (ADB 2009: 36). The same review ADB Compliance Review found that a child in the border town of Poipet died walking to school from his new home in the resettlement site, which as a "longer distance" than his previous home from which he was displaced (ADB 2009: 36).

The ADB Compliance Review suggested that many of these detrimental effects to livelihoods had arisen due to non-compliance with ADB guidelines, such as where "original provisions of the 2006 Resettlement Plan were retained despite changes in the key site parameters" and "compensation paid from 2010 to 2011 was inadequate because it was based on the 2006 rates and did not take price increases over the intervening 5 years into account" despite a 39% inflation during this period (ADB 2014: vii, 19). However, this paper will demonstrate that in the Cambodian railway project, as with the majority of incidences where the Risk Mitigation model was applied, the model was inadequate to restore livelihoods not only because it was inappropriately applied. Additionally, the model itself is built on false assumptions around the supremacy of national economic growth and modernity-based development, which leads to an implementation model that is almost inevitably top-down and exclusionary.

The Implications of a Reformist-Managerial Perspective of Development-Induced Displacement

While the Risk Mitigation Model seeks to re-dress identified grievances regarding the impacts of displacement on livelihoods, it ignores the underlying structural factors that both create and perpetuate poverty, exclusion and human rights violations (Dwivedi 2002: 712) in favour of a short-term and problem-solving approach which is ultimately inadequate for restoring the livelihoods of displaced people. The Risk Mitigation model takes on what Dwivedi (2002: 712) calls a 'reformist-managerial' perspective on displacement which is primarily concerned with how to mitigate and minimize the negative impacts of moving populations, rather than assessing the historical conditions which led to the current inequities (Morvaridi 2008: 54). These issues are key to understanding the impact of development projects on livelihoods, as it is increasingly marginalized communities who are being displaced for development projects, as "people and communities who are expected and legally required to hand over their assets to the

state are likely to be from the fringes rather than from the mainstream of society"⁴ (Bennett and McDowell 2012: 2; McDowell 1996: 4 cited in Turton 2002: 51).

In the case of the Cambodian railway rehabilitation, the populations being moved were considered "squatters and encroachers" despite some of them having helped to de-mine the 7km-long area where the railway had been destroyed and having purchased the land from "families of the members of the armed forces that earlier subdivided and encroached on government land" (ABD 2006: 104)⁵. Further the displacement occurred in a wider context of an economically fragmented and neo-patrimonial country context often characterized by elite land-grabbing, particularly in many of the areas affected by the rail rehabilitation⁶. However, when Cernea undertook a Monitoring Review of the Cambodian railway rehabilitation resettlement program in 2013, he mentioned none of these issues. While the Review was highly critical of the project's resettlement process and its outcomes, its recommendations focused on improving 'financial literacy' of resettled people, job creation, and strengthening the institutional methods and techniques for undertaking resettlement (Cernea 2013: 1-6). While this paper would agree that these responses could mitigate some of the risks to livelihoods posed by displacement, it does not address how poverty and exclusion are created and perpetuated. In this way, the Cambodian railway rehabilitation can be seen as an example of the way in which "the risk model developed assesses the conditions of displaced people but does not tackle the underlying institutional structures that keep poor people in a state of poverty and inequality" (Morvaridi 2008: 53). This is because the risk mitigation approach deals with issues on a project by project basis rather than through an assessment of structural and systematic trends (Kooy 2006: 130), and often "fail[s] to capture local dynamics, the perspectives of displaced people and wider socio-political factors that cause exclusion" (Grabska and Mehta 2008: 4). The crucial deconstruction of the political structures underpinning displacement in order to highlight issues of uneven distributions of power, wealth and protections (Morvaridi 2004: 720), is left unaddressed.

Exploring the conceptual foundations of the Risk Mitigation model

The diagnostic and problem-solving approach of Risk Mitigation (Cernea 1997: 1571-72) is in line with the analytical frameworks of the institutions applying the model, such as the World Bank and the Asian Development Bank. These institutions subscribe to an idea of 'economic growth as development' and hold that "macroeconomic stability is an essential prerequisite" for this growth-centered development (World Bank 2000: 1). While the institutions also promote the need to "address human needs directly" rather than through trickle-down economics (World Bank 2000: 1), under neoliberal theory, economic growth is considered to be the means of addressing these needs, even though the World Bank's own figures show a strong relationship between economic growth and inequality of resource distribution (World Bank 1999, pp.14, 25, cited in Cammack 2002: 175). This is an example of where "macro-economic stability is presented as the key to growth, which is in turn the key to universally beneficial development, reversing a line of causation in which priority is actually given to capitalist accumulation, institutions are shaped accordingly and the disciplines they embody set limits to the extent and distribution of development" (Cammack 2002: 178).

⁴ Patterns of marginalized people being subjected to displacement has been documented in the case of irrigation projects that negatively impacted Tamil and Muslim populations in Sri Lanka (Muggah 2007); the Illusu dam submerging key cultural sites of the marginalized Kurdish population in Turkey (Morvaridi 2004: 734); the Kedung Ombo dam in Java which displaced Indonesian villagers persecuted by the military since the 1960s due to their 'radical' politics (World Bank 2012; Prasetyo 2007: 212); and in the case of the Orang Asli people who were similarly displaced by a development project after being suspected of involvement with insurgents (Lin 2008a: 113; Lin 2008b: 191-194). A counter-argument could be made that a community's level of political exclusion is not a contributing factor for displacement, with the key factor being the geographic location of the population to where it was possible to build infrastructure. However, it is clear from the World Bank's rationale that "the majority of the displaced are rural and poor because new projects are brought to the most under-developed, poorest areas, where infrastructure is lacking and *land and political costs are lowest* [this author's emphasis added]" (World Bank 1994: 93 cited in Turton 2002: 51). Further, as it is often the case that the displaced population is a "relatively impoverished and powerless group" (Turton 2002: 50), it follows then that as Fox (2000: 314) states, there is a "direct association between large projects involving displacement and the lack of political representation of displaced peoples".

⁵ In the case of the affected households around Poipet area, 49% reported having been on the land since 1995 or before. The ADB 2006 Resettlement Plan acknowledged until the conflicts ended in 1998 "Poipet was covered in landmine and UXOs and people were highly at risk when they cleared the land in order to resettle" so their options regarding livable lands were limited (ADB 2006: 110). As these communities were seen as 'non-legal users' of the rail right-of-way they were not eligible for compensation for the land but rather for 'loss of land use' and for 'non-land assets' such as houses, shops, trees (ADB 2006: 116

⁶ For example, one of the site provinces, Battambang, is known for land grabs as wealthy elites from the government-led patronage system have confiscated land illegally for plantations and forestry (OHCHR 2009; Schneider 2011: 14, 16; Halabi 2005: 8-9; Cooperation Committee for Cambodia 2001: v-vi; Boyle and Titthara 2012).

The Risk Mitigation approach builds on underpinning neoliberal assumptions to apply ideas of 'eminent domain' and market value for property, focusing on individual choice-making with the market as the primary institution on which choices are made, and money being the primary means by which events are made to transpire (Oliver-Smith 2010: 132). The role that the Risk Mitigation model has in furthering an economic growth-based idea of development can be seen in the reason given by the ADB for shifting from a Cost-Benefit to Risk Mitigation approach for resettlement planning was in part, "inadequate attention to resettlement does not pay in the long run...impoverished people are a drain on the national economy; thus, avoiding or minimizing displacement as well as proper rehabilitation of those displaced make good economic sense as well as being fair to those adversely affected" (ADB 1995: 8). Within this framework, displaced people are seen as "the unfortunate victims of development projects that are necessary for a country's prosperity or for the greater common good" (Grabska and Mehta 2008: 3), and as "at best, as recipients of charity and welfare, or at worst, as victims or problems" to be 'addressed' and 'dealt with' (Grabska and Mehta 2008: 3) rather than rights-holders who inherently deserve state protection.

These ideals underpinning the Risk Mitigation model limit its utility in adequately addressing the damaging effects that displacement has on the livelihood of resettled persons. Cernea (2000a: 12) acknowledges that currently "some people enjoy the gains of development while others bear its pains", and attempts to remedy this situation through the Risk Mitigation model. However, as Terminski states, the problem is not only that affected communities do not "share in the profits" of the development project in question - which is by itself of great importance given the scale of people displaced each year - but more fundamentally that local communities do not "participate in the decision to carry out" the project in the first place (Terminski 2013: 24), a theme which will be explored further below.

Participation for beneficiaries

As it will be seen in the next section of this essay, the over-riding 'hegemonic planning' technical process of the Risk Mitigation model (Scott 1998, cited in Morvaridi 2004: 725) includes a conceptualization of 'participation' and 'consultation' as a means of enhancing project efficiency, rather than a tool by which populations can claim their right to viable livelihoods. While most development agencies have now come to agree that 'participation by the beneficiaries' is a desirable element in planning and implementing development projects, participatory approaches tend to focus on the former of McGee's two categorisations of participation, those being 'participation in projects' and 'participatory development'. The former, project-based approach, is largely based on the idea that "people's participation in planning projects is desirable because it makes projects more efficient, effective and sustainable" (McGee 2002: 95). The use of the term 'participation' is therefore applied in a framing of 'imminent' conceptualisations of development, whereby the notion has been depoliticized, instead of seen as negotiated with and contested by its subjects, or 'beneficiaries', which therefore obscures the underlying politics of development (Hickey and Mohan 2005: 241). An example of this is Cernea's suggestion of an 'early warning' communication system in order to avoid the consequences of dysfunctional relationships between planners and displaced populations which Cernea states could include resettlement failure or opposition to the project, termed 'reverse participation' (Cernea 2000a: 48). This term is indicative, as in Cernea's framing opposition to projects as 'reverse participation', he conceives that the only constructive form of participation is in support of any given development project. This view is also reflected in the ADB Handbook on Resettlement 1998, a document still in use during the planning for the Cambodian Railways project, which says "Negative public and media images of the project and of the implementation agency may develop. With consultation, initial opposition to a project may be transformed into constructive participation [emphasis added by this author]" (ADB 1998: 39).

The application of this view in practice can be seen in the case of the Cambodian railways project, where there is evidence that the ADB Resettlement Adviser (funded by the Australian government) encouraged the government to nullify the accreditation of Cambodian NGOs who were raising awareness of the way local communities had been treated in the railway resettlement process and advocating for changes in this regard (Radio Australia 2011, and Voice of America 2011, both cited in Aid Watch 2012: 7). The Cambodian government then drafted a law which, if passed, would have "severely restricted the ability of NGOs to work in spheres such as advocacy, legal representation and human rights" (AID Watch 2012: 7). Campaigning for the rights of displaced can therefore be seen to be outside the narrow scope of how the ADB's Risk Mitigation model conceived of constructive participation of Cambodian individuals, communities and civil

society in the Rail Rehabilitation process. Other examples can be seen in Cernea's use of the term 'conscious participation', to advocate for resettled populations receiving information in a timely and transparent fashion in order to help the resettled people to "understand well the impending displacement, and overcome disbelief or the tendency to denial" (Cernea 2000a: 47). Further, Cernea states that communities to be displaced should be 'notified' about large-scale development projects as soon as possible, on the grounds that to do otherwise "deprives the program of the vast contribution which the energy of displaces (and their nongovernment organizations), if mobilized early on, could provide to reconstructing their own livelihoods" (Cernea 1997: 1577). By this, it can be seen that participation as envisioned by the Risk Mitigation model is based on efficient use of resources such as the energy and skills of the displaced populations to help mitigate the negative impacts of displacement, rather than a concern regarding the extent to which rights-bearers have the necessary information to make informed decisions that affect their own lives.

This narrow conceptualization of participation also effects how the process is implemented, in that treating participation as a "technical method of project work rather than as a political methodology of empowerment" the Risk Mitigation model "obscures the analysis of what makes participation difficult for marginal groups in the first place, particularly in relation to processes of state formation, social stratification and political economy (Hickey and Mohan 2005: 242). For example, in the case of the Cambodian railway resettlement, the Resettlement Plan undertook 'consultation' with the communities without consideration of the vulnerability of those citizens classed as 'illegal squatters' by the government (Inclusive Development 2013: 3; BABC 2009: 7); the extreme inequality in land distribution and the neo-patrimonial system of wealth accumulation and political power-broking in Cambodia (Kimchoeun et al 2007: 39-46; COHRE 2008: 8; Global Witness 2007: 10; Hughes 2007: 72); the society-wide marginalization of many of the resettlement population including women (Yasar 2010: 532; Gollifer 2013: 294-5); and the low levels of literacy of the affected people (BABC 2012: 15) which made the mechanisms of participation chosen by the ADB inappropriate. The two main methods used by the ADB Resettlement team regarding all information pertaining to the project comprised of community meetings and dissemination of Public Information Booklets (BABC 2012: 15). The original ADB Resettlement Plan states that "community meetings usually employ the lecture type" of communication (ADB 2006: 47), implying a one-way information flow as opposed to a dialogue. A NGO household survey of displacees by the reputable Cambodian NGO Bridges Against Borders Cambodia (BABC) found that two thirds of the attendees at ADB community meetings did not raise a question or concern during the meeting, with 37% saying there was no chance to ask questions, and in regard to those questions that were asked only 26 per cent of respondents stated they were satisfied that the question had been answered (BABC 2012: 16). In terms of Public Information Booklets, aside from being a one-way form of communication, they had restricted utility because the BABC survey found that 20 per cent of sampled men displacees and 40 per cent of women displacees reported being illiterate, and that even where respondents reported being literate there were concerns regarding their level of literacy. This is a particularly pertinent factor due to the "technically worded" Public Information Booklet which contained passages that "even for literate households... is likely to shed little light on the impacts of the Project" (BABC 2012: 15). This example demonstrates well Cleaver's point that public information or awareness-raising implies an instrumental approach which "fails adequately to address issues of power and control of information" (2001: 38, cited in Morvaridi 2004: 734).

Therefore, ADB's approach ignored the structural inequalities in Cambodian society which limit the opportunities for vulnerable populations to participate in project decision making, despite these being well-documented. Ultimately, despite the ADB Resettlement Plan stating that displacees would "participate in identifying and selecting options", 82 per cent of those displacees surveyed by Bridges Across Borders Cambodia claimed they had been provided insufficient information about the project, and the majority of people interviewed appeared unaware of their entitlements under the resettlement scheme (BABC 2012: 16). Participation was considered in the technical, project-management sense, as there is no suggestion in the project documentation seen by this author that Cambodian communities were involved in the decision to undertake the project. In regard to the resettlement process, a complaint on behalf of the displacees to the Australian Human Rights Commission claims that "affected families were not meaningfully consulted about the resettlement process or provided with genuine options"¹ (HRLC 2012: 6). This is an example of what Arnstein's ladder of participation considers 'tokenism', as consultation is used "as a means of legitimating already-taken decisions, providing a thin veneer of participation to lend the process moral authority" (Cornwall 2008: 270).

Towards a Rights-Based Approach

In order to protect and reconstruct the livelihoods of those people affected by development projects, this paper suggests a focus on the rights of these people to “social and economic development that is inclusive and participatory”, an approach in line with the radical-movementalist perspective (Morvaridi 2004: 721). Applying this view, it is suggested that since national governments are responsible for the social protection of internally displaced people⁷, governments should consider these populations as able to “contribute to the shaping of positive change and whose notions of rights and entitlements to development could be elaborated in the resettlement scheme” (Morvaridi 2004: 734), rather than perceiving them as obstacles of development. However, while it is important to work collaboratively and constructively with state governments to affirm the rights of local people to undertake planning, management and development of their own resources (Dwivedi 2002: 730), it should also be recognized that “even with rights recognized, risks assessed and stakeholders identified, existing iniquitous power relations would too easily allow developers to dominate and distort such processes” and that “understanding this takes us beyond a faith in negotiations”⁸ (World Commission on Dams 2000: 32-1 cited in Dwivedi 2002: 729).

Therefore, it is suggested here that in order to actively engage individuals and communities in decisions that affect their lives, a rights-based approach based on Hickey and Mohan’s notion of participatory citizenship is needed. This approach would be grounded not only on legal responsibilities and entitlements but also practices through which citizens as individuals and/or groups can claim new rights or to enhance or maintain existing rights. This method offers the prospect of rights-bearers claiming citizenship for themselves rather than waiting for rights to be conferred ‘from above’ (Hickey and Mohan 2005: 254). Communities and social movements can look towards the precedents set of movements against development-induced displacement, such as the anti-dam actions by *Narmada Bachao Andolan* in India which “challenges the moral legitimacy of the state regarding its contract to protect and develop its citizens” (Hickey and Mohan: 2005: 248-249). The Cambodian case study applied throughout this paper offers another example, where various NGOs submitted a complaint to the Australian Human Rights Commission¹ (HRLC 2012) regarding the resettlement process, with the complaint focusing on the International Convention on the Rights of the Child, since displaced families state they are unable to educate or feed their children due to their impoverishment, and due to the aforementioned deaths (Inclusive Development International 2012: 1). Further, Grabska and Mehta (2008: 1-25) suggest that the increasing emphasis on promoting the rights of displaced people and their livelihoods, by agencies such as Oxfam, Save the Children and several UN agencies could potentially be seen as a starting point for implementing a rights-based approach for displaced populations.

Recognising that governments have a responsibility to the internationally displaced, communities could mobilise in support of a social care model based on a welfare policy rather than the short-term risk management approach of ‘social protection’⁹ (Morvaridi 2008: 52). This framing recognizes that “actually existing participation, for all its shortcomings, provides a range of opportunities through which the power of development can be actively called to account” and emphasizes ‘poor people’s leverage’ and agency (Moser *et al* 2001: 36, cited in Morvaridi 2004: 734).

CONCLUSION

The Risk Mitigation approach significantly added to the resettlement debate through identification of various risks of impoverishment and advocating that local communities should not be detrimentally affected by development projects. However, as this paper has sought to highlight, the Risk Mitigation model is usually inadequate to restore livelihoods of displaced people. Grounded on neoliberal assumptions

⁷ Internally displaced people do not enjoy the ‘protection’ that refugees do as IDPs are subject to the domestic jurisdiction in which they reside, meaning that they are not the subject of binding international agreements but are rather protected under the legal frameworks of the nation in which they reside (Morvaridi 2008: 58).

⁸ In a similar vein, the Voices of the Poor study, amongst others, confirms that in the eyes of poor and marginalized people worldwide, “there is a crisis in governance... State institutions are often neither responsive nor accountable to the poor (and they see) little recourse to injustice, criminality, abuse and corruption by institutions, even though they still express their willingness to partner with them under fairer rules (Narayan *et al* 2000: 172 cited in Gaventa 2004: 26).

⁹ The short-term social protection approach can be seen in the case of the Cambodia railway rehabilitation project, where ADB partnered with a micro-finance NGO, SKY, to provide those Cambodians who had been displaced due to the project low-cost health insurance for eight months where the cost of the insurance would be deducted from the grant provided for resettlement (DFAT 2013).

regarding the type of development which ought to be sought, 'participation' is often conceived and undertaken in a tokenistic fashion which depoliticizes the decisions that underpin the development process, and therefore ignores issues of power and structure which impact heavily on livelihoods. This paper therefore assesses the Risk Mitigation approach as inadequate for restoring livelihoods of displaced people as it perpetuates exclusion and negatively impacts on livelihoods by ignoring the marginalized status of the populations being displaced. This argument has been made in reference to the Cambodian Railways Rehabilitation project which demonstrates that while some of the flaws of the resettlement process were due to faulty implementation of the Risk Mitigation model, others were due to the assumptions of the Model, and the social and political realities which the Model continues to ignore. In order to constructively engage with the idea of livelihood protection, including in development projects that cause displacement, this paper suggests that a shift is needed to a rights-based framework. Within this framework, community members can interrupt the 'expert voices' through participatory citizenry to "take up the challenge of achieving the fundamental political, legal and institutional changes required to resolve contentious development issues and to actualize those rights" (Morvaridi 2004: 740).

Acknowledgements

This author gratefully acknowledges the excellent research of Matthew Hilton at Aid/Watch in the report 'Off the Rails: AusAID and the troubled Cambodian Railways Project', on which the research in this paper builds.

Bibliography and Reference

- Aid Watch. (2012). Off the Rails: AusAID and the Troubled Cambodian Railways Project. Available online at: http://www.aidwatch.org.au/sites/aidwatch.org.au/files/CambodiaReport_Final-WEB.pdf. Accessed on 27 March 2014).
- ADB - Asian Development Bank. (1995). Involuntary Resettlement Guidelines. Available online at: <http://www.adb.org/documents/policy-involuntary-resettlement>. (Accessed 27 March 2014).
- Asian Development Bank. (1998). Handbook on Resettlement – A Guide to Good Practice. Available online at: http://indr.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/02/Handbook_on_Resettlement.pdf (Accessed 3 April 2014).
- Asian Development Bank. (2003). Social Protection. Framework, Policies and Strategies. Available online at: <http://www.adb.org/sites/default/files/pub/2001/social-protection.pdf>. (Accessed on 4 April 2014).
- Asian Development Bank Operations Evaluation Department. (2006). Special Evaluation Study on Involuntary Resettlement Safeguards. Available online at: <http://www.adb.org/documents/involuntary-resettlement-safeguards>. (Accessed 27 March 2014).
- Asian Development Bank. (2009). Safeguard Policy Statement. Policy Paper. Available online at: <http://www.adb.org/documents/safeguard-policy-statement>. (Accessed 27 March 2014).
- Asian Development Bank. (2014). Final Report on Compliance Review Panel Request No. 2012/2 on the Greater Mekong Subregion: Rehabilitation of the Railway Project in the Kingdom of Cambodia. Available at: [http://compliance.adb.org/dir0035p.nsf/attachments/Cambodia-FinalReport-13Jan2014_OSEC%20Submission.pdf/\\$FILE/Cambodia-FinalReport-13Jan2014_OSEC%20Submission.pdf](http://compliance.adb.org/dir0035p.nsf/attachments/Cambodia-FinalReport-13Jan2014_OSEC%20Submission.pdf/$FILE/Cambodia-FinalReport-13Jan2014_OSEC%20Submission.pdf) (Accessed on 28 March 2014).
- BABC - Bridges Across Borders Cambodia. (2009). Untitled: Tenure Insecurity and Inequality in the Cambodian Land Sector. Available online at: <http://www.babcambodia.org/untitled/untitled.pdf>. (Accessed on 3 April 2014).

- BABC. (2013). Background to the Rehabilitation of the Railways Project and Resettlement Impacts. Available online at: <http://www.babcambodia.org/railways/background.htm> (Accessed 3 April 2014).
- BABC. (2012). Derailed: A Study on the Resettlement Process and Impacts of the Rehabilitation of the Cambodian Railway. Available online at: <http://www.babcambodia.org/derailed/derailed.pdf> (Accessed on 31 March 2014).
- Bennett, O. and McDowell, C. (2012). *Displaced: The Human Cost of Development and Resettlement*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Boyle, D. and Titthara, M. (2012). Land Grab in Battambang. *The Phnom Penh Post*. Available online at: <http://www.phnompenhpost.com/national/land-grab-battambang>. (Accessed on 10 April 2014).
- Cammack, P. (2002). Neoliberalism, the World Bank, and the New Politics of Development. In U. Kothari & M. Minogue (Eds.) *Development Theory and Practice. Critical Perspectives*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave.
- Cernea, M. (1997). The Risks and Reconstruction Model for Resettling Displaced Populations. *World Development*, 25 (10), pp.1569-1587.
- Cernea, M.M. (2000a). Impoverishment Risks, Risk Management, and Reconstruction: A Model of Population Displacement and Resettlement. Available online at: http://www.communitymining.org/attachments/254_population_resettlement_IRR_MODEL_cernea.pdf(Accessed 27 March 2014).
- Cernea, M.M. (2000b). Risks, Safeguards and Reconstruction: A Model for Population Displacement and Resettlement. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 35 (41), pp.3659-3678.
- Cernea, M.M. (2006). Development-induced and conflict-induced IDPS: bridging the research divide. *Forced Migration Review*. Available online at: <http://www.fmreview.org/FMRpdfs/BrookingsSpecial/15.pdf> (Accessed on 2 April 2014).
- Cernea, M.M. (2013). Recommendations of the Consultant's Report, 'Monitoring of Population Resettlement in Cambodia's Railway Rehabilitation Project: Current Status, Strengths, Weaknesses and Recommendations'. Available online at: http://sithi.org/temp.php?url=publication_detail.php&mid=7129#.U1Qt5fmSwV8. (Accessed 27 March 2014).
- COHRE – Centre on Housing Rights and Evictions. (2008). Respect for Housing, Land and Property Rights in Cambodia. Available online at: http://www.cohre.org/sites/default/files/cambodia-title_through_possession_or_title_through_position_nov_2008.pdf (Accessed on 3 April 2014).
- CCC - Cooperation Committee for Cambodia. (2001). Small-scale land distribution in Cambodia: Lessons from Three Case Studies. Available at: <http://www.ccc-cambodia.org/downloads/adi/adireport/Land%20distribution%20report%20final-Eng.pdf> (Accessed on 10 April 2014).
- Cornwall, A. (2008). Unpacking 'Participation': models, meaning and practices. *Community Development Journal*, 43 (3), pp.269-283.
- DFAT – Australian Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade. (2013). Community Resettlement on the Cambodia Railway: Health Insurance. Available online at: <http://aid.dfat.gov.au/countries/eastasia/cambodia/Pages/resettlement-cambodia-railway.aspx> (Accessed on 10 April 2014).
- Dwivedi, R. (2002). *Models and Methods in Development-Induced Displacement (Review Article)*. *Development and Change*, 33 (4), pp.709-732.
- Fox, J.A. (2000). When Does Reform Policy Influence Practice? Lessons from Bank-wide Resettlement Review. In J.A. Fox & L.D. Brown (Eds). *The Struggle for Accountability*

- Gaventa, K. (2004). Towards Participatory Governance: Assessing the Transformative Possibilities. In Hickey, S. and Mohan, G. (Eds). *Participation: From Tyranny to Transformation?* London, UK: Zed Books.
- Global Witness. (2007). Cambodia's Family Trees: Illegal Logging and the Stripping of Public Assets. Available online at: http://www.globalwitness.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/cambodias_family_trees_low_res.pdf (Accessed on 3 April 2014).
- Gollifer, S. (2013). 'Beyond almost all politicians there are women in the shadows': women's experience of local governance. In Smith, J. (Ed). *Journeys from Exclusion to Inclusion: Marginalized women's successes in overcoming political exclusion*. Stockholm, Sweden: International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance.
- Grabska, K. and Mehta, L. (2008) Introduction. In K. Grabska & L. Mehta (Eds.) *Forced Displacement. Why Rights Matter*. London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Halabi, K. (2005). Review of Experiences in Land Distribution in Cambodia. Land Allocation for Social and Economic Development. Available online at: <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTCAMBODIA/Resources/293755-1151087924882/Experiences-in-land-distribution.pdf>. (Accessed on 3 April 2014).
- Hickey, S. and Mohan, G. (2005). Relocating Participation within a Radical Politics of Development. *Development and Change*, 36 (2), pp.237-262.
- Hollenbach, D. (2010). *Driven from Home: Protecting the Rights of Forced Migrants*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Holzmann, R., Sherburne-Benz, L., Tesliuc, E. (2003). Social Risk Management: The World Bank's Approach to Social Protection in a Globalizing World. The World Bank. Available online at: <http://info.worldbank.org/etools/docs/library/78330/3rd%20Workshop/Srmafrica/paristwo/pdf/readings/srmapproach.pdf> (Accessed on 4 April 2014).
- Hughes, C. (2008). Cambodia in 2007: Development and Dispossession. *Asian Survey*, 48 (1), pp.69-74.
- HRLC - Human Rights Law Center. (2012). Complaint to the Australian Human Rights Commission Submitted on behalf of people affected by the Cambodia Railway Rehabilitation Project. Available online at: <http://www.hrlc.org.au/files/Complaint-to-the-Australian-Human-Rights-Commission-FINAL.pdf> (Accessed on 4 April 2014).
- Inclusive Development International. (2012). Press Release: IDI Submits Complaint to the Australian Human Rights Commission on AusAID's Railway Debacle. Available online at: <http://www.inclusivedevelopment.net/cambodian-railway-development-causes-human-rights-violations-ausaid-complicit/> (Accessed on 4 April 2014).
- Inclusive Development International. (2013). Human Rights and the World Bank Safeguards Review. Lessons from Cambodia: Forced Evictions and the Limits of World Bank Accountability. Inclusive Development. Available online at: <http://www.inclusivedevelopment.net/wp-content/uploads/2013/10/Human-Rights-and-the-World-Bank-Cambodia-Case-Study1.pdf>. (Accessed on 3 April 2014).
- IWDA – International Women's Development Agency Inc. (2013). Supporting Cambodian Women's Civil and Political Participation. Available online at: <http://www.iwda.org.au/our-work/civil-and-political-participation/supporting-cambodian-womens-civil-and-political-participation/> (Accessed on 10 April 2014).
- Kimchoeun, P., Vuthy, H., Netra, E., Sovatha, A., Sedara, K., Knowles, J., and Craig, D. (2007). Accountability and Neo-Patrimonialism in Cambodia: A Critical Literature Review. Cambodia Development Research Institute. Working Paper 34. Available online at: <http://www.utexas.edu/lbj/sites/default/files/file/WP34e.pdf> (Accessed 3 April 2014).

- Kooy, M. (2006). Enforcement and/or Empowerment. In Vandergeest, P. (Ed). *Development's Displacements: Economies, Ecologies, and Cultures at Risk*. Vancouver, Canada: UBC Press.
- Lateline, (2011). 'Cambodian Railway Line to Displace Country's Poor'. Televised on the Australian Broadcasting Corporation (ABC) on 13 May, 2011. Available online at: <http://www.abc.net.au/lateline/content/2011/s3216781.htm> (Accessed on 27 March 2014).
- Lin, C.Y.O. (2008a). Autonomy Reconstituted: Social and Gendered Implications of Resettlement on the Orang Asli of Peninsula Malaysia. In Elmhirst, R. and Resurreccion, B.P. (Ed). *Gender and Natural Resource Management: Livelihoods, Mobility and Interventions*. Pp.109-126. UK: Routledge.
- Lin, C.Y.O. (2008b). Indigenous Peoples, Displacement Through 'Development' and Rights Violations: the Case of the Orang Asli of Peninsula Malaysia. In Grabska, K. and Mehta, L. (Eds) *Forced Displacement Why Rights Matter*. Pp.179-197. Basingstoke, New Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- McDowell, C. (1996). *Understanding Impoverishment: The Consequences of Development-Induced Displacement*. Oxford, New York: Berghahn Books
- McGee, R. (2002). Participating in Development. In U. Kothari & M. Minogue (Eds.) *Development Theory and Practice. Critical Perspectives*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave.
- Mehta, L. (2002). The Double Bind: A Gender Analysis of Forced Displacement and Resettlement. First and preliminary draft for paper prepared for workshop 'Engendering Resettlement Policies and Programmes in India'. Available online at: <http://www.ids.ac.uk/files/doublebind.pdf>. Accessed on 27 March 2014.
- Ministry of Public Works and Transport, Kingdom of Cambodia. (2006). Cambodia: GMS Rehabilitation of the Railway in Cambodia Project Resettlement Plan. Asian Development Bank Resettlement Planning Document. ADB – TA: 6251 REG. Available online at: <http://indr.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/08/149-GMS-Rehabilitation-of-the-Railway-in-Cambodia-Project-January-2007.pdf>(Accessed 3 April 2014).
- Minogue, M. and Kothari, U. (2002). Conclusion: Orthodoxy and its Alternatives in Contemporary Development. In U. Kothari & M. Minogue (Eds.) *Development Theory and Practice. Critical Perspectives*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave.
- Morvaridi, B. (2004). Resettlement, Rights to Development and the Illusu Dam, Turkey. *Development and Change*, 35 (4), pp.719-741.
- Morvadidi, B. (2008). Rights and Development-Induced Displacement: Risk Management or Social Protection? In Grabska, K., and Mehta, L. (Eds). *Forced Displacement: Why Rights Matter*. New York, USA: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Muggah, R. (2007). *Relocation Failures in Sri Lanka: A Short History of Internal Displacement and Resettlement*. London, UK: Zed Books
- Napier-Moore, R. and Gent, S. (2007). Rights-based Policies and Forced Migrants. Working Paper No.8. Development Research Centre on Migration, Globalisation and Poverty.
- OECD. (2013). Poverty and Inequality Disparities in Cambodia, Lao PDR, Myanmar and Vietnam. *Southeast Asian Economic Outlook 2013. With Perspectives on China and India*. Available online at: http://www.keepeek.com/Digital-Asset-Management/oecd/development/southeast-asian-economic-outlook-2013/poverty-and-inequality-disparities-in-cambodia-lao-pdr-myanmar-and-viet-nam_saeo-2013-11-en#page1. (Accessed on 2 April 2014).
- OHCHR – Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights. (2009) Land Grabbing in Cambodia. Available online at: <http://www.ohchr.org/EN/NewsEvents/Pages/Protectingtherighttoland.aspx>

- Oliver-Smith, A. (2010). *Defying Displacement: Grassroots Resistance and the Critique of Development*. Austin, TX, USA: University of Texas Press.
- Prasetyo, J.A. (2007). Kedung Ombo. In McGlynn, J.H., Motuloh, O., Charle, S., Hadler, J., Bujono, B., Glade-Agusta, M., Suhartono, G., Abdulllah, T., Mohamad, G., (Eds). *Indonesia of the Soeharto Years: Issues, Incidents and Images, with a foreword by Jimmy Carter*. Jakarta, Indonesia: Lontar/KITLV.
- Sahmakum Tneang Tnaut. (2011). Rehabilitation of Cambodia's Railway: Comparison of Field Data. Available at: [http://tneungnaut.org/PDF/Rehabilitation%20of%20Cambodias%20Railways_STT%20July%202011.pdf_\(Accessed 27 March 2014\)](http://tneungnaut.org/PDF/Rehabilitation%20of%20Cambodias%20Railways_STT%20July%202011.pdf_(Accessed%2027%20March%202014).).
- Santos, L.A. (2014). ADB Admits Mistakes Over Controversial Railway Project in Cambodia', *Devex Development Newswire*. Available online at: <https://www.devex.com/news/adb-admits-mistakes-over-controversial-railway-project-in-cambodia-82809> (Accessed 27 March 2014).
- Schneider, A. E. (2011). What Shall we do Without our land? Land Grabs and Resistance in Rural Cambodia. Paper presented at the International Conference on Global Land Grabbing, 6-8 April 2011. Available online at: https://www.google.com.au/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=4&cad=rja&uact=8&ved=0CEQQFjAD&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.future-agricultures.org%2Fworkshop-resources%2Fdoc_download%2F1264-what-shall-we-do-without-our-land-land-grabs-and-resistance-inrural&ei=CB5dU9_5NozN4QSLkoHgBQ&usg=AFQjCNF8bK4_U2o_Ax8XkTcKf-90sUEsw_A&sig2=hinjO6VAZkgKjWGAgz68Scw&bvm=bv.65397613,d.bGE (Accessed on 10 April 2014).
- Solesbury, W. 'Sustainable Livelihoods: A Case Study of the Evolution of DFID Policy'. Overseas Development Initiative Working Paper 217. Available online at: <http://www.odi.org.uk/sites/odi.org.uk/files/odi-assets/publications-opinion-files/172.pdf>. (Accessed on 27 March 2014).
- Stanley, J. (2003). Development Induced Displacement and Resettlement. Available online at: <http://www.forcedmigration.org/research-resources/expert-guides/development-induced-displacement-and-resettlement/fmo022.pdf> (Accessed on 2 April 2014).
- Sydney Morning Herald. (2014). Cambodian Aid Project Partly Funded by Australia Led to Child Deaths, Report Finds. Available online at: <http://www.smh.com.au/world/cambodian-aid-project-partly-funded-by-australia-led-to-child-deaths-report-finds-20140209-hvbyqb.html> (Accessed on 27 March 2014).
- Terminski, B. (2013). Development-Induced Displacement and Resettlement: Theoretical Frameworks and Current Challenges. Available online at: <http://dlc.dlib.indiana.edu/dlc/bitstream/handle/10535/8833/Bogumil%20Terminski,%20development-Induced%20Displacement%20and%20Resettlement.%20Theoretical%20frameworks%20and%20current%20challenges.pdf?sequence=1> (Accessed on 27 March 2014).
- The Guardian. (2008). Cambodians Eat Rats to Beat Global Food Crisis. Available online at: <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2008/aug/27/cambodia>. (Accessed on 4 April 2014).
- Turton, D. (2002). Forced Displacement and the Nation-State. In Robinson, J. (Ed). *Development and Displacement*. New York, USA: Oxford University Press.
- Vandergeest, P. (2006). Introduction. In Vandergeest, P. (Ed). *Development's Displacements: Economies, Ecologies, and Cultures at Risk*. Vancouver, Canada: UBC Press.
- Vandergeest, P. (2003). *Land to some tillers: Development-induced displacement in Laos*. UNESCO. Available online at: <http://lad.nafri.org/la/fulltext/2157-0.pdf> (Accessed on 4 April 2014).
- Williams, G. (2004). Towards a repoliticization of participatory development: political capabilities and spaces of empowerment. In Hickey, S. and Mohan, G. (Eds). *Participation: From Tyranny to Transformation?* London, UK: Zed Books.

- World Bank. (1990a). *World Development Report: Poverty*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- World Bank. (1990b). Operational Directive OD4.30. Involuntary Resettlement. Available online at: http://www.ifc.org/wps/wcm/connect/322d9d80488559f584b4d66a6515bb18/OD430_InvoluntaryResettlement.pdf?MOD=AJPERES (Accessed 4 April 2014).
- World Bank. (2000). *World Development Report 2000/2001: Attacking Poverty*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- World Bank. (2001a). Social Risk Management. The World Bank's Approach to Social Protection in a Globalizing World. Available online at: <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/SOCIALPROTECTION/Publications/20847129/SRMWBApproachtoSP.pdf> (Accessed on 4 April 2014).
- World Bank. (2001b). Operational Directive OD4.12. Involuntary Resettlement. Available online at <http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/PROJECTS/EXTPOLICIES/EXTOPMANUAL/0,,contentMDK:20064610~menuPK:64701637~pagePK:64709096~piPK:64709108~theSitePK:502184,00.html>. (Accessed on 4 April 2014).
- World Bank. (2004). *Involuntary Resettlement Sourcebook – Planning and Implementation in Development Projects*. Available online at: <http://www4.worldbank.org/afr/ssatp/resources/html/gender-g/Source%20%20documents%5CTool%20Kits%20%20Guides%5CDesigning%20Projects/TLP%20RO10%20invol%20resettlementsourbookWB.pdf>. (Accessed on 2 April 2014).
- World Bank. (2012). *Recent Experience with Involuntary Resettlement: Indonesia – Kedung Ombo*. Available online at: <http://lnweb90.worldbank.org/oed/oeddoelib.nsf/DocUNIDViewForJavaSearch/6C34C30D2054817D852567F5005D6224>. (Accessed online at 7 April 2014).
- World Bank. (2013). *Cambodia Overview*. Available online at: <http://www.worldbank.org/en/country/cambodia/overview>. (Accessed on 2 April 2014).
- Yasar, Y. (2010). Gender, Development, and Neoliberalism: HIV/AIDS in Cambodia. *Review of Radical Political Economics*, 42, pp.528-548.