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I was born on 6th May, 1953 and I have never seen freedom in my life. We can't stay safely in our villages, homes, anywhere, because our lives are in danger. I have had to flee many times, but I haven’t died yet. But I have watched many people die, right before my eyes”. These are the words of Naw Paw Paw an IDP woman who teaches at the Thay Nye Khe School in Nyaung Lay Bin District, in northern Karen State. Even though she has only studied until the 7th grade in Htoo Wah Lu School, she has taught for 26 years of her life.

After a military attack, a result of the four cuts policy (see box), in 1974 Naw Paw Paw set up the primary school where she teaches. In the school there are 30 students and she has taught them under difficult circumstances because the situation is very unstable. People are always on the run, and the students often have take exams in the forest under the trees. Also because their village is not very far from an SPDC military camp, the villagers never know when the SPDC will come. This means their daily lives are in danger and Naw Paw Paw always has to remind her students about this.

The health of villagers, according to Naw Paw Paw, is another big concern. She said “we lack knowledge about medicine, so we can’t cure people who are sick.” Sometimes, though, there are people who come and sell medicines. With some of these, villagers can read to find out how to use them to treat diseases. From time to time former medics or nurses also come and sell the medicines and give directions for using them. At her school, when there is no medicine available, the children have to take herbal cures such as tree and plant roots from the forest.

Some of the children at the school have no parents and can’t afford to buy books. In this situation Naw Paw Paw will try hard to find materials from different sources, often refugee camp schools or other village schools. If they need extra chalk, though for example, they cannot buy it from a nearby town. In Burma there are very specific limits on buying school materials. For this reason, they use a stone from the river and sharpen it, so the students can write on the blackboard. This is a very big problem but as Naw Paw Paw says, the people really want the children to be educated people, who can write and read their own language.

Naw Lay Lay Paw earns the equivalent of just 5,000 Thai Baht per year (US$130) and with this amount of money she has to take care of her family, to buy rice, salt, chilies and the basic need of the household. When she has fled, four of her children and her dad passed away.
This was in 1997 and her father couldn’t run, because he was too weak so she had to leave him behind. She couldn’t go back because the SPDC were staying near him. He stayed alone and she couldn’t send rice to him. She had left some rice for him but there was no fire for the stove as the two matches she left for him would not light. It was about two weeks before they could return and as some of the people approached the village at night time they saw her father had died. Naw Paw Paw didn’t know where the SPDC was, so she was afraid to go back and bury him because when she climbed up the hill overlooking her village she saw the fields were burned down.

Four days later she went back and buried him, while the SPDC troops were still close by. She and some of the villagers quickly buried her father in this difficult and dangerous situation. For this reason it hurt her heart so much because her dad had been a British soldiers and he was recognized and respected by the British. Now all of the status he had was lost because of the SPDC. Not so long after her youngest baby got seriously sick and because there was no medicine the baby died. Previously, two of her other children had died on the same day.

Despite Naw Paw Paw’s experiences as an IDP, and even though she has faced many problems she has never surrendered and continues help her community as much as she can. Sometimes I wonder to myself “Are we always on the run….. Where can we find a comfortable life?” Unfortunately there are no answers that come to my mind.

---

**Four Cuts Policy**

The military junta that rules Burma introduced the Four Cuts policy in the 1970s. The policy aimed to undermine the support networks of the insurgent groups by cutting their access to information, supplies, recruits and food. In order to cut these networks, the military dictatorship targeted the civilian population. This policy lead to increased militarisation, forced displacement, human rights abuses and oppression of Burmese villagers.

---

**VIDEO LAUNCH:**

**SEASON OF FEAR**

*Internally Displace People in Burma call for International action*

This video shows the day-to-day struggle of over half a million displaced persons in eastern Burma and how displacements impacts communities and individuals. In September 2005, the Burmese military launched an offensive and displaced thousands of people in Nyaung Lay Bin and Toungoo Districts. Some villages were burnt down and some people had to cross border to take shelter in refugee camp.

In the context of human rights, this should be a cause for increased international pressure on the military regime in Burma. The actions we and the IDPs themselves are calling for includes increase level of humanitarian aid and support to IDPs and condemnation by the international community of attacks on IDPs.

To receive a free copy of this video please contact us via email at durham@mozart.inet.co.th

To view other videos produced by Burma Issues please visit www.burmaissues.org/En/video2.html
The Politics of Subsistence: 
IDP Coping Strategies as Non-Violent Resistance 
By Nanda Kyaw Thu

An adequate understanding of internal displacement in Burma necessitates a conceptualisation of displaced villagers as political actors. This means realising that internal displacement arises from the overt policy of the State Peace and Development Council (SPDC) to expand military control over all civilians and that attempts by those displaced to maintain their livelihoods directly challenges this policy. Perceiving the coping strategies of internally displaced persons (IDPs) as forms of non-violent resistance to the further militarization of their homelands is especially relevant for those civilians living in hiding.

The eastern ethnic regions of Burma are home to the country’s largest concentration of IDPs. The most recent estimates place the IDP population in this area at approximately 540,000; of which 92,000 are hiding in free-fire areas. Although both rural and remote, these free-fire areas are the most actively disputed regions as armed opposition groups vie for control with SPDC and SPDC-backed troops.

Under the rubric of ‘counter insurgency’ tactics, SPDC forces target civilians living in these contested areas ostensibly to undermine support for insurgent activity. Villagers are perpetually harassed and often forcibly relocated to military-controlled resettlement sites. While SPDC officials claim internal displacement in such cases is a consequence of Burma’s civil war with armed opposition groups, it is more accurately explained as part of a national policy of complete militarization. Indeed, as the Karen Human Rights Group has observed, “abuses were never primarily intended to undermine the armed resistance – they are targeted at the civilian villagers, because they are intended to bring the villagers under direct military control”. By removing civilians from remote contested areas the SPDC is able to further encroach on ethnic lands, conduct large-scale natural resource exploitation and undermine local cultural cohesion.

While regular military patrols, widespread landmine contamination and food insecurity are ever-present, many of those displaced choose to remain in hiding at or near their abandoned villages rather than relocate to military-controlled areas, or flee, where possible, to neighbouring Thailand. In this way they can retain some control over their land and lives and resist further militarization.

Those IDPs choosing to remain in hiding face threats from both military forces troops and the natural environment. While in hiding, villagers are effectively outside of SPDC control. As such they are deemed enemies of the State and regularly shot on sight. When IDP hiding sites are discovered, the Tatmadaw (SPDC military) destroys all dwellings and loot whatever possessions are left by those who fled. Such attacks occur regularly throughout the year, requiring IDPs to repeatedly flee and preventing the establishment of any permanent settlements. The military destroys agricultural lands and food stores and plants landmines to prevent the return of villagers.

As a consequence of the poor living conditions that IDPs are forced into, illnesses are frequent and malnutrition is rife. The threats of military attack, food insecurity, and illness and injury are the primary obstacles to IDPs’ survival outside of military controlled settlements. Furthermore, obstacles to education serve to curtail the intellectual growth of the next generation.

Given the SPDC’s aim of complete militarization over land and civilians, villagers’ attempts to live outside of military control become political acts. Survival becomes an act of resistance. The strategies IDPs use to cope with their situation oppose what would otherwise be the depopulation of their homeland and the establishment of military dominance over all aspects of civilian life.

In the face of direct military attacks, IDP communities have little choice but to flee their temporary lodgings, possessions in hand. The surest means by which civilians in hiding cope with recurring military patrols is through the establishment of early warning systems. Villagers in hiding typically establish observation posts to monitor the activity of SPDC and SPDC-backed troops. When patrols are sighted, those on lookout will run back to inform others at the hiding site. This is a particularly risky practice as those on sentry duty are typically unarmred and have often been shot dead when sighted by SPDC troops. Other measures supportive of IDPs’ early warning systems involve the exchange of information about troop movements with opposition patrols and other IDPs passing through a given area. Through such advanced warning IDPs are able to decrease the likelihood of being detected and subsequently attacked.

The Tatmadaw’s policy of undermining IDP sub-
sistence capacities negates the possibility of any sort of food security. Villagers often flee into hiding in conjunction with military relocation orders. Such orders are followed up with the destruction of village infrastructure including crops and the deployment of anti-personnel landmines within the village vicinity and throughout agricultural land. When fleeing their homes, villagers typically grab what clothing and provisions they can carry; most often this amounts to rice for no more than a few days to a week. Fear of landmines and SPDC patrols prevent IDPs from returning to tend their crops.

Knowing that military patrols could arrive any time, villagers often prepare emergency rice stores in the jungle to which they can return after displacement. These, however, are destroyed on sight by SPDC troops and villagers found storing rice in the jungle are accused of supporting insurgent forces. To supplement stored provisions, displaced villagers often grow cash crops like betel nut or cardamom which require less land and energy to sustain than rice. Profits from these crops are then used to buy rice. The risk that IDPs will be arrested upon entry into SPDC-controlled villages prevents IDPs from selling their produce at open markets. Temporary markets established in the jungles where IDPs are hiding allow them to make the required sales and purchases with other villagers. Alternatively, IDPs can sometimes borrow rice from those with enough to share. Also, by consuming meals of watered down rice porridge, villagers can often stretch their food reserves.

Internally displaced villagers are forced to hide in unhygienic environments with limited protection from the elements. They also have limited education about preventable diseases and suffer from ailments such as malaria, HIV/AIDS, “gastrointestinal problems, coughs, anemia, worms, chest infections and skin disease” as well as “common colds, respiratory infections, digestive problems…, diarrhoea, dysentery, skin infections, vitamin deficiencies, dizziness, fatigue, and depression.”

Occasionally, villagers are able to take limited medicine with them during their initial flight from home. These supplies are usually quite limited and IDPs often supplement them with traditional remedies of bark, roots and leaves available in the forest. Such treatment is often inadequate or ineffective. More extensive medical supplies are provided by opposition forces and backpacker health teams operating out of facilities across the border. Trained medics on these teams are able to provide some treatment; although demand outstrips supply.

Obstructions to education do not present direct threats to the present livelihoods of displaced villagers but they undermine the strength of future generations. As such, education is highly prized by those in hiding who do their utmost to provide educational opportunities for their children despite the obstacles inherent in internal displacement. IDPs are quick to establish whatever form of schooling is possible after military patrols depart from the area. Bamboo shelters serve as makeshift schools with students sitting on the ground. Villagers fabricate writing implements out of split bamboo and charcoal and those acting as teachers often have only a few years of basic education themselves.

These makeshift schools must close down immediately upon approach by SPDC patrols. When discovered, troops burn down all structures and materials left behind. Although disheartening, these search and destroy campaigns do little to frustrate the drive for education, as IDPs quickly establish new schools as the situation allows.

An understanding of IDPs as active agents resisting the militarization of their society through non-violent means is a necessary precursor to an adequate assessment of the phenomena of internal displacement as a whole. That IDPs in hiding chose to struggle through such dire conditions evinces how dismal the situation of abuse in SPDC-controlled villages really is. Although beyond the scope of the present article, the conceptualisation of displaced villagers as political actors has implications for humanitarian agencies seeking to address IDP issues and international bodies evaluating the SPDC’s responsibilities under the United Nations Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement. Such organisations would do well to support, through aid or advocacy, the coping strategies of those on the run, as they are the most capable of assessing the contextual needs of forced displacement.

Endnotes
1. Internal Displacement and Protection in Eastern Burma, Thailand Burma Border Consortium, October 2005
4. Karen Human Rights Group, Enduring Hunger
Internal Displacement:
A Global Issue for a Global Community
By Moe Ko Htee

The internally displaced person (IDPs) situation in Burma is only part of a wider global displacement crisis affecting nearly 25 million people1. IDPs according to the United Nations are “persons who, as a result of persecution, armed conflict or violence, have been forced to abandon their homes and leave their usual place of residence and who remain within the borders of their own country”. Their access to social networks that can assist them are very limited, if they exist at all. Consequently IDPs are among the world’s most vulnerable populations.

The global number of IDPs has risen sharply from 1.2 million in 1982 to nearly 25 million2. These 25 million IDPs are displaced in at least 49 countries, with more than half in Africa. Burma’s IDP population is among the ten largest groups of displaced people in the world.

While the global IDP figures have grown, the number of refugees has decreased from 17.8 million in 1992 to 9.2 million in 20043. Currently IDPs outnumber refugees by more than two to one. One aspect that has lead to this change is the increased difficulty in crossing an international border. Neighbouring countries are unwilling to accept mass, or even small, exoduses, of people, due to the issues related to refugees, in particular prolonged refugee situations, and the associated financial burden. Furthermore, countries are concerned about internal conflicts overflowing onto their soil and the possibility of anti-government groups using “safe havens” (such as refugee camps) to launch their resistance movements. Victims of displacement who try to cross an international border are seen as violent threats and burdens that must be contained – within their nation’s borders. Those that do manage to flee are often confined to isolated camps4. Despite this shift in humanitarian crises, IDPs continue to receive limited international attention.

More importantly, they receive little, if any, international protection. There are no legal instruments or institutions specifically designed to protect IDPs. While the Universal Declaration of Human Rights applies to everyone, refugees have added protection under the 1951 Refugee Convention and the 1967 Protocol. The same obligation to protect and assist internally displaced persons does not exist.

In an attempt to counter this, the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement were developed as a framework for protecting IDPs in 1996. While these 30 guiding principles were presented to the Human Rights Commission in 1998, they have yet to be put forward to the United Nations General Assembly. Consequently, the principles have not been made into an international convention or presented to member States’ for ratification. Some nations do follow these principles. However this is completely voluntary and there are no avenues for recourse should these principles be broken.

Within the principles the rights of IDPs during all phases of displacement are emphasised and protection strategies are recommended. The guidelines also provide suggestions for protection against arbitrary displacement; protection and assistance while displaced and during the return, resettlement and reintegration of IDPs into communities5.

The principles also make very clear that it is the responsibility of the national authorities to ensure that the IDPs basic needs (food, water, sanitation, health and shelter) are met. While the global IDP figures have grown, the number of refugees has decreased from 17.8 million in 1992 to 9.2 million in 20043. Currently IDPs outnumber refugees by more than two to one. One aspect that has lead to this change is the increased difficulty in crossing an international border. Neighbouring countries are unwilling to accept mass, or even small, exoduses, of people, due to the issues related to refugees, in particular prolonged refugee situations, and the associated financial burden. Furthermore, countries are concerned about internal conflicts overflowing onto their soil and the possibility of anti-government groups using “safe havens” (such as refugee camps) to launch their resistance movements. Victims of displacement who try to cross an international border are seen as violent threats and burdens that must be contained – within their nation’s borders. Those that do manage to flee are often confined to isolated camps4. Despite this shift in humanitarian crises, IDPs continue to receive limited international attention.

More importantly, they receive little, if any, international protection. There are no legal instruments or institutions specifically designed to protect IDPs. While the Universal Declaration of Human Rights applies to everyone, refugees have added protection under the 1951 Refugee Convention and the 1967 Protocol. The same obligation to protect and assist internationally displaced persons does not exist.

In an attempt to counter this, the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement were developed as a framework for protecting IDPs in 1996. While these 30 guiding principles were presented to the Human Rights Commission in 1998, they have yet to be put forward to the United Nations General Assembly. Consequently, the principles have not been made into an international convention or presented to

Worst Displacement Situation:
- Burma
- Colombia
- Cote d’Ivoire
- Democratic Republic of Congo
- Indonesia
- Iraq
- Nepal
- Russian Federation
- Somalia
- Sudan
- Uganda

Sad displacement is often caused by State’s through conflict with non-state actors, development projects and persecution against their own people. According to the Internal Displacement: Global Overview of Trends and Developments in 2004, a report released by the Global IDP Project in 2005, at least 13 governments are actively involved in displacing people. Very few governments provide protection or assistance to their country’s displaced populations. Half of the world’s IDP population is completely unprotected, with governments failing to provide adequate humanitarian assistance to 18 million displaced persons. Five million IDPs receive no assistance at all.

However, over the last twelve months half the States with displaced populations have taken constructive steps to address their humanitarian needs. While the sentiments behind these efforts were genuine, these countries had limited resources at their disposal and their IDP populations were relatively small. Consequently such initiatives only benefited one quarter of the world’s IDP population.

While the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement emphasis the responsibility of the State, they also make provi-

IDPs Are Among the World’s Most Vulnerable Populations

The global number of IDPs has risen sharply from 1.2 million in 1982 to nearly 25 million. These 25 million IDPs are displaced in at least 49 countries, with more than half in Africa. Burma’s IDP population is among the ten largest groups of displaced people in the world. While the global IDP figures have grown, the number of refugees has decreased from 17.8 million in 1992 to 9.2 million in 2004. Currently IDPs outnumber refugees by more than two to one. One aspect that has lead to this change is the increased difficulty in crossing an international border. Neighbouring countries are unwilling to accept mass, or even small, exoduses, of people, due to the issues related to refugees, in particular prolonged refugee situations, and the associated financial burden. Furthermore, countries are concerned about internal conflicts overflowing onto their soil and the possibility of anti-government groups using “safe havens” (such as refugee camps) to launch their resistance movements. Victims of displacement who try to cross an international border are seen as violent threats and burdens that must be contained – within their nation’s borders. Those that do manage to flee are often confined to isolated camps. Despite this shift in humanitarian crises, IDPs continue to receive limited international attention.

More importantly, they receive little, if any, international protection. There are no legal instruments or institutions specifically designed to protect IDPs. While the Universal Declaration of Human Rights applies to everyone, refugees have added protection under the 1951 Refugee Convention and the 1967 Protocol. The same obligation to protect and assist internationally displaced persons does not exist.

In an attempt to counter this, the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement were developed as a framework for protecting IDPs in 1996. While these 30 guiding principles were presented to the Human Rights Commission in 1998, they have yet to be put forward to the United Nations General Assembly. Consequently, the principles have not been made into an international convention or presented to member States’ for ratification. Some nations do follow these principles. However this is completely voluntary and there are no avenues for recourse should these principles be broken.

Within the principles the rights of IDPs during all phases of displacement are emphasised and protection strategies are recommended. The guidelines also provide suggestions for protection against arbitrary displacement; protection and assistance while displaced and during the return, resettlement and reintegration of IDPs into communities.

The principles also make very clear that it is the responsibility of the national authorities to ensure that the IDPs basic needs (food, water, sanitation, health and shelter) are met. As internal displaced persons have not crossed an international border, the responsibility of assisting these vulnerable people remains with their own governments.

Sad displacement is often caused by State’s through conflict with non-state actors, development projects and persecution against their own people. According to the Internal Displacement: Global Overview of Trends and Developments in 2004, a report released by the Global IDP Project in 2005, at least 13 governments are actively involved in displacing people. Very few governments provide protection or assistance to their country’s displaced populations. Half of the world’s IDP population is completely unprotected, with governments failing to provide adequate humanitarian assistance to 18 million displaced persons. Five million IDPs receive no assistance at all.

However, over the last twelve months half the States with displaced populations have taken constructive steps to address their humanitarian needs. While the sentiments behind these efforts were genuine, these countries had limited resources at their disposal and their IDP populations were relatively small. Consequently such initiatives only benefited one quarter of the world’s IDP population.

While the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement emphasis the responsibility of the State, they also make provi-
sions should the government be unable or unwilling to fulfill their obligation. In accordance to the principles, if this should happen it is up to members of the international community to step in. However, this is easier said than done. As it is often the State governments that cause displacement, they are usually unwilling to bring international attention onto the humanitarian crisis within their borders - including accepting or facilitating assistance. Some State’s, such as the Burmese junta, even deliberately prevent international organizations from accessing displaced people.

However, providing food, shelter and clothing to 25 million people is a huge undertaking. No single country has the resources on hand to tackle such a predicament. Consequently a coordinated approach between the United Nations, inter-government agencies, civil society and non-government organizations is required. According to Refugees International, a US-based group focusing on providing protection and assistance to displaced persons around the world, this is not happening. “No single UN or other international agency has responsibility for responding to internal displacement and, as a result, the global response to the needs of internally displaced persons is often ineffective.”

Furthermore, it is vital to ensure that IDPs participate in developing and designing a durable solution to their situation. In many cases IDPs are silent victims with little, if any, opportunities to voice their concerns to authorities. This is especially true in countries that frequently deny political and civil liberties and human rights, including freedom of expression. Under such circumstances it is highly improbable that a partnership would be formed between the IDP population and the authorities to address protection and assistance issues. In the unlikely case that one was formed, it would not have the open forum necessary to fully address the issues – merely providing a band aid to a gunshot wound.

In countries that have some level of political freedoms, displaced populations are usually discriminated against and denied these rights, further distancing them from the processes and institutions that are necessary to finding a durable solution to the IDP situation.

However, while State governments, for the main part, are unwilling to engage displaced populations, non-government organizations and civil society are trying to do the opposite. Together with the IDPs they have been looking at imaginative ways for displaced populations to voice their concerns to the international community. They see the participation of IDPs as key to the development, introduction and monitoring of assistance programs. Some IDPs have become effective advocates for change at the national, regional and international levels.

Nonetheless, the predominant limiting factors to IDP-based movements, is their situation. Displaced people live a precarious existence, struggling for survival from one day to the next. Food scarcity is a huge issue and nearly 19 million IDPs around the world do not have access to clean drinking water or adequate sanitation7. Diseases and malnutrition are rife. Living in these circumstances it is usually beyond the displace people’s ability to come together and form a collective in order to present a unified voice. Sadly due to this lack of organization grassroots level advocacy groups often fail to make an impression. Furthermore it is difficult for representatives of displaced populations to contact national authorities. Should these authorities attempt to develop strategies addressing the issue of displacement, IDPs could be excluded from participating in the process.

Internally displaced persons are not just victims of their circumstances or mere statistics. They are people who are resisting the destruction of their homeland, culture and way of life through non-violent means. On a day to day basis they show more strength, courage and determination than most people demonstrate in a life time. Civil society, non-government organizations, inter-government agencies and the United Nations need to increase their humanitarian assistance to IDPs: and focus the deliverance of this aid directly to displaced populations.

However this is not enough. A more coordinated approach is not only needed but is well overdue. The United Nations should take the initiative and increase the international recognition and compliance of the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement. This can be achieved by either re-introducing the principle as an international convention and having individual countries ratify them or via the General Assembly’s acceptance of the principles through a majority vote.

As a global society we are judged not by how we treat the fortunate, but rather how we protect the vulnerable. Our ambivalence must end - for each moment humanity fails, a life of endless promise is lost forever.

Endnotes:
1 United Nations High Commission for Refugee, March 2006
2 Stephen Castle, Refugee Studies Centre, Oxford University, December 2005
3 Ibid
4 Ibid
5 Internal Displacement Monitoring Centr, March 2006
6 Refugee International, March 2006
7 Ibid
ASEAN’s special envoy visits Burma: A special ASEAN envoy concluded their visit to Burma a day early, according to security sources and diplomats.

Malaysian Foreign Minister Syed Hamid’s visit aimed to press the junta over democratic reform and allegedly his request to meet Aung San Suu Kyi were rejected.

Thailand’s former ambassador to the United Nations Asda Juyanama said “Myanmar did not invite him. ASEAN forced Myanmar to make the invitation because Myanmar was giving a bad name to ASEAN,”.

“Myanmar does not realize that what’s going on inside the country is negatively affecting the image of ASEAN. If the envoy just talks to the government, the visit may end up being sort of window-dressing. It may look good in terms of the publicity for Myanmar,” he said.

Bird Flu in Burma: Mandalay is struggling to contain an outbreak of avian influenza, the Food and Agriculture Association said after receiving word from the authorities that 42 poultry farms had likely been affected by the outbreak.

The SPDC confirmed the deaths of more than 6,000 chickens and quails in the infected areas. The authorities have culled more than 200,000 poultry in response.

All cases that had tested positive for bird flu in Burmese laboratories had occurred in the seven-kilometer radius “control zone” around the original infection site at a farm in near Mandalay.

This suggests that the virus has spread outside a three-kilometer “restricted area” established on March 11, two days after the outbreak was first detected.

New wave of refugees: More than 700 Karen villagers have fled their homes for Thailand following the relocation of the Burmese capital and renewed fighting between the Karen National Union and the Burmese army, according to the Karen Refugee Committee (KRC).

In January and February 656 Karen refugees arrived at the Thai Mae Ra Moo refugee camp and 141 had arrived by mid-March, a source along the border said.

The camp does not have enough housing prepared for the new residents. New arrivals are staying in a temporary boarding house or with friends and relatives.