



**LUNDS**  
UNIVERSITET

## **IDMC's Portrayal of Responsibility for the Forcefully Displaced, During the Eritrea-Ethiopia Conflict (1998- 2000)**

---

A content analysis of the portrayed responsibility towards conflict-induced displaced persons. Including, the causes and consequences of displaced persons, with concentration on the conflict between Eritrea and Ethiopia through David Miller's theory and as reported by the Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre (IMDC).

**Natasha Daszak**

Department of Human Rights

Institution of History

Course Code: MRSG33

Term: Spring 2018

Supervisors: Emma Severinsson and Andreas Tullberg



## *Abstract*

This paper is about the issue of responsibility for forcefully displaced in conflict. It highlights the issue of responsibility in regard to forcefully displaced persons as portrayed by the International Monitoring Centre (IDMC).

The subject for analysis is IDMC's report submitted year 2006, which is a summary of forced displacement's causes and consequences in the Eritrea and Ethiopia conflict (1998-2000). The aim of the paper to determine who the IDMC portray as responsible -in accordance with the theory applied- for those who have been forcefully displaced during and after the conflict. Via the use of David Miller's theory on responsibility, a deeper understanding of the conflict and forceful displacement as a whole will be presented. Through a content analysis and with the use of tables, an analysis of IDMC's report will be formed and in the result of the analysis, actors will be analysed and presented as bearing responsibility. Finally, the discussion will present the results, answers to the research questions and examine why the IDMC portrays certain actors as responsible.

### *Key Words:*

Human Rights, Displacement, Eritrea-Ethiopia, Conflict, International Humanitarian Law, IDMC, IDPs, Responsibility, Forcefully Displaced, Expulsion, Deportation, Border-Conflict

# Definitions

---

EECC: Eritrea-Ethiopia Claims Commission

Deportation: To force someone to leave a country

Displaced: To force something or someone out of its usual or original position

ICCPR: International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights

ICRC: International Committee of the Red Cross

IDMC: Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre

IDP: Internally Displaced Person

*Jus in bello*: Law of War

NGO: Non-Governmental Organisation

NPO: Non-Profit Organisation

NRC: Norwegian Refugee Council

OAU: Organisation of African Unity

Responsibility: Something that it is your job or duty to deal with

R2P: Responsibility to Protect

*Sui generis*: Constituting a class alone

UN: United Nations

UNDHR: Universal Declaration of Human Rights

UNHCR: The UN Refugee Council

WFP: World Food Program

**Table of Contents**

- 1. Introduction .....5**
- 1.1 Conflict.....5**
- 1.2 General.....5**
- 1.3 Problem Statement, Purpose and Question Formulation .....6**
  - 1.3.1 Purpose..... 6
  - 1.3.2 Question Formulation ..... 6
- 1.4 Material and Delimitations .....7**
  - 1.4.1 Primary material ..... 7
  - 1.4.2 Source Criticism ..... 8
- 2. Literature Overview and Prior Research ..... 9**
- 2.1 Criticising the Claims.....9**
- 2.2 R2P and international assistance..... 10**
- 2.3 Displacements impact on women..... 11**
- 2.4 Lack of research ..... 11**
- 2.5 R2P and refugee crisis..... 12**
- 2.6 Displacement’s positive opportunities ..... 13**
- 3. Theory and Method ..... 14**
- 3.1 Theory ..... 14**
  - 3.1.1 Distributing responsibility ..... 14
- 3.2 Method ..... 18**
  - 3.2.1 Qualitative Content Analysis..... 18
- 4. Analysis ..... 22**
- 4.1 Disposition ..... 22**
- 4.2 Causes..... 22**
  - 4.2.1 Italian colonialism..... 23
  - 4.2.2 International community..... 24
  - 4.2.3 Unknown..... 25
  - 4.2.4 Table ..... 26
- 4.3 Consequences..... 28**
  - 4.3.1 Non-Profit Organisations and Non-Governmental Organisations ..... 28
  - 4.3.2 United Nations and International community..... 30
  - 4.3.3 Those who planted landmines..... 32
  - 4.3.4 Local communities..... 33
  - 4.3.5 Displaced persons..... 34
  - 4.3.6 Table ..... 35
- 4.4 Responsibility Result..... 37**
  - 4.4.1 The ultimate responsibility..... 41
- 5. Discussion..... 42**
- 6. Summary..... 45**
- 7. List of Reference..... 46**

# 1. Introduction

---

## 1.1 Conflict

The origin of Eritrea and Ethiopia's border conflict begins with Italian colonialism. In 1889 the Treaty of Uccialli was signed between Ethiopia and Italy, it established the border between the Empire of Ethiopia and areas of Eritrea (then occupied by Italy). In a dispute between Ethiopia and Italy in 1896, Italian forces were defeated and the two actors came to a temporary boundary arrangement. In 1900, 1902 and 1908 Ethiopia and Italy concluded three boundary agreements that created the common boundary of the colony of Eritrea and the Empire of Ethiopia. Since then, none of the boundaries have been demarcated.<sup>1</sup> A few decades later the issues concerning the border became more hostile and this was the start of the Eritrea-Ethiopia conflict, a conflict that ended in the displacement of thousands of people.

## 1.2 General

In order to grasp the context of this paper it is important to highlight certain aspects that should be considered throughout the text. Firstly, it is important to mention that the aim of this paper is to analyse aspects of responsibility portrayed in a text published by a certain organisation, I shall use David Miller's theory on responsibility and apply it on the International Displacement Monitoring Centre's report.

Secondly, the responsibility of the two main actors in the Eritrea-Ethiopia conflict I have chosen will be presented but not analysed as responsibility bearers, due to the fact that they are evident bearers of ultimate responsibility in all outcomes resulting from conflict. Their evident responsibility derives from the Responsibility to Protect (R2P) doctrine, which entails that the primary responsibility for the well-being of individuals within a sovereign state, lies with that state.<sup>2</sup> Thirdly, the IDMC is an organisation developed in Norway and is in close association to the United Nations, which in regards to their portrayal of responsibility provides a basis for analysis in this paper. Finally, this paper is not a paper on the conflict between Eritrea and Ethiopia, but rather on the IDMC's portrayal of the conflict.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Decision Regarding Delimitation of the Border between the State of Eritrea and the Federal Democratic, Eritrea-Ethiopia Boundary Commission*, 13 April 2002.

<sup>2</sup> *International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (ICISS), The Responsibility to Protect*, International Development Research Centre, 2001, Ottawa.

## 1.3 Problem Statement, Purpose and Question Formulation

### 1.3.1 Purpose

The purpose of the paper is to analyse the IDMC's portrayal of the situations of forcefully displaced persons as written in the report from 2006 "Ethiopia: Government recognition of conflict IDPs crucial to addressing their plight". Through David Miller's theory on responsibility I will analyse IDMC's portrayal of the causes and consequences for the forcefully displaced, I hope to understand who is/are portrayed as responsible for both the displacement and the future welfare of those people during the conflict between Ethiopia and Eritrea (1998-2001).

From a human rights perspective it is difficult to identify an apparent bearer of responsibility for displaced persons during conflict. But, it is important to find an actor(s) responsible for forcefully displaced persons, in order to grant affected individuals human rights and justice.

This paper will concentrate on one specific conflict, in order to provide an actual case that has been –in official terms- resolved. But the analysis and result of this paper can, most likely, be applied to other conflicts with forcefully displaced persons. Other conflicts may not provide the same responsible actors, but this paper would provide a theory-based approach to how causes and consequences can determine the portrayed responsible actor(s).

It is important to remember that the result expressed in this paper will be based on the specific theory, method and primary material used and will therefore present responsibility from a specific and limited point of view.

It may not come as a surprise that forceful displacement (especially in conflict) is a violation of human rights according to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees' (UNHCR) report 1999.<sup>3</sup> Yet, it is not specifically written in the United Declaration of Human Rights that people have a right to not be subject to forceful displacement.<sup>4</sup>

### 1.3.2 Question Formulation

I aim to answer the following questions in the *Result* of the paper. The first question aims to answer who IDMC portray as bearers of responsibility, and in order to give a more

---

<sup>3</sup> UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), *Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, 1999, 2000, A/55/12*, p. 1.

<sup>4</sup> UN General Assembly, *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*, 10 December 1948, 217 A (III).

detailed understanding of IDMC's portrayal I aim to identify causes and consequences, during the Ethiopia- Eritrea border conflict that help distinguish these actors. The purpose of the second question is to, via the first question, understand and provide reasons for IDMC's portrayal.

1. Through applying David Miller's theory on IDMC's report, who can be identified as bearers of responsibility for the forcefully displaced in the conflict between Ethiopia and Eritrea (besides the states as responsibility bearers)?
2. What could be the reason for the IDMC portraying certain actors as bearers of (Miller-based) responsibility?

## 1.4 Material and Delimitations

This paper is limited to a specific material, context, method and perspective. The context of the paper is current in terms of the constant difficulties surrounding the identification of responsible actors. Identifying a responsible actor(s) could help to understand other conflicts and broaden the understanding of displaced persons.

I have primarily chosen to limit the time span of the analysis from 1945-2017; with the exception of explaining the affect colonialism (1890) could have on responsibility. The reason for this limitation is that the first recognitions of displaced persons where introduced after the Second World War that officially ended 1945 and the latest prior research I have investigated was published 2017.

### 1.4.1 Primary material

The primary material consists of the Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre's (IDMC) report *ETHIOPIA: Government recognition of conflict IDPs crucial to addressing their plight* published 2006,<sup>5</sup> in which the issue of forcefully-, conflict induced- and internally displaced persons are reported. I have chosen this material due to the fact that it is published by an organisation whose target group are internationally influential actors, which in turn indicates the importance and influence the report has on the international community.<sup>6</sup>

IDMC is the leading agency for information concerning internally displaced. The Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC) established the centre the same year as the Eritrea-

---

<sup>5</sup> Norwegian Refugee Council/Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre (NRC/IDMC), *Ethiopia: Government Recognition of Conflict IDPs Crucial to Addressing their Plight. A Profile of the Internal Displacement Situation*, 26 April 2006.

<sup>6</sup> International Displacement Monitoring Centre (IDMC), *Webbpage*, "About IDMC".

Ethiopia conflict started, in 1998. The aim of the IDMC is to aid people around the world through assisting national and international capacities in order to improve the situation of those forcefully displaced, as a result of conflict or violation of human rights.

As requested by the United Nations, the Centre's (situated in Geneva) task is to provide a database with inclusive and current information about the situation of internally displaced persons (IDPs) worldwide. Another duty appointed to the centre is to advocate and present sustainable solutions to the situations of IDPs in accordance with international standards.<sup>7</sup>

The report chosen as the primary material provides information on the background of the conflict, but also causes and consequences of displaced persons. The subjects of the report have been limited to those that have been deemed as relevant for the research and purpose of the paper. Another reason for limiting the paper's primary material -to the report submitted by the IDMC- is due to their influential role on the international arena. Further, the report can also be linked to my research position and the articles I have used to place my purpose in perspective. The aim is to through my material, answer the questions in my *Question Formulation*.

### **1.4.2 Source Criticism**

In regard to the volume of the material, not all aspects in the report have been analysed, due to the fact that they do not all contribute to the purpose of this paper. Another important criticism that can be aimed at the material, is the fact that the report consists of a combination of quotes and statements published by other sources, meaning that the IDMC's opinion is projected through their choice of information. However, this specific criticism can be used to gain a deeper understanding of the IDMC's opinion.

Additionally, the origin of the report can also be criticised, judging by the fact that the report is published by an organisation that represents the "West" and not necessarily the countries that they write about. This fact can be used to my advantage in the paper, since the sources the IDMC uses, provides an insight into their west-orientated information and position on responsibility bearers.

The criticism that could be aimed at the primary material will be taken into account when analysing the material and when discussing the result of the research. Thus some of

---

<sup>7</sup> Norwegian Refugee Council/Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre (NRC/IDMC), 2006, p. 2.



the aspects of the criticism can and will be used to understand and discuss the result and answer the research questions.

## 2. Literature Overview and Prior Research

---

With the development of the UNHCR - that was created in 1950 to assist the overwhelming amount of displaced persons in Europe- the issue of displacement, gained first acknowledgement.<sup>8</sup>

Since the creation of the UNHCR, issues concerning displacement have gained increased recognition and are the topic of many researches. The articles that will be presented in this part of the paper concentrate on different subjects within the issue of forced displacement and responsibility. They highlight the problems, possibilities and precautions concerning forced displacement.

I have decided to focus on articles from various categories in order to provide examples of different fields of focus within prior research and regarding the subject I have chosen to analyse.

### 2.1 Criticising the Claims

Frits Kalshoven, Professor Emeritus of Public International Law and of International Humanitarian Law at the University of Leiden and Liesbeth Zegveld, partner at Böhler Advocaten in Amsterdam, write in their book *Constraints on the Waging of War*, of the Eritrea-Ethiopia Claims Commission (EECC).<sup>9</sup> They describe the EECC's mandate to determine the claims of loss, damage or injury, given forth by the two governments (Ethiopia and Eritrea) or by persons who were nationals of one of the parties.

Kalshoven and Zegveld also provide examples of claims provided by the two parties, which serve purpose in this paper. These include claiming the responsibility of each party for leaving behind landmines after the conflict and claims concerning aerial bombardment.<sup>10</sup> The authors do not criticise the Claims Commission, instead they cite the

---

<sup>8</sup> The UN Refugee Agency (UNHCR), *Webbpage*, "History of UNHCR".

<sup>9</sup> Kalshoven, Frits & Zegveld, Liesbeth., *Constraints on the waging of war: an introduction to international humanitarian law*, 4th ed., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2011.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, 264-265.

responsibility portrayed and the responsibility the states wanted from each other. For example the aerial bombardment was an on-going discussion between the two. While both states were bombed, Ethiopia claimed that Eritrean troops had intentionally dropped bombs in the area of a school, whereas Eritrea claimed the bombing was an accidental.<sup>11</sup>

In conclusion, Kalshoven and Zegveld provide an understanding in the difficulty in identifying bearers of responsibility. They also provide an insight into the role the international community plays in conflicts, this being their attempt to intervene and resolve them.

## **2.2 R2P and international assistance**

Elisabeth Ferris, Erin Mooney and Chareen Stark write in their report *From Responsibility to Response: Assessing National Approaches to Internal Displacement*, about the government's responsibility to turn to the international community for aid, when they can no longer see to the well-being of their population.<sup>12</sup> The authors highlight the responsibility of states to allow the international community to provide rapid assistance and accessibility to the forcefully displaced in need.<sup>13</sup>

The author's focus on the international community, portraying the international community as heroic-actors taking responsibility to remedy the suffering populations situations. I will apply the idea of international responsibility on the analysis of IDMC's report and examine if they too in any way describe the international community as responsible for forcefully displaced.

Further, it would seem that the authors support the involvement of the United Nations (UN) in situations concerning forcefully displaced and sovereign states. They write in their report, that in order for a state to show international cooperation, they should take responsibility and allow a representative of the UN Secretary-General on the Human Rights of IDPs to visit the country.<sup>14</sup> This shows the support that the authors have for the international community, a lot like the support IDMC has for the United Nations. The responsibility of states and the international community will serve as a starting point when analysing IDMC's report and their support for the international community.

---

<sup>11</sup> Ibid., p. 265.

<sup>12</sup> Brookings-Bern Project on Internal Displacement, *From Responsibility to Response: Assessing National Approaches to Internal Displacement*, November 2011.

<sup>13</sup> Ibid., p. 167.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid., p. 168.

## 2.3 Displacements impact on women

Lucy Reed, has served as commissioner on the Eritrea-Ethiopia Claims Commission and is presently an International lawyer. In her article, *Assessing Civil Liability for Harms to Women during Armed Conflict: The Rulings of the Eritrea-Ethiopia Claims Commission*, she writes about the rulings related to the damages imposed during the conflict and their disproportionate affect on women. Reed commences with an explanation of the EECC and informs the reader that it was a *sui generis* international tribunal. She also mentions the Algiers Agreement which is a peace agreement that officially ended the conflict and from which the EECC derived (2001).<sup>15</sup>

In connection to Reed's focus on women's situations, she writes of the EECC's standard of proof showing that each side was liable for occasional rapes and that it is the states responsibility to take action against it.<sup>16</sup>

The author also writes that both Eritrea and Ethiopia were granted rewards, in the *hope* that the sum would be used to fund and benefit women and girls in affected areas. Reed seems to imply that there is no certainty that the funds would be directly beneficial towards women and girls.<sup>17</sup> Which can indicate a sort of mistrust in the states ability to take responsibility.

In conclusion, Reed, in comparison to Kalshoven and Zegveld, Ferris, Mooney and Stark, focuses on the hardship and rulings concerning displaced women during conflict and identifying those who bear responsibility for their sufferings.

The focus of my paper may be on the IDMC's portrayl of responsibility towards forcefully displaced, but by reading and analysing Reed's text I have gained an insight into portrayed responsibility concerning women in conflict, which broadens the basis of my research.

## 2.4 Lack of research

Sarah Kenyon Lischer, Assistant Professor at the Department of political science at Wake Forest University, focuses on conflict-induced displacement as a whole in the article *Causes and Consequences of Conflict-Induced Displacement*.<sup>18</sup> Lischer focuses on various conflicts, and highlights important elements concerning causes and consequences of displacement and connects them to the threat they pose to international security.

---

<sup>15</sup> Reed, Lucy, 2011, "Assessing Civil Liability for Harms to Women during Armed Conflict: The Rulings of the Eritrea-Ethiopia Claims Commission", *International Criminal Law Review*, no. 3: 589-605, p. 590.

<sup>16</sup> Ibid., p. 595.

<sup>17</sup> Ibid., p. 599.

<sup>18</sup> Lischer, Sarah K., 2007, "Causes and Consequences of Conflict-Induced Displacement", *Civil Wars*, 9:2, p. 142-155.

Further, Lischer writes that conflict induced displacement consists of two factors “1) the violence that caused the displacement and 2) the characteristics of the resulting displacement crises”.<sup>19</sup> She identifies a problem in the fact that scholars often focus on one or the other of these factors, which results in a generalisation of all types of violence and viewing all displaced persons as an identical mass. Further, Lischer criticises the fact that policy makers in charge of conflict often overlook the importance of working together with refugee experts, instead policy makers see displacement as an unfortunate outcome of war, this view in turn hinders assistance to affected populations.<sup>20</sup>

An example provided by Lischer is that of civil wars, where displacement could not only be an accidental outcome but also an intention, in addition, violence intentionally aimed at civilians resulting in displacement is more difficult to resolve.<sup>21</sup>

In conclusion, Lischer emphasises the importance of integrating conflict and displacement to “help overcome gaps in the current understanding of conflict-induced displacement”<sup>22</sup>. However, it is of importance to examine both causes and consequences of displacement to identify responsibility, this is an aspect I have taken into account while analysing IDMC’s report.

## 2.5 R2P and refugee crisis

Stefania Panebianco and Iole Fontana write in their article *When responsibility to protect ‘hits home’: the refugee crisis and the EU response*, about the dilemmas concerning the responsibility to protect and the intervention in sovereign states. They write that the situation in Syria is an example of the difficulty to find justification for a violation of sovereignty, in order to uphold humanitarian responsibility for the international community.<sup>23</sup>

Further, the authors argue that the problems and questions surrounding the international communities responsibility is never ending and depends on the circumstances of the conflict. They also write that states are in accordance with R2P responsible for their population even though they do not possess citizenship.<sup>24</sup> This article gives an insight to how the R2P doctrine portrays a pressure to be put on both state and international community to take responsibility for forcefully displaced persons. However, it is clear that none of the texts

---

<sup>19</sup> Ibid., p. 142

<sup>20</sup> Ibid., p. 143.

<sup>21</sup> Ibid., p. 146.

<sup>22</sup> Ibid., p. 154.

<sup>23</sup> Panebianco, Stefania and Fontana, Iole, 2017, ” When responsibility to protect ‘hits home’: the refugee crisis and the EU response”, *Third World Quarterly*, 39:1, p. 3.

<sup>24</sup> Ibid., 6-7.

so far, focus on the responsibility of any other actor than the states and the international community.

## 2.6 Displacement's positive opportunities

Sadaf Lakhani, Consultant with the World Bank's social cohesion and violence prevention team, writes in the article *Forced Displacement: Moving from managing risk to facilitating opportunity*<sup>25</sup> about forced displacement as an opportunity for growth, integration, economic sustainability and other positive opportunities.

In contrast to earlier researches Lakhani provides examples of positive aspects of displacement. That said, it is of importance to take into account that she is an employee of the World Bank. The World Bank works based on economic values rather social. Meaning that the ideas Lakhani presents are most likely influenced by aspects of economy and sustainability from the perspective of an organization that provides loans to poor countries.

The author highlights that, if managed well, displaced persons can provide opportunities to host communities and this should be taken into account rather than seeing displacement as an issue of humanitarian crisis. She focuses on the importance of displaced persons' dependency on external assistance and she claims that this could be reduced through viewing displaced persons as a development challenge.<sup>26</sup>

Although Lakhani tends to lack distinction between refugees and IDPs - as Lischer has expressed, is important- it is clear that the author focuses on economy, which is not the subject of this report. However, Lakhani mentions the responsibility of host communities in conflict. Further, the author also portrays it as unsustainable to rely on the international community's help.<sup>27</sup> This slightly contradicts formerly mentioned research, which seems to portray the responsibility of the international community as a desired outcome. Lakhani proposes a change in attitudes in host communities, instead of seeing displaced persons as a burden, they should consider the positive economic opportunities they bring with them.<sup>28</sup>

In conclusion, Lakhani contrasts all of the previous researchers. This is not very strange considering the organisation she writes for, the World Bank, which concentrates on economic issues and not so much those involving displaced persons and their well-being.

---

<sup>25</sup> Lakhani, Sadaf, 2013, "Forced Displacement: Moving from managing risk to facilitating opportunity", *World Bank*.

<sup>26</sup> Lakhani, 2013, p. 3-4.

<sup>27</sup> Ibid., p. 6 and 11.

<sup>28</sup> Ibid., p. 9.

## 3. Theory and Method

---

### 3.1 Theory

The theory is central in this paper; it is not only applied in the analysis, discussion or result, but in all three. Since, the research questions I aim to answer include this perspective it is important to consequently use the theory throughout the paper. Also, it is important to remember that the theory limits the result and provides a perspective in the analysis rather than concrete answers to my questions. I have limited my theory to one I find will provide an interesting perspective when applied to the primary material and that will contribute to the research within human rights. Again, the fact that states are sovereign entails that they are always responsible for seeing to the population's human rights, the same goes for when they ratify conventions. This is an aspect Miller does not pay specific attention to, but that is important in relation to my subject.

#### 3.1.1 Distributing responsibility

I have chosen to analyse the portrayal of forced displacement from a perspective that is current in human rights, the *connection theory*. David Miller's connection theory of responsibility will serve a useful purpose in my paper. Apart from depth, I hope that applying the theory will help to gather a versatile analysis of the Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre's portrayal of the issue of displacement in conflict, with concentration on the Eritrea - Ethiopia border conflict (1998-2001).

David Miller's connection theory concentrates on the distribution of responsibility. In this paper his theory will be applied in the analysis to gather a perception of who bears the responsibility for the causes of the conflict, the consequences and forcefully displaced persons according to IDMC's report.

Instead of concentrating on one actor being the sole bearer of responsibility, Miller describes responsibility as a connection. It is a connection between different kinds of responsibility (causal, moral, capacity and community) and accordingly, different actors. His theory is based on pluralism, which means that depending on the case, there may be more than one responsible actor.

It is important to find a responsible agent for international humanitarian crises, an agent that can put the bad situation, right. In order to find this agent one should ask oneself

a few questions; Where does the responsibility lie? With displaced persons, themselves? With other actors besides states?

The issue at hand is finding an agent (A) remedially responsible for a patient's (P) situation and making sure the A upholds responsibility towards P. According to Miller, the issue prevails with underlying principles and a lack of institutional mechanisms that assign responsibilities formally. Therefore, his aim is to produce a principle for distributing responsibilities that people can agree on. But first I shall introduce four different principles that are at the basis of Miller's *Connection Theory*.<sup>29</sup>

### ***Causal Principle***

To address an agent as causally responsible for a circumstance is to judge an agent as the cause of an outcome. This meaning that an agent bears the responsibility because it has triggered the outcome of an event. An example put forward by Miller is that of an individual that trips over a dent in the pavement and knocks over the individual in front of him/her, the individual that trips is causally responsible due to the fact that he/she has caused the event and the outcome.

Causal responsibility is most often based on common sense, meaning that if C causes E, C is responsible whether the outcome was intended or not. The causal attributions are determined by normative assumptions and therein can be assessed as faulty at times; an example of this would be *natural* causes of situations that cannot be avoided, or A may act on P but not bear responsibility because it is justified. Further, if there are two agents that can be linked to a causal responsibility one often depends on moral attributions. Therefore causal responsibility itself cannot explain remedial responsibility.<sup>30</sup>

### ***Moral Principle***

The moral responsibility can be detected through questions such as; did an agent intend the outcome? An example would be if I were babysitting two children, one (Y) of them hurts the other (X), Y is then causally responsible for hurting X, but I am morally responsible because I took responsibility for looking after the children when I agreed to this with their parents.<sup>31</sup>

According to Miller, moral responsibility is narrower than causal responsibility and therefore it would seem that it is more accurate to judge an agent based on moral attributions.

---

<sup>29</sup> Miller, David, 2001, "Distributing Responsibilities", *The Journal of Political Philosophy*, vol. 9, nr. 4, p. 453-454.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 455-457.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 456.

If a person (H) is in need of medicine more than another (J) it is the remedial responsibility of H to replace it if H takes it, but H is not responsible for J's suffering, because H needed it more.

There is often a connection between moral and causal responsibility and one can be morally responsible even though unintentionally causing an outcome.

Moral principle is too narrow and causal is too wide and both are based on aspects surrounding the past, meaning that the focus within the principle is, who brought the situation about? Difficulty arises if the responsible agent is not around anymore or even worse, dead!

Miller claims that, remedial responsibilities should not disappear if the agent is nowhere to be found or dead, therefore the moral principle alone is insufficient. Let us now test the principle of capacity and assess Miller's perception.<sup>32</sup>

### ***Capacity Principle***

According to Miller the capacity principle means that an agent's capacity to remedy the situation determines who is responsible. The principle can be divided into effectiveness and cost. Effectiveness is weighed against costs to determine who has the best capacity in a moral sense. A problem with the capacity principle is that it merely focuses on the present agent's capacity to remedy (in contrast to causal and moral) and neglect the past and the agent held remedially responsible is often judged entirely on physical capacity.

An example of a capacity responsibility is: If A is drowning and P is the strongest swimmer in the area, P has a responsibility to try and save A. Miller also highlights the fourth and last principle, focusing on special responsibilities to those with mutual ties.<sup>33</sup>

### ***Communitarian Principle***

Miller presents the principle of community, as certain ties that link persons together. These ties can be based on; family, religion, common history, ethnicity etc. and these persons often see themselves as having special responsibilities to each other. In order to understand this principle, Miller provides additional scenarios.

Firstly, if an individual (Y) is on a boat with a fellow crew (X) and Y falls in, X is remedially responsible to rescue Y, instead of waiting for another boat to pass.

Secondly, a criticism towards communitarian responsibility, if A intentionally injures P or happens to be the only one around and there is no communal connection between the two actors, A should be remedially responsible.

---

<sup>32</sup> Ibid., p. 459-460

<sup>33</sup> Ibid., p. 461.



The problems presented by Miller show that in order to determine an A remedially responsible for P one may need to involve several principles.<sup>34</sup>

### ***Connection Theory***

Miller explains that none of the four principles (causal, moral, capacity, community) are sufficient on their own. Therefore, there are three ways of approaching responsibility. First, abandoning the search for a general theory and instead construct individual accounts of responsibility to fit each case. Second, find *one* principle that trumps all others, the chosen one will account for the responsible agent. Third, use a multi-principle theory, meaning a combination of all four principles in a system of ranking.

According to Miller, the problem with the first approach is that abandoning the idea of a general principle is not an option, something must be decided. The second approach is problematic because there are negative aspects among all principles and singling out one would cause a focus to be either on the past or on the present. The final approach is problematic in the aspect that the principles are ranked and tested. If they are ranked and one starts with the moral principle it is often proved that many agents are found morally responsible and along side moral responsibility come other responsibilities.<sup>35</sup>

Miller's approach is multi-principle and plural instead of multi-principle and ranked. He writes that "(...) we should simply look to see which principle or principles apply in a particular case, and if we find that more than one applies, we should weigh their respective strengths."

There is also the issue of *immediate* responsibility and *final* responsibility, meaning short-term remedy or long-term remedy. A may be immediately responsible for P's situation, but B is finally responsible. Miller claims that the principle of capacity and community provide immediate responsibility (quick and effective) and moral, causal and (sometimes) community provide final responsibilities (sustainable).<sup>36</sup>

Through discarding the idea of applying *one* principle and the idea of applying principles in a fixed order, Miller settles for the pluralist approach of responsibilities. Miller then develops a connection theory, claiming that widely dispersed responsibilities are not sustainable due to the fact that agents would just wait in the hope of someone else to remedy the patient.

---

<sup>34</sup> Ibid., p. 462-463

<sup>35</sup> Ibid., p. 464-466.

<sup>36</sup> Ibid., p. 467-468.

There may be many agents in a position to remedy the patient and those who should be singled out are he/she who is most closely connected to P and the persons whose connection is the strongest.

A, may be remedially responsible for P either because of causal or moral responsibility, or perhaps if A has the capacity to rectify or communal responsibility, he/she is responsible. When the case seems complex to solve, Miller provides the option of finding a special link between agent and patient in order to single out which A is responsible for P's situation. If there is a certain agent that can remedy P's situation, we should turn to that agent. If there are two or more, we should focus on the strongest connection. If A is weakly linked to P in terms of moral responsibility, but B is strongly linked in terms of capacity, then B should be held responsible. If ties are of comparable strength between two agents, then Miller recommends them to share the responsibility between them. By using multiple criteria, it is always ensured that someone will be assigned to the remedy of P.<sup>37</sup>

Finally, the aim of Miller's connection theory is to demonstrate the complexity of real-world cases. The theory will be used to analyse IDMC's portrayal of who is/are responsibility bearers of the forcefully displaced, it will also highlight the complexity of world issues and provide a way of thought which can be used to direct focus to an agent with remedial responsibility based on the case study.

## **3.2 Method**

The method I have chosen to use in this paper, will be used as a practical way of analysing and illustrating how I have tackled my subject. Through the use of my chosen method I will aim to answer the questions stated in my question formulation. I have limited my method to a method I deem useful based on the chosen theory and material.

### **3.2.1 Qualitative Content Analysis**

In this paper I will use the method of qualitative content analysis, with aspects from critical discourse analysis and with the use of coding.

Since the text I have chosen to examine concentrates on the issue of *displacement* I have chosen to sample out four main aspects that will be analysed; cause, consequence, responsibility and forced displacement. The four aspects will serve a purpose both

---

<sup>37</sup> Ibid., p. 469- 471.

methodologically and theoretically. I hope to use the aspects in order to structure a logical coding system. I will commence with two questions that provide a wide understanding of how the text perceives the causes and consequences of forced displacement, through analysing their portrayal I then hope to use Miller's theoretical approach to determine who could be singled out as responsible for the different approaches according to IDMC.

According to Elo and Kyngäs one should approach the text with these questions in mind; Who is telling? Where is this happening? When did it happen? What is happening? Why? Through these questions and reading and re-reading the text, it is possible to gather greater understanding of the text.<sup>38</sup> The authors also recommend applying a research of qualitative content analysis to subjects that have few or no previous studies or when knowledge is fragmented, which suits my subject well considering it has not previously been studied to the same degree as I attempt to.<sup>39</sup>

There are two central aspects of content analysis: qualitative and quantitative. I have chosen to use the former approach, in regard to my material. The qualitative approach concentrates on analysis and less on the numerical approach of counting occurrences or statistics, as in quantitative content analysis. Further, the approach I have chosen to use is often used to gather a broader and more all-around understanding of the material. Qualitative method is also used to understand underlying reasons, opinions and motivations of texts.<sup>40</sup>

Other than two approaches, there is also the decision of using an inductive or deductive type of analysis. I have chose the inductive type since it includes coding, categories and abstraction. The idea is to categorise in order to provide a description of phenomena to increase understanding and generate knowledge. The reason for not applying a deductive method is due to the fact that it is typically used while analysing earlier work such as models, theories, literature reviews and so on. It is also often used during research of medical patients and not often in research concerning social studies, thus I limit the analysis method to an inductive qualitative content analysis.<sup>41</sup>

After gathering data and limiting it to the IDMC's report as I have in this paper, I shall follow five steps of analysis that are mentioned in Taylor-Powell and Renner. First, as

---

<sup>38</sup> Elo, Satu and Kyngäs Helvi, 2008, "The qualitative content analysis process". *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, Vol 62(1), p. 109.

<sup>39</sup> Ibid., p. 111.

<sup>40</sup> Bergström, Göran & Boréus, Kristina (red.), *Textens mening och makt: metodbok i samhällsvetenskaplig text- och diskursanalys*, 3., [utök.] uppl., Studentlitteratur, Lund, 2012, p. 50.

<sup>41</sup> Ibid., p. 111.

mentioned earlier, reading and re-reading the chosen text is key, alongside continuously taking notes of relevant subjects that can be used in the analysis. It is important to consider the quality of the text for example if it has been collected in a biased way and accordingly describe the limitations one deems appropriate for the analysis.

Secondly, review the purpose of the paper and the questions that seem relevant for the text, the questions may change as the text is processed. When the questions are determined one can choose to focus on topic, time, period, case, individual and group.

Thirdly, one should commence identifying themes or patterns and then organize them into categories with labels and explain what is included and not in the categories.<sup>42</sup>

The fourth step, is to identify patterns and connection between categories, there are different approaches within this step; category description, larger, relative importance and relationships. I have chose to concentrate on relationships because it seems like the most relevant approach for my chosen text. The approach entails that two or more themes occur together or in connection, meaning that one is discovered and so is the other. These connections can explain why something occurs and an explicit table can help to portray these connections in relation to each other.

The fifth and last step, involves merging themes, categories and connections. Asking questions such as, what does it all mean? What is really important? And why?, helps to interpret the data collected and attach meaning and relevance to the analysis. In this paper, most of the data collected and analysed will be presented by quotes to help serve a purpose of assurance, that the specific data I have collected proves a point.<sup>43</sup>

### ***Coding***

In order to provide a comprehensive structure in this paper, I have chosen to include coding tables. These will be explained and designed in accordance with the themes and questions I aim to analyse.

Coding is often used as an instrument in manual analysis; it entails examining the occurrence of something in a text. It is also important, while coding, to consider the circumstances from which a text has emerged. Often the coding may need to be revised and modified or double coded, through testing the method on a third party. To decide what is to be included in the coding is key. Those factors that are registered and included in the code table are called, *coding entities* and the variation between them, *variables*.

---

<sup>42</sup> Taylor-Powell, Ellen and Renner, Marcus, 2003, "Analyzing Qualitative Data", *Program Development & Evaluation*, p. 1-3.

<sup>43</sup> Ibid., p. 5.

I have previously named one way of testing the material; one can also test it via a pilot study. Carrying out a pilot study involves trying the method of analysis on a small portion of the text. When this is accomplished, the researcher checks through the result and determines whether it is reasonable and if it checks out with the aim of the analysis, if not, the researcher must rethink the method.<sup>44</sup>

I have decided to code based on four questions I aim to pose to IDMC's text and based on these questions, I aim to detect a responsible actor through the application of the theory.

---

<sup>44</sup> Bergström and Boréus, 2012, p. 54-56.

## 4. Analysis

---

### 4.1 Disposition

The disposition of the text will be arranged in accordance with the questions I have chosen to analyse. These questions all have to do with the issue of *forced displacement* and how the issue is portrayed in the report published by IDMC. Further, I have chosen to apply the theory of responsibility throughout the text, focusing on the responsibility for each and every actor.

The analysis will consist of quotes from the report and with a qualitative content analysis and with the help of my theory, I aim to reach deeper into the meaning of the portrayal of displaced persons during conflict and who bears the responsibility for them and their situation according to IDMC. Following the first two headings, there will be a section for comparing responsibilities. After, I shall attempt to (through coding) reach a conclusion on who is/are the bearer(s) of responsibility for the Eritrea-Ethiopia cause, consequences and conflict according to IDMC's report. The result is based on the theory, IDMC's portrayal and the method, identifying an actor(s) as bearers of responsibility is difficult and therefore the result is specific for the method, material and theory I have used.

As stated in the introduction of this paper, I aim to answer two questions. The first concentrating on IDMC's portrayal of responsible actors and the second on what could be the reason they portray certain actors as responsible.

### 4.2 Causes

In order to identify the portrayed responsible actor(s) for the conflict, I have decided to commence with the portrayal of responsibility regarding the *cause* of the conflict. This is the first step of two steps in the process of understanding the responsible actor(s) as portrayed by IDMC.

Following this heading, there are categories; "Italian colonialism", "International community" and "Unknown". These categories have been chosen because I consider them to be portrayed as potential responsibility bearers in regard to the cause of the conflict.

Since we have determined that both Eritrea and Ethiopia are responsible for the events that lead to forceful displacement, these actors will not be categorised below, but presented in the table in order to increase understanding.

In addition to the states, a cause for forcefully displaced persons can be identified in events dating back to the time of Italian occupation 1936-1941 and Italian colonialism 1890 (of Eritrea). These events will be presented in the following section.

#### **4.2.1 Italian colonialism**

Eritrea's de facto border in 1991 was that of the Italian colony of Eritrea established in 1890. In line with the OAU principles on the integrity of colonial borders, this border was agreed to be a starting point, but both sides agreed that it was inconclusive and that some details needed to be clarified. The border had never been clearly demarcated and Italy had made several claims on Ethiopian territory prior to its full-scale invasion of Ethiopia in 1936 and five-year occupation. There was no border demarcation throughout the subsequent British military administration in Eritrea, the 1952 federation of Eritrea with Ethiopia, or after the removal of Eritrea's federal status in 1962, which set off the Eritrean liberation struggle. In 1991 both Ethiopia and Eritrea accepted that there were inconsistencies in the border but full demarcation was not regarded as a high priority.<sup>45</sup>

This quote reflects the possibility that another actor is responsible for the cause of displacement. The border between Eritrea and Ethiopia (during the conflict) was a border that had been recognized as temporary by both countries. The report portrays the border demarcation as the central aspect of the conflict and therefore one could interpret that those who sketched the border (that existed when the conflict broke out), are those who are responsible for the cause of the conflict and forced displacement.

The lack of demarcation expressed in this quote, leads to the inconsistencies that were not focused on in 1991, but that later sparked a conflict that would leave thousands in humanitarian crisis.

To claim the actors who sketched the border are those that should be responsible for the cause of forceful displacement indicates that responsibility for the cause leads to responsibility for the consequences. The Italian colonialism of Eritrea starting in 1890, left both countries displeased with the border, meaning that colonial actors present in the process of deciding the border, if deemed responsible, were not able to carry out their responsibilities when the war broke out in 1998.

---

<sup>45</sup> Norwegian Refugee Council/Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre (NRC/IDMC), 2006, p.15.

According to Miller, remedial responsibilities should not disappear because one is deceased or nowhere to be found. In conclusion, the colonialists may have brought the situation about and therefore be morally responsible. But, it is not sustainable to determine a deceased actor as responsible, considering there is nothing they can do to relieve the afflicted.<sup>46</sup>

#### 4.2.2 International community

During this period both countries also engaged in a flurry of new arms purchases. Eager international weapons suppliers supplied arms and military instruction, in often cases to both countries simultaneously.<sup>47</sup>

Although the report neglects to provide examples of international weapons dealers (for reasons not stated) it is clear that the international community plays a role in the cause and perhaps maintenance of the conflict.

This quote provides the reader with a short insight into a role that the international community played in the conflict by means of weapons. It would seem that the international community bears a form of responsibility towards forcefully displaced, seeing as they have played a role in causing their situation through weapons deals. Farmers in rural areas have no access to weapons and therefore do not stand a chance of survival against enemies in possession of weapons. These rural inhabitants are therefore often forcefully displaced due to fear of losing their lives to enemies in possession of weapons.

According to an article in the New York Times written by Raymond Bonner, the main suppliers during the beginning of the conflict were; China, Ukraine and Bulgaria.<sup>48</sup> These countries could therefore be seen as responsible for the cause of forcefully displaced persons.

The enmity between the two governments became very evident during the UN General Assembly in October when the Foreign Ministers of the two countries made impassioned speeches condemning the other side and accusing the UN and international community of not doing enough to end the conflict.<sup>49</sup>

---

<sup>46</sup> Miller, 2001, p. 459-460.

<sup>47</sup> Norwegian Refugee Council/Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre (NRC/IDMC), 2006, p. 16.

<sup>48</sup> Bonner, Raymond, "Despite Cutoff by U.S., Ethiopia and Eritrea Easily Buy Weapons", *New York Times*, 23 July 1998.

<sup>49</sup> Norwegian Refugee Council/Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre (NRC/IDMC), 2006, p.17.



As stated earlier, the report portrays both countries as the responsible actors who caused the conflict. However, this quote clearly shows that, from the perspective of the two conflicting countries, the international community is somehow responsible for not ending the conflict and therein most likely responsible for not ending the humanitarian crisis of forcefully displaced. Although it is clear that the IDMC finds it important to highlight the portrayal of responsibility from the country's point of view, it is also clear that international organisations are somewhat portrayed as heroes.

- The US, European Union and U.N. provided substantial support to OAU's mediation efforts.
- Already in 1998 the OAU proposed an eleven-point framework agreement to settle Eritrean-Ethiopian war.<sup>50</sup>

While the UN is portrayed as helping the Organisation of African Unity in mediation efforts, it is also written in the report that international weapons dealers are supplying the conflict with weapons. While the UN is portrayed as doing its best to stop the conflict, it is also an organisation where its own member states are supplying and upholding the conflict. This hypocrisy, in turn, could determine the international community as responsible for the causes of forcefully displaced persons.

According to Miller, responsibility can be allocated to the actor with the best capacity to relieve the afflicted. Miller calls this perspective the capacity principle, there is however a problem with determining a responsible actor judging by their capacity. The evident role historical events play in the cause of displaced persons is forgotten. Instead, the capacity of the international community could focus merely on the present agent's capacity to remedy and neglect the past, the agent held remedially responsible is often judged entirely on physical capacity and not on actual responsibility for the cause of the conflict.<sup>51</sup>

### 4.2.3 Unknown

This category serves the purpose of pointing out a section in the text where the origin of the event caused is unknown. The origin is unknown to the reader due to the reports exclusion of naming an actor responsible for the occurrence.

---

<sup>50</sup> Ibid., p. 33.

<sup>51</sup> Miller, 2001, p. 461.

The international airport in Eritrea's capital, Asmara, was bombed, causing the international community to evacuate and the government to briefly close the airport. This conflict caused the first wave of Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) to flee their homes in search of safety.<sup>52</sup>

This quote shows the occasional tendency IDMC's report has to neglect identification of a responsible actor. In the quote, the bomber's nationality (Ethiopian or Eritrean) is not mentioned and although the bomber's nationality is not identified, it would seem most likely that Ethiopian troops are responsible, since it is a conflict between Ethiopia and Eritrea. The reasons for IDMC not identifying the bombers are not specified. Yet it could be assessed that while the perpetrator is not identified, it is quite obvious who it is. Therefore, IDMC seems to indicate that Ethiopia's bombing caused the first conflict that left the first wave of internally displaced persons.

#### **4.2.4 Table**

Judging by the analysis of the different quotes concerning the cause of the conflict and therein the cause of forcefully displaced persons, it would seem that through Miller's theory, IDMC portrays different views on who the responsible actors are.

Firstly, the report portrays both Ethiopia and Eritrea as responsible for the beginning of the conflict. Yet, through further inspection and on the basis of the Miller theory, it is important to reflect on historical events such as colonialism and occupation by Italy. The Italian influence on border decisions dating further back than the actual border conflict, imply that they could indeed be morally responsible for the cause of forcefully displaced.

Secondly, the portrayal of the international community by the IDMC, proves that they too serve a potential role as causers of forceful displacement. IDMC portray the international community as heroes in the majority of the report while briefly mentioning international weapons suppliers. It would seem that IDMC do not deem the international community as the main actors responsible for the cause of forcefully displaced.

---

<sup>52</sup> Norwegian Refugee Council/Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre (NRC/IDMC), 2006, p. 16.

In the following table (see **Table 1**) the results of the first analysis will be presented. Judging by the portrayal of the cause of conflict and therein the cause of forcefully displaced, I have chosen to assess who IDMC portrays as responsible for the cause of forcefully displaced. The three possible actors will be ranked from 1-3, where 1 is portrayed as most responsible (the states) for the cause of the conflict and forcefully displaced and 3 is portrayed as least responsible.

**Table 1: Cause**

| Question   | Actors   | Causal Principle     | Moral Principle     | Capacity Principle      | Communal Principle                |
|--|--|----------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Who is portrayed - through the application of Millers theory on IDMC's report- as responsible for the <i>cause</i> of forced displaced persons during the Eritrea-Ethiopia conflict? | 1. Ethiopia and Eritrea<br>2. International Community<br>3. Italian Colonialists | Ethiopia and Eritrea | Italian Colonialism | International Community | No evidence of Communal principle |

The table (see **Table 1**) shows that judging from the report and based on Miller’s theory on responsibility, the IDMC’s report portrays Ethiopia and Eritrea as the responsible causers of forced displacement.

According to the Miller-theory, causal responsibility is when an actor causes a certain situation via his/her/their actions, and moral responsibility is when he/she/they could have foreseen the outcome.<sup>53</sup> It would seem that Ethiopia and Eritrea fit into both principles, they were indeed the two actors that started the conflict, hence the name “Eritrea-Ethiopia conflict”, the two countries are also responsible morally.

However, the report also portrays the Italian colonialists and the international community as bearers of responsibility, when applying Miller’s theory. To summarize, the

<sup>53</sup> Miller, 2001, p. 455-456.

two states bear ultimate responsibility, always, this according to R2P, but the report does not stress the responsibility of the two other actors as much as they do that of the states. This could be due to the IDMC's influential role among the international community and the will to not jeopardise that influential role by shining light on the negative aspects of the international community (more specifically the "West"). After gathering a deeper understanding of who are portrayed as responsible for the cause of forcefully displaced, I shall now analyse who are portrayed as responsible for the consequences, meaning who is responsible for remedying the situation of the thousands of forcefully displaced.

### **4.3 Consequences**

Following the IDMC's portrayal of cause-responsible actors I have chosen to analyse the portrayal of actors responsible for the consequences of the conflict and therein forcefully displaced persons.

This is the second and last step in the process of understanding the overall responsible actor(s) as portrayed by IDMC.

Following this heading, there are categories; "Non-profit organisations and Non-governmental organisations", "Those who plant landmines during the conflict", "UN and International community", "Local communities" and "Displaced persons". These categories have been chosen because I consider them to be portrayed as potential responsibility bearers in regard to the consequences of the displaced persons.

#### **4.3.1 Non-Profit Organisations and Non-Governmental Organisations**

Non-Profit Organisations (NPOs) and Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs) are of great importance during the consequences of forced displacement. Governments or donors often finance them in order to distribute vital aid (health care, food, water and so on). The IDMC does not explicitly state that these organisations are responsible for the consequences of displacement, but do express the attempts by the organisations to relieve the suffering persons' situations.

UN OCHA-EUE estimated about 329,040 IDPs registered as a result of the Ethiopian-Eritrean War (...) About 59,000 IDPs had not received their rehabilitation cash grant and neither were assisted by WFP or ICRC.<sup>54</sup>

---

<sup>54</sup> Norwegian Refugee Council/Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre (NRC/IDMC), 2006, p. 96

In this quote, the IDMC provides information on the amount of internally displaced persons (IDPs) as a consequence of the conflict. In the year 2003, the World Food Program (WFP) and International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) faced challenges, in the form of providing means to rehabilitate displaced persons. Also, the quote suggests an expectation that the WFP and ICRC would claim responsibility for assisting the displaced persons, but failed to do so. In light of this emergency situation of failing to provide assistance, the IDMC portrays yet another actor as an alternative bearer of responsibility:

WFP is appealing to donors to provide US\$90 million in assistance to cover the organisation's 2003 emergency operation.<sup>55</sup>

The WFP seems to (in times of desperation) turn to donors. These donors are not announced by name, but it is clear that they are seen as in possession of economic means to help. If an actor has the capacity to aid those in crisis situations, the actor should bear responsibility.<sup>56</sup> In result the IDMC portrays the WFP of transferring the position of responsibility to “donors”.

In reaction to the repression, several donors have diverted their support for Ethiopia away from the government, instead funding NGOs directly; they have warned the government that non-partisan aid distribution has become difficult in an increasingly politicised environment.<sup>57</sup>

Donors may be portrayed as more responsible than NGOs, this quote shows that IDMC suggests that donors mistrust the government and therefore donors fund NGOs directly. The portrayal of mistrust for governments and trust for NGOs indicates that donors in turn believe that NGOs should be assigned more responsibility for the displaced persons than the government. To summarise, it would seem that NGOs and NPOs are portrayed as accepting responsibility for the consequences of displacement although their activity depends on “donors”. Due to the donors funding, it seems that IDMC portrays the responsibility taken by NGOs and NPOs as more righteous than assigning donors responsibility, although the organisations seem to have failed to assist 59,000 IDPs according to IDMC’s report.

---

<sup>55</sup> Ibid., p. 75

<sup>56</sup> Miller, 2001, p. 461

<sup>57</sup> Norwegian Refugee Council/Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre (NRC/IDMC), 2006, p. 8.

According to Miller's theory, donors are in possession of the best economic capacity to relieve those suffering, whereas NGOs are both funded by donors and therefore possess capacity *and* have a special link to the displaced persons due to their (often) physical presence in affected areas.

In regard to funding and assistance it is now of interest to analyse IDMC's portrayal of the UN and international communities involvement in the consequences of the conflict that have resulted in forceful displacement.

### **4.3.2 United Nations and International community**

Since the aim of the United Nations (UN) is "working to prevent conflict; helping parties in conflict make peace; peacekeeping; and creating the conditions to allow peace to hold and flourish. These activities often overlap and should reinforce one another, to be effective."<sup>58</sup>, it seems that their intervention concerning displaced persons during the consequences of the Eritrea-Ethiopia conflict is nothing more than predictable. In IDMC's report, the UN and international community are portrayed as intervening actors who have taken it upon themselves to, perhaps not claim responsibility, but remedy some of the consequences suffered by displaced persons. Firstly the IDMC writes:

With funding from the international community, the government is trying to slash food dependency for 15 million people in the country.<sup>59</sup>

Indicating a portrayal that the international community did accept some remedial responsibility, due to funding granted to the government in order to remedy consequences suffered by displaced persons (in this case, food dependency). Other than funding, the UN and therein the international community, are portrayed by the IDMC as important mediators of the peace agreement that ended the conflict.

In April 2002, an independent border commission issued its decision on boundary delimitation between the two countries following their destructive border war from 1998-2000. According to the Algiers peace accord of December 2000, which officially ended the war, the sides agreed that any border ruling would be "final and binding". Both countries claim to have been awarded the now-symbolic village of Badme, where the conflict erupted in May 1998.<sup>60</sup>

---

<sup>58</sup> United Nations, *Webpage*, "What We Do: Maintain International Peace and Security".

<sup>59</sup> Norwegian Refugee Council/Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre (NRC/IDMC), 2006, p.103.

<sup>60</sup> *Ibid.*, p.36.

Evidently, judging by the portrayal, the two parties (Ethiopia and Eritrea) had difficulties reaching a peaceful agreement, as a result, the UN in cooperation with OAU and international community made several attempts to negotiate truce between the states.<sup>61</sup>

The OAU presented the two countries with detailed “technical arrangements” for the implementation of the OAU’s framework agreement and its modalities in August 1999. Worked out by experts from OAU, the U.N., and the governments of Algeria and the U.S., the technical arrangements were presented as an integral and final part of the OAU settlement plan. The document mandated a peacekeeping mission, established under the authority of the U.N. Security Council, to monitor and assist with the implementation of the OAU’s peace package. Paragraph 9 required the parties inter alia to commit themselves to the prohibition of displacement and deportation of civilian populations and to facilitate human rights monitoring.<sup>62</sup>

The portrayal of the OAU and UN as working together to resolve the conflict implies that the two actors belonging to the international community, assumed responsibility for mediating a solution for the consequences of the conflict. This portrayal leads to the impression that the two countries would fail to reach agreement and responsibility for the conflict without international assistance.

The UN is also identified as a bearer of capacity to assume responsibility for mines, as portrayed in the quote below:

The mission identified a need for UN involvement in the development of a national capacity for mine action provided that certain preconditions could be met, the most fundamental of which was the cessation of the conflict with Eritrea and the establishment of a mechanism for civilian coordination in humanitarian mine action (...) The signing of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement between Ethiopia and Eritrea on 12 December 2000 in Algiers opens the way for the full re-engagement of the United Nations in providing direct capacity-building assistance to the Government of Ethiopia in Humanitarian Mine Action.<sup>63</sup>

In order for the UN to intervene in mine action, the conflict needed to officially terminate. After the signing of the Algiers agreement, the conflict was concluded and the UN was able to use its capacity to assist the mine actions.

---

<sup>61</sup> Ibid., p. 16-17.

<sup>62</sup> Ibid., p. 34.

<sup>63</sup> Ibid., p. 101.

Due to the analysis of IDMC's portrayal of the UN and international community, it seems that actors within this category (rather than *accepting* responsibility) brought responsibility upon themselves, most likely as a result of their capacity being the best to propose peaceful agreements and assume remedial responsibility. The UN and international community are, as a result, portrayed as assuming responsibility for setting forth an arrangement between the parties in conflict and responsible for distributing their responsibilities for the consequences of the conflict. As mentioned, the UN agreed to assist mine actions and therefore brought upon itself certain responsibility, but another possible responsibility bearing actor for the threats these mines pose to displaced persons (as left behind after the conflict), could be those who planted the mines.

### **4.3.3 Those who planted landmines**

IDMC's report portrays landmines as a consequence of the conflict and the fact that the mines have affected the return home of many displaced persons.

The presence of land mines hampers their return and resumption of agricultural activities.<sup>64</sup>

Due to the effects landmines left behind after the conflict have had on displaced civilians, it would seem that those who planted the landmines are responsible for the suffering and the difficulty for displaced persons to return home. Although IDMC, yet again, does not state who have set out these landmines, it is most likely militants from either side of the conflict.

Although security in Tigray and Afar improved considerably during the year, most displaced people could not return home because pervasive landmines severely limited access to farm and pasture land.<sup>65</sup>

The portrayal of landmines in this quote, results in the conclusion that those responsible for setting out landmines can indeed be responsible for the effects suffered by displaced persons. Not only do the displaced persons suffer in terms of insecurity for themselves, they also suffer consequences in terms of limited farmland and pasture for animals.

---

<sup>64</sup> Ibid., p. 99.  
<sup>65</sup> Ibid., p.100.



During the recent conflict with Eritrea, it is thought that as many as 100,000 landmines may have been planted in the Western Zone of Tigray alone.<sup>66</sup>

This quote portrays no specific country as responsible for planting landmines in the Tigray region (border region) in Ethiopia. Yet, the portrayal implies that, those who planted the mines (most likely Ethiopia in an act to defend the region<sup>67</sup>) are responsible for the consequences suffered by displaced persons in this very region.

In conclusion it would seem, via an analysis of IDMC's portrayal of land mines and their affects on displaced persons, that those who have planted landmines could be responsible for displaced persons' sufferings.

According to Miller's theory on responsibility, persons are responsible according to the causal principle for the consequences of landmines. Meaning that if C causes E, C is responsible whether the outcome was intended or not.<sup>68</sup>

#### **4.3.4 Local communities**

Other than governments, host communities have also become responsibility bearers as a consequence of the conflict:

The vast majority of those displaced were hosted by local communities, who were also extremely poor, with a significant number requiring relief food assistance for many years to meet minimum food needs.<sup>69</sup>

Although host communities have not willingly claimed responsibilities for forcefully displaced persons, the situations after the conflict have contributed to undeniable responsibility. Unfortunately as portrayed in the quote below, "forced" responsibility of host communities has consequences, such as bad attitudes.

Some hosts are sceptical and hesitant, stating that any available space in their area is meant for their own next generation.<sup>70</sup>

---

<sup>66</sup> Ibid., p. 100.

<sup>67</sup> Kalshoven and Zegveld, 2011, p. 264-265.

<sup>68</sup> Miller, 2001, p. 45.

<sup>69</sup> Norwegian Refugee Council/Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre (NRC/IDMC), 2006, p. 88.

<sup>70</sup> Ibid., p. 106.

Although host communities are important to take into account when analysing responsibility, it is evident that IDMC's report portrays their responsibility as unavoidable due to the consequences of the conflict and therein, forced displacement. From the Miller-theory point of view it would seem that host communities, much like the UN and international community, are responsible under the category of capacity. The government is however, responsible in terms of moral and causal responsibility (as earlier mentioned), they are responsible for the cause of the conflict and therefore are responsible for the consequences and sufferance of displaced during the conflict (despite unintended displacement).

#### 4.3.5 Displaced persons

Briefly mentioned in the IDMC's report, is the issue of displaced persons' relations to the state. Portrayed in the quote below is the indication that in order for civilians to uphold a good relation to the state, they must have good relations with *kebele*<sup>71</sup> (local councils) and *wereda*<sup>72</sup> (district councils):

There is evidence that the local administration is normally conceptualized by the villagers as a fusion of both state and party authority. Ethiopians are well aware of the wide-ranging powers of these administrative bodies and are conscious of the fact that they need to maintain good relations with their officials. Observers describe how all who are dependent on the support or approval of the state, rely on their contact with kebele (and to a lesser extent wereda) officials.<sup>73</sup>

According to the IDMC, if a person (including displaced) wants to be supported by the state they must uphold a good relation to officials. This could mean that if displaced persons refuse to respect *kebele* and *wereda* officials they know which consequences follow, meaning that they themselves cause consequences and inflict harm on themselves in the form of mistreatment by officials. While knowing the consequences of disrespecting officials, these persons could, according to Miller's theory on causal responsibility, be responsible for the consequences of displacement.

It is important to keep in mind that this portrayal by IDMC, only concerns Ethiopia and it is not stated that the same applies to Eritrea.

---

<sup>71</sup> Ibid., p. 7.

<sup>72</sup> Ibid., p. 7.

<sup>73</sup> Ibid., p. 87.

### 4.3.6 Table

Judging by the analysis of the different quotes concerning the consequences of the conflict and therein the consequences suffered by forcefully displaced persons, it would seem that through Miller's theory the IDMC portray different views on who the responsible actors are.

In order to clarify the portrayed responsibility through the use of Miller's theory applied on the report, I shall now group the actors into different types of responsibility.

Firstly, non-profit and non-governmental organisations have claimed responsibility for the consequences of the conflict though they were not involved in the cause of it. According to Miller, these organisations may be responsible due to their capacity to utilise funds needed in an attempt to remedy the situation of displaced persons.

Secondly, the international community and the United Nations are portrayed as responsibility bearers but of their own will to intervene and not due to causing the conflict, seeing as they are not portrayed as doing so. Miller's theory would imply that these actors are responsible due to their capacity to remedy the situation. For instance, the UN is an organisation that aims to uphold peace around the world, therefore they intervene with the cooperation of the OAU in order to mediate a peaceful agreement for the two parties, therein they bring it upon themselves to bear responsibility since they have a capacity that the conflicting countries do not.

Thirdly, those who have planted mines during the conflict have affected displaced persons, due to the lack of claiming responsibility to remove the mines. Through further inspection using Miller's theory it would seem that these actors are causally responsible for the consequences of these mines and therefore responsible for the consequences suffered by displaced persons. Not only are they causally responsible but also morally, since the outcome was perhaps not intended but could have been foreseen.<sup>74</sup>

Fourthly, local communities are portrayed as hosting displaced persons, as a consequence of the conflict. This is a responsibility that may not fall upon the actor considering that they are not responsible for the cause of the conflict, however they are remedially responsible in terms of capacity. Miller's theory, when applied, shows that the portrayal of local communities by the IDMC results in a proof that host communities are close to displaced persons and therefore have a responsibility in terms of capacity. They also have responsibility in accordance with the communitarian principle, suggesting that the host

---

<sup>74</sup> Miller, 2001, p. 456.

communities have special connections to the displaced in terms of nationality and therein bear remedial responsibility.

Hence, by applying Miller's theory, it is clear that governments have played an important role in the responsibility of the conflict. Since states are responsible for the well-being of their population it could be assessed that they are most responsible for the cause of the conflict and therein displaced persons, but also for the consequences. This means that they could be held as both morally and causally responsible. Morally, due to the fact that both states used expulsion and causally, because they are responsible for causing the conflict.<sup>75</sup> Finally, displaced persons themselves can be interpreted as responsible to an extent. IDMC's portrayal shows that displaced persons are subject to inflicting sufferance on themselves as a result of "bad relations" with officials. In accordance with Miller's theory this would imply causal responsibility on displaced persons themselves, seeing as it is up to them to uphold good relations with officials and not doing so would imply bad relations to the state and therein consequences. This could in turn spike criticism towards Miller's theory, since it seems unfair that the forcefully displaced be responsible for the consequences suffered, since they are not responsible for the conflict.

In the following table (see **Table 2**) the results of the second analysis will be presented. Judging by the portrayal of the consequences suffered by forcefully displaced, I have chosen to assess who IDMC portrays as responsible for the consequences of forcefully displaced (with the help of Miller's principles). The five possible actors will be ranked from 1-5, where 1 is portrayed as most responsible (the states) for the cause of the conflict and forcefully displaced and 5 is portrayed as least responsible.

---

<sup>75</sup> Norwegian Refugee Council/Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre (NRC/IDMC), 2006, p. 18-19.

**Table 2: Consequences**

| Question  | Actors  | Causal Principle  | Moral Principle  | Capacity Principle  | Communal Principle       |
|---|---|---|--|---|--------------------------|
| Who is portrayed - through the application of Millers theory on IDMC's report- as responsible for the <i>consequences</i> of forced displaced persons during the Eritrea-Ethiopia conflict? | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Governements</li> <li>2. Those who planted land mines</li> <li>3. Local communities</li> <li>4. The United Nations and International community</li> <li>5. Displaced persons</li> </ol> | <p>Governments</p> <p>Those who planted land mines</p> <p>Displaced persons</p> | <p>Governments</p> <p>Those who planted land mines</p> | <p>Local communities</p> <p>The United Nations and International community</p> <p>Non-profit and non-governmental organisations</p> | <p>Local communities</p> |

The table (see **Table 2**) shows that judging by the report and based on Miller's theory on responsibility, the IDMC's report portrays five main actors as responsible for the consequences of forced displacement.

To summarise, it would seem that Ethiopia and Eritrea are most responsible for the consequences of forcefully displaced persons, according to the portrayal by the IDMC. But, after gathering a deeper understanding of who are portrayed as responsible for the consequences suffered by forcefully displaced, it would seem that apart from the states there are other actors responsible in accordance with different principles. Next, I will identify who is/are responsible for the conflict as a whole, meaning who is responsible for relieving the situation of the thousands of forcefully displaced, besides that of the states.

#### 4.4 Responsibility Result

It is important to keep in mind that the table and results presented on the following page are conclusions drawn from IDMC's report, Miller's theory on responsibility and this specific method.

I will start by presenting a table (see **Table 3**), this will provide both the results of **Table 1** and **Table 2** along with a summary of who are responsible for conflict induced

displaced persons. Thereafter, I will explain the results presented and how they are connected to Miller's theory on responsibility.

In **Table 3** there are four actors that are presented in the *Summary* part of the table, I have assessed that these actors are the most important to focus on in the result of the analysis of IDMC's report, because they are responsible on most levels. The four actors will then be numbered from 1-4, the purpose of this distinction is to clarify that they are portrayed as responsible on different grounds, when applying Millers theory.

The first actor is responsible both for the causes and consequences in terms of causal and moral responsibility. The second actor is responsible in terms of capacity. The third actor is responsible in terms of the capacity and community principle and finally, the fourth actor is responsible in terms of causal and moral principles.

To take into account, when studying the actors presented in the table section "Summary": I have chosen to assemble both Ethiopia and Eritrea with the actor called "Government" because they are portrayed as the same actor by IDMC's report. I have also chosen to do the same with International Community and the UN, because the UN is an International actor.

**Table 3: Result**

| Questions   | Actors  | Causal Principle                               | Moral Principle                                 | Capacity Principle   | Communal Principle                |
|---|---|--|---|--|-----------------------------------|
| Who is portrayed - through the application of Millers theory on IDMC's report- as responsible for the <i>cause</i> of forced displaced persons during the Eritrea-Ethiopia conflict?        | 1.Ethiopia and Eritrea.<br>2.International Community<br>3.Italian colonialists  | Ethiopia and Eritrea                           | Italian Colonialism<br><br>Ethiopia and Eritrea | International community  | No evidence of Communal principle |
| Who is portrayed - through the application of Millers theory on IDMC's report- as responsible for the <i>consequences</i> of forced displaced persons during the Eritrea-Ethiopia conflict? | 1.Governments<br>2. Local Communities<br>3. Those who Planted land Mines<br>4. The United Nations and International Community<br>5. Displaced Persons | Governments<br><br>Those who planted landmines | Governments<br><br>Those who planted land mines | Local Communities<br><br>The United Nations and International Community<br><br>Non-profit and non-governmental Organisations | Local Communities                 |
| <b>Summary:</b>   |   |  |   |  |                                   |
| Through applying David Miller's theory on IDMC's report, who can be identified as bearers of responsibility for the forcefully displaced in the Eritrea-Ethiopia conflict?                  | 1. Ethiopia and Eritrea   | Cause and Consequence                          | Cause and Consequence                           | None   | None                              |
|   | 2. International community  | None   | None  | Cause and Consequence  | None                              |
|   | 3. Local communities  | None   | None  | Consequences   | Consequences                      |
|   | 4. Those who planted land mines   | Consequences                                   | Consequences                                    | None   | None                              |

Below, results in section *Summary* of **Table 3**, will now be presented and explained. Via the application of David Miller's theory, the material selected from IDMC and the method of qualitative content analysis the result is as follows:

Firstly, the IDMC portrays the states as most responsible; this comes as no surprise since the IDMC is an international organisation. The organisation most likely advocates an international system where states are subject to the primary responsibility of their own people in accordance with R2P. This is after all the main duty of a state. Since both states knowingly entered a conflict they are both causally and morally responsible for forcefully displaced individuals, this in accordance with Miller's theory.

The second actor, the *international community* is a special actor. The international community is portrayed as bringing it upon themselves to remedy the situation caused by Ethiopia and Eritrea. Although, certain actors were responsible for supplying arms to the conflicting countries and therefore could have prevented the issue of displaced persons, through withstanding from trading possibilities. Through Miller's theory it is also evident that the international community impose responsibility on themselves for the consequences suffered by displaced persons, in accordance with the capacity principle. The international community and therein the UN and OAU have played a large role in mediating a peace agreement for the two parties in order to reach an end to the conflict and have therefore been able to poses a somewhat heroic image of themselves.

The third actor, *host communities* have an unavoidable responsibility. They are not only responsible according to Millers principle of capacity, but also the principle of community. Host communities (despite sometimes "bad attitudes" towards displaced) have been subject to displaced persons settling down in their communities and due to their capacity these communities are responsible for the displaced. They are also responsible in terms of the community principle, because they belong to the same nationality as those internally displaced.

Finally, playing an important role in the responsibility for displaced persons, are those who planted mines. According to Kalshoven and Zegveld, both countries planted mines close to their military positions, but these mines caused consequences that affected displaced persons. On account of the mines, the actors are not just morally but also causally responsible. Similar to the responsibility of both governments, those who planted the mines intentionally, caused consequences such as displaced persons' inability to travel home.



#### **4.4.1 The ultimate responsibility**

In order to identify an actor(s) responsible for both the cause and consequences for the situation of conflict induced displaced persons, I shall now apply Miller's connection theory. According to Miller, the four principles are not sufficient on their own, instead he advocates a plural and multi-principle approach. He also presents the subject of *immediate* responsibility and *final* responsibility, meaning that an agent (actor) can provide either short-term or long-term remedies. According to Miller, the principle of capacity and community are included in immediate responsibility (quick and effective) while the principles of moral, causal and (occasional) community provide final responsibility (sustainable).

When the idea of immediate and final responsibility are applied to this analysis, it would seem that Ethiopia and Eritrea (causally and morally responsible) and those responsible for planting landmines (causally and morally responsible) are finally responsible, whereas the international community (capacity responsible) and local communities (capacity and communally responsible) are immediately responsible.

Furthermore, Miller provides an option when a case is deemed as too complex to solve; the option is to find a special link between the "agent" (in this case actors) and "patient" (in this case displaced persons). The special link is determined by the strongest connection between the agent and patient. For instance, if A is weakly linked to P in terms of moral responsibility, but B is strongly linked in terms of capacity, then B should be held responsible.

## 5. Discussion

---

In this section I will discuss aspects of the material, theory, prior research and improvements.

To begin, I have earlier presented the primary material analysed in this paper, the report submitted in 2006 by the Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre (IDMC). The report is published by IDMC, which is a part of the Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC) who describe themselves as an independent non-governmental humanitarian organisation.

The NRC may describe themselves as independent but they are a “Western” organisation who portray the situations of internally displaced worldwide. Due to the IDMC’s recognition by the United Nations General Assembly resolutions, it would seem that they have an important role in the international community. This may indeed have an affect on the IDMC’s portrayal of displaced persons, since a large portion of their report used in this paper, consists of information from influential international organisations and not the directly affected displaced persons. The services they provide to the international community are many, one of which is to provide “credible” data. One could critique the credibility, when the majority of the report consists of citations published by the UN. This however, explains the portrayal of the international community as some kind of “heroes” who do all they can to end the conflict peacefully as many quotes convey. Further, the portrayal of responsibility bearers as assessed by the theory and material, seems to indicate the fact that the responsibility lies with the governments involved in the conflict but in need of the international communities help. The report only briefly mentions instances in which the international community could be held responsible for the causes and consequences of the forcefully displaced. These are actors such as the international weapons dealers and Italian colonialists.

The perspective of this paper, in the form of Miller’s theory of responsibilities allows us to analyse and interpret the portrayal of situations presented by the IDMC. Although, the report does not explicitly give us the names of responsible actors, the use of the theory can give us examples of who they are portraying as responsible, from a certain perspective. Presenting the portrayal of a responsible actor can be both risky and innovatory. The former, due to the risks of not presenting the responsibility bearer for displaced persons, as intended by IDMC.

The latter, due to the fact that the result is limited, because of the limited material and theory and therefore the result is an example of who are portrayed as responsibility bearers in this specific context.

The prior research mentioned in this paper, has had similarities and differences with the IDMC's report. Similarities between the prior research and the analysis are aspects such as responsibility to protect, landmines, causes and consequences of displacement, intended displacement and issues concerning host communities.

Firstly, Kalshoven and Zegveld provided examples of a dispute between the two states (Eritrea-Ethiopia) when setting forth claims. These disputes were largely founded in the will to find a responsible actor for different events. Just like the report it shows finding someone responsible is difficult, it takes analysis.

Secondly, Ferris, Mooney and Stark presented the aspect of the international community and their help as heroic acts of kindness and fairness. Their support of intervention in accordance with R2P, an indication of mistrusts in states ability to establish peace themselves. The IDMC did not portray the states as trustworthy enough to establish peace, they were instead seen as in need of international aid and a shift of responsibility onto the international arena.

Thirdly, Reed wrote of the states responsibility to see to that the issue of rape is resolved and that the states cannot be trusted with funds that are intended for these purposes. Again, the issue of trust in governments is mentioned, the IDMC and Reed had this in common.

Fourthly, Lischer presented two factors to take into account when analysing 1) the violence that caused the displacement and 2) the characteristics of the resulting displacement, I have taken these aspect into account when analysing IDMC's portrayal. I have also tried to see displacement not as a portrayed outcome of conflict, but also as something that can be identified as intentional.

Fifthly, Panebianco and Fontana wrote of the pressure put on states to take responsibility and if they fail to do it the transfer of that responsibility to the international community.

Finally, Lakhani provides a contrasting view on the subject of displacement. Lakhani writes of the positive opportunities forced displacement can bring and the responsibility of host communities to work towards this economic opportunity. This aspect is of interest

considering the fact that host communities have been presented in the result of this paper, as immediately responsible towards internally displaced persons. The host communities are not portrayed as economic opportunities in the IDMC report, they are rather portrayed in a negative light as ill prepared and unwilling.

All prior researchers have one thing in common; they all indirectly tackle the issue of responsibility. The research has not been analysed through the application of David Miller's theory on responsibility or on the IDMC's report. However, with the use of the correct theory, material and method it can be possible to present specifically selected actors responsible on different levels according to different principles, both immediately and finally responsible.

There are always aspects within research that can be developed, in this paper some of these aspects would be:

To compare the results of the analysis with results deriving from a different case or material, in order to define the applicability of Miller's theory of responsibility and therein find a responsible actor. Perhaps, the use of additional theories within the perspective of responsibility would provide interesting results and depth to research. But these are examples of improvements that can be used in future papers.

## 6. Summary

---

In this paper I have analysed the Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre's portrayal of displaced persons, with the perspective of responsibility as illustrated in David Miller's theory.

The purpose of the report was to:

(...) to analyse the portrayal of the situations of forcefully displaced persons as written in IDMCs report (2006) "Ethiopia: Government recognition of conflict IDPs crucial to addressing their plight"<sup>92</sup>

The analysis showed that a number of actors could be portrayed as responsibility bearers with the assistance of Miller's theory. Through applying David Miller's theory on the IDMC's report it would seem that the states and those who planted the mines were finally responsible in accordance with the causal and moral principles and that the international- and local communities were immediately responsible in terms of the capacity principle.

The purpose of the paper, was to attempt to find a portrayed responsibility bearer and provide reasons as to why the IDMC portrays these actors as responsible. The responsibility bearers have been presented in **Table 3** and the reason has been discussed in the Discussion. The questions that have been formulated in the introduction of this paper have been answered, to a certain degree. I have identified IDMC's portrayed responsible actors –as previously stated- they are not necessarily the actors that IDMC would admit to being responsible for the causes and consequences for displaced persons, these actors and reasons are instead, singled out with the use of a specific theory, method and material. Therefore, the result is specific and limited to the purpose of this specific analysis.

## 7. List of Reference

---

### Primary Material:

Norwegian Refugee Council/Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre (NRC/IDMC), *Ethiopia: Government Recognition of Conflict IDPs Crucial to Addressing their Plight. A Profile of the Internal Displacement Situation*, 26 April 2006, available at: <http://www.refworld.org/docid/4455beb64.html> [accessed 2 January 2018]

### Reports:

Brookings-Bern Project on Internal Displacement, *From Responsibility to Response: Assessing National Approaches to Internal Displacement*, November 2011, available at: <http://www.refworld.org/docid/4f38cbe32.html> [accessed 16 April 2018]

*Decision Regarding Delimitation of the Border between the State of Eritrea and the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia*, Eritrea-Ethiopia Boundary Commission, 13 April 2002, available at: [http://www.refworld.org/cases,EE\\_BCOM,4a54bbec0.html](http://www.refworld.org/cases,EE_BCOM,4a54bbec0.html) [accessed 7 January 2018]

UN General Assembly, *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights*, 16 December 1966, United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 999, pp. 172-346, available at: <http://www.refworld.org/docid/3ae6b3aa0.html> [accessed 7 January 2018]

UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), *Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, 1999, 2000, A/55/12*, available at: <http://www.refworld.org/docid/3b00f4d40.html> [accessed 7 January 2018]

UN General Assembly, *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*, 10 December 1948, 217 A (III), available at: <http://www.refworld.org/docid/3ae6b3712c.html> [accessed 7 January 2018]

International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (ICISS), *The Responsibility to Protect*, International Development Research Centre, 2001, Ottawa.

### **Articles:**

Elo, Satu and Helvi Kyngäs, 2008, "The qualitative content analysis process". *Journal of Advanced Nursing* , Vol 62(1), pp. 107-115.

Panebianco, Stefania and Fontana, Iole, 2017, " When responsibility to protect 'hits home': the refugee crisis and the EU response", *Third World Quarterly*, 39:1.

Lakhani, Sadaf, 2013, "Forced Displacement: Moving from managing risk to facilitating opportunity", *World Bank*, pp. 1-18.

Lischer Sarah Kenyon, 2007), "Causes and Consequences of Conflict-Induced Displacement", *Civil Wars*, 9:2, pp. 142-155,

Miller, David, 2001, "Distributing Responsibilities", *The Journal of Political Philosophy*, vol. 9, nr. 4, pp. 453-471.

Reed, Lucy, 2011, "Assessing Civil Liability for Harms to Women during Armed Conflict: The Rulings of the Eritrea-Ethiopia Claims Commission", *International Criminal Law Review*, no. 3, pp. 589-605.

Taylor-Powell, Ellen and Renner, Marcus, 2003, "Analyzing Qualitative Data", *Program Development & Evaluation*, pp. 1-12

### **Books:**

Bergström, Göran & Boréus, Kristina (red.), *Textens mening och makt: metodbok i samhällsvetenskaplig text- och diskursanalys*, 3., [utök.] uppl., Studentlitteratur, Lund, 2012.

Kalshoven, Frits & Zegveld, Liesbeth., *Constraints on the waging of war: an introduction to international humanitarian law*, 4th ed., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2011.

### **News Articles:**

R. Bonner, "Despite Cutoff by U.S., Ethiopia and Eritrea Easily Buy Weapons", New York Times, 23 July 1998, available at: <http://www.nytimes.com/1998/07/23/world/despite-cutoff-by-us-ethiopia-and-eritrea-easily-buy-weapons.html>, [accessed: 7 January 2018]

### **Websites:**

International Displacement Monitoring Centre (IDMC), *Webpage*, "About IDMC", available at: <http://www.internal-displacement.org/about-us/>, [accessed: 13 December 2017]

The UN Refugee Agency (UNHCR), *Webpage*, "History of UNHCR", Available at: <http://www.unhcr.org/history-of-unhcr.html>, [accessed: 14 December 2017]

The World Bank, *Webpage*, "What We Do", Available at: <http://www.worldbank.org/en/what-we-do>, [accessed: 9 December 2017]

United Nations, *Webpage*, "What We Do: Maintain International Peace and Security", Available at: <http://www.un.org/en/sections/what-we-do/maintain-international-peace-and-security/index.html>, [accessed: 4 December 2017]