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The aim of this study was twofold; firstly it sought to describe the human security situation of Roma IDPs and IDPs living in collective centers, secondly it tried to create an understanding for how the human security situation can affect IDPs capabilities to develop. The findings of the study were mainly based on a field study conducted in Belgrade, Serbia for two months. The results of the study were that IDPs in collective centers have a poor human security situation regarding basic income, employment, adequate housing and experienced personal security. Roma IDPs suffer from the same insecurities, but in addition also has poor human security in basic education and personal safety. Their stagnant human security situation proved to be the result of the inability to help IDPs by the actors involved in the relief work. Obstacles such as the Serbian government’s policy of return, a society in transition, the status of IDPs, lack of necessary documents together with lack of agency of IDPs and mistrust between different levels of the society, have hindered a positive improvement of IDPs human security situation. Their poor human security situation and their lack of instrumental freedoms in the Serbian society have lead to limited prospects for these two groups of IDPs to develop in the Serbian society.
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1. Introduction

Serbia has the largest number of internally displaced persons (IDPs) in Europe; over 205,000 IDPs are living within its borders. The majority of these became displaced in 1999 as a consequence of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization’s (NATO’s) military intervention in Kosovo. Today, almost nine years after their displacement IDPs belong to one of the most vulnerable groups of the Serbian society, due to high unemployment rates and a poor economic situation. Many IDPs face poverty because of scarcity of jobs, they live under inadequate housing conditions and have difficulties retaining their legal rights because of lack of documentation and ID-cards. Especially vulnerable among IDPs are Roma, who not only have the similar problems as other IDPs, but in addition suffer from discrimination because they belong to a marginalized minority group in Serbia (Norwegian Refugee Council 2005:8).

Because these people did not cross an international border when they fled from their homes, it is the Serbian authorities that are responsible for their protection (UNHCR 2007:3). However, even though IDPs suffer from the same problems as refugees from Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina do, they are not entitled to the same assistance as them due to the fact that they are IDPs and follow by the government’s policy of return. IDPs are considered to be temporary citizens who are to return to their place of origin as soon as it is possible to do so. This has not yet been a realistic option for the majority of IDPs, because of the unresolved status of Kosovo. Hence, there are limited possibilities for the IDPs to
either return to their homes in Kosovo or to integrate in the Serbian society, and even though they have been subject to a lot of attention from local and international organizations, their living situation has not improved the past years (Norwegian Refugee Council 2005:8).

This study deals with the conditions IDPs are living under from a human security perspective. A study of their human security is needed for two reasons. Firstly, human security has become a well-used concept because of its focus on people instead of the nation state. However, although the concept is commonly used, there are few case studies conducted using human security as a methodological tool and/or theoretical explanation. In order to evaluate if the concept can be of pragmatic use, case studies are needed. Secondly, there have not been any studies dealing with IDPs from a human security perspective in Serbia. Numerous reports and studies have dealt with IDPs’ human rights and socio-economic conditions, but none have explicitly considered their security situation, which is of vital importance in order to understand what capabilities people have to develop within their own society.

The findings of this study are based on a field study conducted for a period of two months in Belgrade, Serbia. The analysis builds on interviews with organizations working with IDPs and with IDPs themselves. The focal point of the field study has been to view the security situation out of the displaced persons’ perspectives, hence to use a bottom-up approach.
1.2 Aim and Questions
The aim of this study is twofold, firstly it seeks to give a comprehensive description of the human security situation of Roma IDPs and IDPs living in collective centers, secondly it tries to create an understanding for how their capabilities to develop are affected by the human security situation. This is done through analyzing their economic and personal security and through examining why the relief work of actors involved with IDPs has been ineffective. The questions at issue are as follows:

- How is the human security situation among Roma IDPs and IDPs in collective centers in Belgrade?
  - How is the economic and personal security situation?
    - What is the average number of IDPs receiving a basic income, covering necessary expenses?
    - How is the employment among IDPs in regard to average rate of unemployment and access to labor market?
    - Under what conditions do IDPs live?
    - What problems do IDP children have in their access to primary education?
    - How common is it that IDPs are subject to physical and psychological violence from their surroundings as well as neglect from the local society and the Serbian authorities?
  - How is the experienced economic and personal security situation?
    - In which areas of economic and personal security do IDPs have feelings of safeness?
Which components of economic and personal security cause feelings of insecurity among IDPs?

- Why have actors involved with IDPs been unable to change the stagnant human security situation of IDPs?

The reason for making a distinction between the factual situation and the experienced situation in the research questions is because sometimes peoples’ perceptions do not necessarily reflect the reality (Human Security Centre 2005:50).

The definition of IDPs used in this study is the same as the one adopted and used by the United Nations:

Persons or groups of persons who have been forced or obliged to flee or leave their homes or places of habitual residence, in particular as a result of or in order to avoid the effects of armed conflict (…) and who have not crossed an internationally recognized border (Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement (2)).

The definition of the human security concept used in this study is drawn from the one outlined by United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) in 1994. Human security means that individuals in a society enjoy safety from threats created from poverty, such as hunger, disease and repression, and protection from both systematic and sudden hurtful disruptions in every day life.
1.3 Method
The method which is used in this study is a case study. The case study is a method used to understand and interpret specific situations, groups or phenomena (Merriam 1994:9, 17). What is specific for the case study is its focus on the context in which the group lives or in which the phenomenon takes place, and on the aim to discover relations or theories (Merriam 1994:9).

This method is the best choice for this study since the aim is to understand a specific phenomenon, which has not been explicitly covered before. Furthermore, it allows the use of several types of methodological techniques, which proves most useful in this context when information about the studied phenomenon could be collected from diverse sources, with different techniques (Merriam 1994:24).

This case study seeks to first and foremost describe the human security situation of two different groups of IDPs, but it also seeks to outline a theory explaining the consequences and reasons of the stagnant human security situation. This type of case study could be called interpretative case study and the aim is to collect as much information about the studied phenomenon as possible in order to formulate a theory or interpretation of it. The result could be everything from outlined tendencies to a finished theory (Merriam 1994:41-2).

The methodological techniques are both qualitative and quantitative, bits and parts of both techniques have been used where suitable. The most distinguished characteristics of the qualitative technique used are interviews, a small and non-random selection of interviewees and respondents, an inductive analysis and a comprehensive result. The
characteristics of the quantitative technique that have been used are structure (in interviews and pre-determined variables) and the use of questionnaires (Merriam 1994:32).

The reasons for using a mix of these techniques are treated continuously in the following paragraphs, which describe how the methodological techniques are used in this study.

The qualitative technique consists first and foremost of semi-structured interviews. The interview questions were prepared beforehand, but were of an open character, allowing the interviewee to answer freely. During the two-month field study in Belgrade interviews were conducted with one Roma IDP, three international organizations, two local non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and one governmental body. In total nine persons were interviewed, five men and four women.

Observation was a minor part of the qualitative work in the study. At one occasion I made a field visit together with a field mobile team of one of the local NGOs. The purposes of the visit was to see how the organization conduct their field work, to get a general sense of how Roma IDPs live, and to get a chance to talk to Roma IDPs about their situation in presence of an interpreter.

Except for these two, informal conversations with various persons with insight in issues related to this study are used as information sources. All these different kinds of sources are used to analyze the situation and draw conclusions.

The quantitative technique is used as a tool to make the human security approach more pragmatic. This means that the concept of human security firstly has been divided into economic and personal security, and thereafter these two have been subtracted into variables more easy to work with and also to analyze. In the end these are put together
again to create a comprehensive picture of the human security situation. The reasons for doing so are multiple. Firstly, human security is not a concept used in the daily lives of people, and in order to ask them about their human security situation this has to be done in a more pragmatic way. Secondly, it allowed me to form a questionnaire I could use in order to get information about these various components from IDPs themselves. To use a questionnaire was in this case a good way to cross the language barriers between me and the respondents, since the questionnaire was translated into Serbian. It also proved to be the easiest way of receiving information from a higher number of IDPs, since IDPs living in collective centers in general are, after eight years of displacement, tired of being ‘guinea pigs’ of different studies.

It should be pointed out that the purpose of the questionnaire is not to get a statistical and generalizable result. The questionnaires are used to outline tendencies and to confirm information gained from other reports or from the interviewed organization representatives. They are part of the research process, which leads to an understanding of the human security situation of IDPs. Also, these tendencies could serve as ground material for further, ‘deeper’ studies in this area.

Let us return to how the human security concept has been operationalized in this study before outlining the background variables used in the questionnaire. The variables which economic and personal security consists of are primarily drawn from UNDP’s human development reports, but also from the definition of interpersonal violence outlined by the World Health Organization (WHO). Economic and personal security has been operationalized as follows.
Economic security is compromised of four variables, basic income, safe housing, employment and primary education. Basic income means to have a regular income of some sort, whether from an employee or from social safety nets, covering all necessary expenses (rent, food, bills, hygienic tools, basic clothing). Safe housing means to live in adequate accommodation, and to know that it is possible to stay in the current accommodation as long as needed. The definition of employment is as simple as to have a job, while primary education is to have access to primary education and to have the right conditions of fulfilling it.

Personal security treats interpersonal violence, which is violence that occurs between individuals (WHO 2007 [www]). It is subdivided into physical violence, psychological violence and neglect. The security aspect of these is to not be subject to physical and psychological violence, and not experience neglect from the society.

Also, part of the operationalization is the experience people have of these different components, whether they cause feelings of safeness or insecurity.

Finally, the background variables used in the questionnaire is sex of respondent, age of respondent, place of origin and numbers of years in displacement. In total fifteen questionnaires were handed out in two different collective centers. Of the respondents eight were female and seven were male.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Security</th>
<th>Personal Security</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic income</td>
<td>Physical violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe housing</td>
<td>Psychological violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>Neglect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Operationalization of Economic and Personal Security
Before turning to the next section in this chapter, I will briefly consider both the negative and positive sides of using this methodological approach.

On the negative side, to make an extensive description of a specific case takes a lot of time, and also costs a lot of money, and with a field study conducted for a period of two months this could affect the result of the study negatively. Further, case studies could oversimplify factors in a phenomenon, leading the reader to believe the wrong things (Merriam 1994:47). It is also difficult to generalize the results given in a case study (Merriam 1994:48).

However, it is already pointed out that this study does not seek to either give a fully detailed picture of the human security situation, nor does it try to generalize the results. On the contrary, the method is chosen in order to get a comprehensive picture of the tendencies found, which later on could structure other deep going studies. The positive characteristic of a case study is that it gives the opportunity to study a complex phenomenon which has many variables of importance. It is also connected to real situations and therefore it has the possibility to give a good description of the phenomenon (Merriam 1994:46).

1.3.1 Resources and Critique of Sources
This study relies on both primary and secondary sources. The primary sources consist of information provided from interviews, questionnaires and official statistics. The secondary sources are drawn from reports and literature.

The major part of the information on IDPs is drawn from interviews with, and reports written by, international and local organizations working with IDPs. These sources are considered as trustworthy and reliable because of their long experience in the field and their
extensive insight in the problems and issues at stake. However, as with all non-profit, NGOs, there could be a bias because of their dependency to the interests of donors. The interest of the international community in an issue could also affect the governmental organizations used in this study. To tackle this possible bias that might be present, the information given from the different sources are compared and valued in the light of each other. The same procedure has been done in order to verify information from secondary sources. Also, it should be pointed out that this study mostly relies on information that is relatively new, which proves to be useful when analyzing the contemporary situation.

Except for the international and local organizations, two important sources are Amartya Sen and Hideaki Shinoda. Sen is a professor of Economics and Philosophy at the Harvard University, and also winner of the Noble Prize in Economics in 1998 (Biographical Note 2006 [www]). Shinoda is an associate Professor at the Institute for Peace Science at Hiroshima University (Hideaki Shinoda n.d [www]). Thus, both sources are because of their knowledge within the field of economics, development and human security, considered as reliable sources.

It should also be noted that the values and background of the author could influence the result of a study even though objectiveness is the primary goal.

1.3.2 Limitations
As the IDP population is so large this study is limited to IDPs living in collective centers and Roma IDPs. The reason for choosing these groups is because of their vulnerability. The intention was to focus on IDPs living in collective centers only, but after evaluation of the
information gained in the field, it became evident that it is necessary to direct light to the human security situation of Roma IDPs as well.

Further on, limitations are made regarding the human security concept. As explained later on in this study, the concept of human security includes many components. Hence, this study is focusing on the economic and personal security of IDPs because of its connection to peace and conflict. Although, for example, health and human rights are vital factors of human security and development, they are subjects well covered in other fields, and therefore left out of this particular study.

1.4 Disposition
This paper starts of with a brief background to the displacement and a short explanation of why the prospects of return and integration are so small. The background chapter is followed by a chapter which describes the concept of human security and the capability approach. Thereafter three major kind of actors engaged in the problems of IDPs are recognized and described. In this section the aim and activities of the organizations interviewed in this study are briefly portrayed. The fifth chapter analyzes the human security situation using the data collected in the field, while the sixth chapter gives an explanation to why the relief work has not been effective in terms of improving the human security situation of IDPs. These two chapters are followed by the final and concluding chapter of this study, where the human security situation is connected with the capability approach in order to show the correlation between IDPs human security and their possibility to develop.
2. Background

Today, almost nine years after the last bombs struck strategic targets in Serbia leaving behind devastation and damage, there are over 205,000 IDPs living in Serbia proper\(^1\). The majority of these fled from Kosovo during two periods, in 1999 and 2004 (Norwegian Refugee Council 2005:35, 46). This section briefly describes the historical and political background of their displacement, ending with a short explanation of why the prospects of return to the place of origin or integration in the Serbian society are considered as small.

2.1 Historical and Political Background

In the early 1990s the Kosovo Albanians were engaged in a peaceful secessionist movement, creating parallel institutions and undertaking parallel elections while on the same time boycotting Serbian elections (OSCE 1999:4). Even though there were tensions between the Serbian authorities and the parallel administration of Kosovo, the conflict did not turn violent until after the Dayton Peace talks in 1995. The newly organized Kosovo Liberation Army (UCK) which claimed to resist the Serbian police and security forces using violent means, targeted police stations, policemen and also civilian Serbs and Albanians working for the Serbian authorities. The Serbian government struck back these violent attacks decisively with the help of special security forces (OSCE 1999:5).

---

\(^1\) Serbia proper is a term used to exclude the geographic area of Kosovo. The map of Serbia is shown in Annex two.
In early 1998 these reprisal attacks on Albanian villages brought the immediate attention of the international community. In order to put an end to the massacres the diplomatic initiative of the six-country Contact Group (consisting of France, Germany, Italy, Russia, the United Kingdom and the USA) and the United Nation’s Security Council persistently tried to pressure the two fighting parties to find a solution for the conflict and stop the violence. Throughout the entire year several negotiations and mediations by European and USA diplomats were held without any results. On the contrary, reports showed persistent violations and massacres of the Albanian population by the Serbian security forces. When the Milošević-Holbrooke agreement was announced in October, the international community believed the conflict had come to a breakpoint. But the two months of calm following the agreement proved to have been nothing else than a respite for the warring parties, and in December 1999 violence erupted once again (OSCE 1999:6-7).

Subsequent to the dissolution of the cease fire NATO threatened to use military force. In a last attempt to ease the diplomatic crisis emerging between Serbia and the mediators, the Contact Group organized a conference concerning the future of Kosovo in Rambouillet on 6th February 1999. Even though the Albanians leaders, along with UCK, proved to be willing to sign an agreement, the Serbian authorities refused, leaving the negotiations a failure (OSCE 1999:7). As the violent attacks continued in Kosovo, NATO gave as a last resort, the Serbian government an ultimatum, to either sign the agreement or be subject of military attack. The Serbian government rejected the proposal, and on 24th March NATO commenced its military intervention against the Serbian security forces (OSCE 1999:8).

---

2 In this context the international community refers to the member states of the United Nations.
In the beginning of June NATO suspended the intervention subsequent to Serbia’s president Slobodan Milošević and the Serbian National Assembly accepting the peace plan embodied in United Nations Security Resolution 1244. On 10th June Kosovo became a protectorate of the United Nations and also got an interim administration (UNMIK) which task was to rebuild and establish democratic institutions in Kosovo until a final solution was settled (OSCE 1999:8).

During the violent conflict between the Serbian forces and UCK severe atrocities were committed by both sides, causing flows of refugees and IDPs from both the Albanian population and the minority groups of Kosovo3. Between October 1998 and June 1999 it is estimated that 50,000 Serbs fled from Kosovo to Serbia due to severe human rights violations and abductions committed by the UCK (Norwegian Refugee Council 2005:25). However, it was after the withdrawal of the Serbian forces in 1999 that the largest flow of Serbs and Roma fled from Kosovo to Serbia.

It is believed that the displacement was caused by a climate of revenge within the Albanian population following the peace agreement. Except for numerous human rights violations, fear and terror caused Kosovo Serbs to flee from their homes. Regarding the Roma population they were targeted because they were in many cases believed to have been collaborators with the Serbian forces (Norwegian Refugee Council 2005:27). In total about 200,000 people became displaced following the withdrawal of the Serbian forces in 1999 (Group 484(a) 2006:63).

3 The largest minority groups in Kosovo are ethnic Serbs and the RAE group (an often used acronym for Roma, Ashkaelia and Egyptians, three groups with different religious and linguistic traditions). Other than these there are small ethnic groups of Kosovo-Turks, Kosovo Croats, Gorani, Muslim Slavs, Cerkazi and Roman Catholic Kosovo Albanians, but these will not be addressed in this paper (Norwegian Refugee Council 2005:43-45).
The second flow of displacement was a consequence of the ‘March Violence’ in 2004. The imminent cause of the violent demonstrations and riots that surged Kosovo for three days is believed to be the death of three Albanian boys, which in the media was described to be caused by ethnic Serbs. Hence, it was mainly the Serbian population that was targeted, but also the Roma and Ashkaelia minority groups suffered from violent attacks by Kosovo Albanians. Following the March Violence 4,100 persons became displaced, out of which 82 percent were ethnic Serbs. The majority of the displaced fled within Kosovo, the rest to Serbia (Norwegian Refugee Council 2005:35; Rakić & Ilić 2006:5).

2.2 Prospects of Return and Integration

It is estimated that since 1999 15,859 persons have returned to Kosovo (UNHCR & Praxis 2007:11). The main reasons for the insignificant numbers of returnees are the security situation in Kosovo, limited freedom of movement and access to social services, poor economic prospects and the unresolved status of Kosovo (Norwegian Refugee Council 2005:204).

Regarding the possibility of integration this is not considered as an option for IDPs by the Serbian authorities as long as the status of Kosovo is left unresolved. Instead the government is focusing on return as a durable solution (Rakić & Ilić 2006:37). In the National Strategy for Resolving the Problems of Refugees and Internally Displaced Persons, adopted by the Serbian authorities in 2002 the main objective regarding IDPs was to create conditions for durable return. Integration as a solution was mainly considered to be a solution for refugees living in Serbia. For example IDPs are excluded from housing programs in the strategy plan (Government of the Republic of Serbia 2002:5, 12).
3. Theory of Human Security and Capability

This study combines two theories; one theory is drawn from the human security concept, the other from Sen’s capability approach. The human security concept will be used when analyzing the data collected from interviews, questionnaires and reports. Thereafter the capability approach will be used to connect the human security situation of IDPs in Serbia to their possibilities of developing.

3.1 Human Security

The traditional concept of security most commonly concerns the safety of the nation state from external threats. In international relations the notion of security connected to territorial borders is termed ‘national security’, and it is this term that has been of use since the end of the First World War in the academic world and in international politics (Shinoda 2004:6). National security does not only imply the protection from external threats but also the protection of individuals’ rights in a state. Accordingly, a belief of the state as a “night watch state” (ibid:7) has developed since late 18th century. The state now became considered to have full responsibility for the domestic order and thereby also the party with power to use coercive means, as well as the responsible agent for its citizens’ social rights (ibid:7f).

The perception of security as a matter solely focused on the nation state was challenged in the beginning of the 1990s when UNDP presented a new concept called human security
in its *Human Development Report 1994*. UNDP gave a new perception of security, focusing on the individual human being, and thereby created a security concept that was *people-centered* instead of nation centered (UNDP 1994:22).

Except the fact that human security is centered on people there is no clear definition of the concept. There are two visions of human security prevalent today, one broad and one narrow. While this study draws from the broader vision of human security, this vision is given predominant attention in the following section, providing simply a brief description of the narrow vision in the end of the chapter.

The broad human security vision is closely linked to the definition given by UNDP in 1994, which is “safety from chronic threats as hunger, disease and repression,” and “protection from sudden and hurtful disruptions in the patterns of daily life” (Shinoda 2004:10). The idea behind this was to divert attention from only receiving security through armaments to gaining security through human development, and also to not only consider “freedom from fear”, but also “freedom from want” in security policies (Shinoda 2004:10).

UNDP introduced seven categories in its report, representing possible threats to human security: economic security, food security, health security, environmental security, personal security, community security and political security (UNDP 1994:24-5). These are explained further in figure one.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Economic security</strong></th>
<th>is concerned with basic income, either through employment or a publicly financed safety net. It measures the average income, unemployment rates, availability to social security/social safety nets, poverty rates and homelessness rates.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Food security</strong></td>
<td>means that people have physical and economic access to basic food.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health security</strong></td>
<td>concerns the major causes of deaths in the developing world as well as in industrial countries. It measures access to safe water, access to health services, life expectancy at birth, childbirth mortality, maternal mortality and number of HIV/AIDS positive or infected.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Environmental security** is threatened through a combination of the degradation of local ecosystems and the global system and concerns therefore issues as water scarcity, pressure on land (i.e. deforestation, salinization) and air pollution.

**Personal security** is security from physical violence. There are several forms of violence; physical torture, war, ethnic tension, crime, street violence, rape, domestic violence, child abuse, suicide and drug use. Another form of threat is industrial and traffic accidents.

**Community security** is security experienced through a group membership. It could also be a reason for insecurity, for instance in cases where traditional communities employ bonded labour, practice genital mutilation on girls or when entire groups feel insecure because of ethnic discrimination.

**Political security** concerns the fulfilment of basic human rights in a society. Human rights violations can be political repression, systematic torture, ill-treatment or disappearance of people. It also concerns freedom of the press.

**Figure 1: Seven Categories of Human Security (UNDP 1994:25-33)**

As seen in the figure the range of threats against humans are wide, including almost every possible threat humans could encounter in their every day lives. This nearly all-including toolbox of security threats has been a source of major criticism, not only because of the great methodological challenges it creates (Mack 2004:47). Keith Krause, a professor of International Politics, compares the broad vision as merely “a shopping list”, and states that the use of this list only leads to human security being a synonym for “bad things that can happen” (2004:44). Andrew Mack, director of the Human Security Centre, criticizes this broad concept because “a concept that explains everything in reality explains nothing” (2004:49). Also, it has been said that the human security concept in general offers nothing to the idea of security, and how security is tied with threats and use of violence or conflicts (Krause 2004:44).

Lastly, on a practical level, the idea behind using security focused on people was also to be able to use a bottom-up approach, and thereby put people first on the agenda instead of the state (Krause 2004:44).
The narrow vision on the other hand focuses explicitly on “freedom from fear”, that is to remove threats of and use of force and violence in the everyday life of people (Krause 2004:44). One of the advocators of the narrow vision, the Human Security Centre, stated that human security is a two-edged concept. It is not only about the reality gained through actual numbers and statistics; it is as much about the perceptions individuals have about reality. People might feel more insecure, and think the likelihood of falling victim for violent attacks are higher than the actual risk (Human Security Center 2005:50). This way of thinking is used in this study as well.

3.2 The Capability Approach
The capability approach introduced by Sen is not used in its whole in this study, only those parts which are of pragmatic use are applied. However, it seems to be unwise to draw these parts out of their context, and therefore the idea behind the capability approach is explained in its length, and the components used in this particular study are pointed out in the end of the chapter.

Sen’s theory emanates from the idea that development is a process which expands the real freedoms people enjoy (Sen 1999:3). Freedom plays a vital role in development, not only because freedom is its primary goal, but also because freedom is its primary means. Hence, freedom has both a constitutive role and an instrumental role in development. The former treats the expansion of basic freedoms, which enable people to avoid different forms of deprivation, while the latter describes the different ways development could be promoted through expanding the freedoms of people (Sen 1999:36-7).
Sen views freedom as both a *process* allowing actions and decisions, and as the actual *opportunities* people have with regard to the personal and social circumstances they are living under (Sen 1999:17). It is the individual freedoms that are the basic building blocks in Sen’s analysis, he puts primary attention to the capabilities individuals have to live the kind of lives they have reason to value (Sen 1999:18).

In his theory Sen identifies five types of instrumental freedoms that have the possibility of expanding the capabilities of people: (1) political freedoms, (2) economic facilities, (3) social opportunities, (4) transparency guarantees, and (5) protective security (Sen 1999:10). Political freedoms are connected to the individual’s freedom to participate freely in elections and to express his or her own political views. Economic facilities relate to the individual’s opportunity to consume, produce or exchange economic resources, while social opportunities are connected to facilities such as education and health care services (Sen 1999:39). The two last freedoms, transparency guarantees and protective security concern openness of the society and social safety nets of vulnerable citizens (Sen 1999:39-40).

For people to have greater freedom to do what they have reason to value is significant for several reasons. Sen (1999:18) points out that it enhances individuals overall freedom, and that it gives individuals opportunity to gain valuable outcomes. Further on, it expands the abilities of people to help themselves.

This leads to a vital component of the capability approach; *agency* of the individual. Sen (1999:19) defines an agent as “someone who acts and brings about change, and whose achievements can be judged in terms of her own values and objectives”. An agent can, with sufficient social opportunities, achieve a life which he or she wants, and also help others to
do so. This should be put in contrast with seeing people as merely recipients of social benefits or aid, putting them in a passive position (Sen 1999:11).

Following Sen’s line of argument about agency, it is important to recognize that development in large, and also the enhancement of the individual’s capabilities, requires removal of different forms of unfreedom in a society, such as lack of basic opportunities of health services, lack of education, lack of employment and lack of economic and social security (Sen 1999:4).

As examples of basic deprivations of capabilities, Sen points out poverty and unemployment (1999:21). Poverty does not only mean that a person has a low income, it also means that he or she lacks the freedom of living an adequate life (Sen 1999:20). Similarly, unemployment leads in many cases to social exclusion, and leaves the unemployed with less self-reliance and worse psychological and physical health (Sen 1999:21).

Finally, Sen also provides an evaluative focus of his capability approach. Evaluation of capabilities could be done by looking at what a person is able to do, that is the realized functionings, or it could be done by investigating the real opportunities of a person, that is the capability set of alternatives. According to Sen these two kinds of evaluation give us different information, the first approach tells us what people do, while the second describes what people are free to do (Sen 1999:75).

Sen’s theory also suffers from shortcomings. For instance, the main component of Sen’s theory – freedom – is an abstract concept, it is not something people have or own, it is a relative term of something people enjoy to a higher or lower extent. Such an abstract concept is difficult to use practically, to help with something concrete. Also, the most
common criticism directed towards the capability approach is the challenge of making it operational, to apply it and practice it. And even though Sen himself find this criticism “ill-founded” (Sen 1999:24), this seems, from my own experience, to be the case.

Despite the criticism, there are parts of the capability approach that can be of help in this study. The idea of individuals’ capabilities created from the circumstances under which they are living, and also that they can help themselves given the right opportunities are of use in the two last chapters of this study. The agency aspect is also utilized throughout the study, but is examined thoroughly in the fifth chapter. Finally, the instrumental freedoms and unfreedoms pointed out by Sen are taken into consideration in the conclusion as well.
4. Actors

During my field study a number of actors were identified as playing a vital role for the human security situation of IDPs in Serbia. Except for those dealt with here, which are considered to be the most influential and important actors, the local authorities and the local society are recognized as parties affecting the situation. Since this is a case study dealing with human security, a bottom-up perspective is used. Thus, the identification and description of actors starts off with those at the very bottom of the actor’s triangle shown in figure two, and thereafter local organizations and international organizations are dealt with. The chapter ends with a description of the Serbian Government.

![Actor's Triangle](Image)

**Figure 2: Actor’s Triangle (Ramsbotham, Woodhouse & Miall 2005:24).**

4.1 IDPs

Currently there are 206,879 IDPs living in Serbia proper (UNHCR & Praxis 2007:10). The two largest groups are ethnic Serbs and RAE. It is estimated that Serbs pose 75 percent of the entire IDP population, while the second largest group; RAE makes up 11.2 percent
These figures are only showing how many of the IDPs that are registered, and regarding the RAE population it is believed to be a huge discrepancy between the number of registered persons and the actual number of IDPs. Hence, even though there are about 22,000 RAE registered as IDPs, the numbers of RAE IDPs are believed to be 40,000-50,000 (ibid:11).

Shown in table two is the age and gender structure of IDPs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Persons</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00-04</td>
<td>837</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-17</td>
<td>24.771</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>23.308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-59</td>
<td>61.564</td>
<td>29.76</td>
<td>61.128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 and over</td>
<td>15.416</td>
<td>7.45</td>
<td>19.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>102.588</td>
<td>49.59</td>
<td>104.291</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Age and Gender Structure of IDPs (UNHCR & Praxis 2007:63)

As shown, the majority of IDPs are aged 18-59, hence of working age. Also, the gender structure is relatively equal - there is only a small difference between the numbers of women and men, the explanation for this discrepancy can be found in the slight over representation of women aged 60 and over.

The geographic pattern of IDPs has changed over the years. In the beginning the majority of IDPs stayed in southern Serbia, near the border of Kosovo, but when the status of Kosovo remained unsolved and the possibilities to return did not improve, many moved to central and northern Serbia in order to find better opportunities for employment (Group 484(a) 2005:63). In 2005 the district of Belgrade had the largest number of IDPs, followed by Kraljevo and Kragujevac (Norwegian Refugee Council 2005:49).
The majority of IDPs live in rented accommodation. Others live with friends or relatives, in their own houses or in collective centers (Norwegian Refugee Council 2005:51). The distribution of IDPs by accommodation is shown in table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accommodation</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Persons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Host families</td>
<td>25-30</td>
<td>49.800-59.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own house</td>
<td>10-15</td>
<td>20.000-30.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective Centers</td>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>6.000-10.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renting</td>
<td>55-60</td>
<td>100.000-120.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Distribution of IDPs by accommodation (Norwegian Refugee Council 2005:51)

In 2003 the Serbian government decided to close down all collective centers in Serbia. According to Miroslav Guteša, Field Assistant and Marko Vučinić, Community Services Assistant at UNHCR there are still 64 collective centers open, accommodating the most vulnerable of IDPs. Except for the number of people living in recognized collective centers, there are also a small number living in collective centers unrecognized by the government. As of October 2005 there were 52 unrecognized collective centers hosting 1,765 IDPs throughout Serbia (IDP Interagency Group 2005:61).

As described earlier, agency is an important factor in Sen’s capability approach. A sign of active agency of IDPs are the IDP associations. The idea behind the associations is to by their own involvement seek solutions to the problems they are facing (Group 484 n.d:8). These associations provide IDPs with various assistance programs, such as legal assistance, assistance on housing and property issues in Kosovo, addressing obstacles to return to Kosovo as well as humanitarian and individual assistance (Guteša & Vučinić, UNHCR). These organizations have an umbrella organization called Unije (the Union). Unije has
proved to be very efficient concerning showing a united front towards the Serbian authorities (Ružica Banda, Democratization National Human Rights Officer, OSCE).

4.2 International and Local Organizations
When the IDPs became displaced in 1999 they received assistance from various international organizations. Even though the need for humanitarian assistance only declined to some extent, the international assistance was either phased down significantly or phased out completely already in 2003 (Group 484(b) n.d:5). Except for the assistance provided for IDPs by international organizations, there are several local organizations involved in the work of protecting and assisting IDPs.

In this study representatives of three international organizations, The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) and Danish Refugee Council (DRC) were interviewed. Two local organizations, Group 484 and Hi Neighbour were also interviewed. Further I participated in a visit to a Roma settlement with a mobile team of a third local organization; Praxis. The interviews were generally concerned with the organization’s work and issues related to that (such as successful and unsuccessful projects, and obstacles to implement projects), and their experiences from the field, what they themselves have learned of the living situation of IDPs.

This section is divided into two parts, first each organization is briefly described in order to give the reader an idea of what they do and how they incorporate IDPs in their activities. Second, the findings of the interviews are presented; the incorporation of IDPs in project activities (that is, if they engage IDPs in their work or if they provide them with
assistance only), the assessed needs of IDPs, and the obstacles of working towards meeting these needs.

4.2.1 UNHCR
UNHCR began working with IDPs relatively recently. Their mandate is to provide IDPs with protection and basic humanitarian assistance. Even though they are involved in the work of helping IDPs worldwide, their budget is still mostly aimed at refugee related issues. In the case of Serbia, UNHCR is the leading organization dealing with IDPs, but they are not officially in charge of the activities because of the fact that IDPs are citizens of Serbia (Guteša & Vučinić, UNHCR; UNHCR 2006:436).

In Serbia UNHCR started off its assistance to IDPs with programs aimed at ‘care’ in order to put out the imminent need of humanitarian assistance. Today this has shifted to development programs. However, these programs are mainly directed towards refugees (Guteša & Vučinić, UNHCR).

UNHCR is either an implementing party of or funding projects which provide IDPs with help related to documentation, legal assistance, support to victims of sex and gender based violence (SGBV), social housing programs (PIKAP), agriculture programs, medical assistance, cash-grants and it also lobbies for IDPs rights in the government (Guteša & Vučinić, UNHCR; UNHCR 2006:437).

Except for these programs, UNHCR covers the costs of 45 collective centers in Serbia (UNHCR 2006:438).
4.2.2 OSCE

OSCE’s mission in Serbia is related to democratization of the Serbian institutions and support of civil society (OSCE 2007:1). It is part of OSCE’s core mandate to assist the return of IDPs to Kosovo together with UNHCR and also to help other organizations to build capacity to provide IDPs with legal assistance during their displacement (Banda, OSCE; OSCE 2007:4).

Although OSCE does not work directly in the field, they work closely with the government in order to enhance the rights of IDPs while in displacement. Recently the organization together with the NGO Praxis published a Legal GAP analysis⁴, based on extensive research. The GAP analysis is meant to give the government an efficient tool to work with improvements of the rights of IDPs (Banda, OSCE).

4.2.3 Danish Refugee Council

DRC is a humanitarian organization, which aims to “protect refugees and IDPs against persecution and to promote durable solution” (DRC 2005:2). DRC is an organization with many years of experience of the Western Balkan region (DRC n.d [www])

The programs directed towards IDPs are mainly concerned with facilitating sustainable return to Kosovo. This is done by organizing go-and-see visits, go-and-inform visits and participation in municipality groups. The idea of these activities is to help IDPs make decisions about return based on their own free will (Olivera Vučić, IDP Protection Coordinator, DRC).

⁴ A legal gap analysis is in this context a tool used to analyze the legal framework of IDPs.
4.2.4 Group 484

Group 484 (Grupa 484) is an NGO working to empower forced migrants, such as refugees, IDPs and asylum-seekers, as well as the local community with special focus on youth, to become open and tolerant and respect diversities in the society (Group 484 2006:1).

In their work they offer informative, legal and psychosocial assistance to IDPs as well as conduct research and write policy papers. They also have activities which aim to empower IDPs to advocate their own rights (Danilo Rakić, Policy Officer, Group 484). Further on, Group 484 was one of the contributing parties to the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper the government of Serbia adopted in 2003 which has resulted in two progress reports, the last one published in August 2007 (Rakić, Group 484).

4.2.5 Hi Neighbour

Hi Neighbour (Zdravo Da Ste) is a local NGO with a rather different procedure compared to the other organizations presented in this study. Their programs involve children, youth and elderly and aim at integration of refugees and IDPs. Therefore an important part of their work is to arrange meetings and activities where both IDPs and the local population are involved. Instead of aiming for a specific goal, Hi Neighbour focuses on the process. Their activities are conducted through ‘participation and conversation’, hence, there is no specific agenda or subject on the schedule, instead the interests of the participants are in focus. By this they hope to give IDPs the power to search for solutions and solve their own problems (Drobnjak Sladjana, Youth Coordinator, Hi Neighbour).
4.2.6 Praxis
Praxis is an NGO working to protect, improve and promote human rights of IDPs and refugees. Their activities include providing IDPs with free legal aid as well as free legal information and counseling (Praxis 2007 [www]).

Praxis visits those IDPs which are not able to go by themselves to dislocated registry offices in Serbia in order to copy the documentation necessary to file for new documentation. They also pay the additional administration fees for documentation issuance (field visit).

In addition to their legal work directed towards IDPs, they are campaigning and lobbying for the rights of displaced persons (Praxis 2007 [www]).

4.2.7 Findings
All organizations interviewed perceived IDPs as active agents who themselves are actively involved with influencing their own situation. Many programs are not only focused on basic humanitarian assistance, but also to actively engage IDPs to find solutions on their own. This is done through interaction with other people living under similar circumstances and/or with the local society. To empower IDPs while in displacement by focusing on their rights seem to be a strategy adopted by several organizations, in order to provide other help than simply assistance to return.

What most representatives expressed concern for was the fact that the government’s return policy makes it difficult to achieve positive results. Since IDPs have been displaced for so many years, and have more or less been simply sitting and waiting for a solution, they believe it is necessary to have long-term programs, which involves integration as well.
Rakić at Group 484 describes the need of economic empowerment as necessary for the IDPs to be able to make a decision based on their free will of whether they want to integrate in the Serbian society or return to their place of origin. All organizations recognize the need of involving IDPs in the Serbian society.

However, even though the need is recognized, the organizations have limited opportunities to actively work with projects related to integration. This fact is well explained by UNHCR and Praxis:

As a consequence of this reluctance to acknowledge the long-term duration of the displacement, strategies put into place have been short to mid-term in vision. Most initiatives have been undertaken on an ad hoc basis. Seven years post-displacement, there is still no clear vision or strategy for the community of IDPs. As a further consequence, the “return only” policy has had a negative impact on the type of assistance the international community and local NGOs can bring to bear. These organizations that deal with the protection of IDPs and the promotion of their rights are mainly confined to running programmes compatible with a “return only” policy (UNHCR & Praxis 2007:41).

Nonetheless, during the interview with Guteša and Vučinić at UNHCR, they were a bit more hopeful about reversing this trend because they in 2006 experienced that UNHCR had ‘broken the ice’ with the government regarding the inclusion of IDPs in housing programs. This means that they are now allowed to include IDP families in the PIKAP programs, which before were only for refugees.

Although these organizations actively work with IDPs and put a lot of effort into their work, in many cases I encountered feelings of frustration. Despite all their hard work and efforts they have only succeeded to make small-scale changes. This is not only explained to
be a consequence of the return policy or the unresolved status of Kosovo. Banda at OSCE pointed out two other problem areas which the organizations encounter. Firstly, one problem is lack of communication and coordination of issues dealing with IDPs between the different ministries. Secondly, it is difficult to make changes in a country experiencing political transition due to the constantly changing structures of the government. There have been numerous elections resulting in new structures, a new constitution has been adopted, and there were structural changes after the dissolution of Serbia and Montenegro. As a result the process to implement changes has been time consuming.

4.3 The Serbian Government
Since the IDPs did not cross a national border when they fled from Kosovo it is the Serbian government that is the instance responsible for their protection and assistance (Guiding Principles of Internal Displacement I (3)). There is no special institution in charge of IDPs, instead the responsibility is shared between different ministries. Two of the most important instances are The Commissariat of Refugees and The Coordination Center of Kosovo and Metohija (CCK). The Commissariat is responsible for registration and issuance of IDP-cards, accommodation and support of IDPs in collective centers and also to provide IDPs and their associations with individual humanitarian support when possible (Commissariat of Refugees 2007 [www]). The tasks of CCK are to deal with issues related to Kosovo and to coordinate humanitarian assistance and return of IDPs (Ivana Radić, European Affairs Advisor, and Stanko Blagojevic, Advisor, CCK).
No initiatives made by CCK pay any special attention to female IDPs\(^5\), even though single mothers, women with children with disabilities and senior women are considered as IDPs with specific needs (Pavlov, Volarević, & Petronijević 2006; Guiding Principles of Internal Displacement I (4)). According to Blagojevic at the CCK, they could pay special attention to female IDPs because it would not cost them much, but it makes no sense to do so since the real needs of IDPs are basic needs, such as obtaining food, coal and fuel. To promote gender issues when people lack basic facilities would only be “strange”, and therefore they are not prioritized.

According to UNHCR and Praxis (2007:6) the Serbian government has the past seven years tried to address the needs of IDPs along with other vulnerable groups of citizens. For example, the *National Strategy for Resolving the Problems of Refugees and Internally Displaced Persons*, and the *Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper* mentioned earlier are part of these efforts the government has undertaken. However, there are no legal documents which defines the status of IDPs or what assistance and protection they are entitled to (UNHCR & Praxis 2007:14).

Further on, the government adopted a new constitution in 2006 which establishes many human and minority rights and freedoms, and also entrenches the equality in front of the law for all of Serbia’s citizens (The Constitution of the Republic of Serbia 2006:II (21)). However, despite the efforts undertaken, UNHCR and Praxis (2007:6) make the conclusion that IDPs are still one of the most vulnerable groups in Serbia. The reason for this is described by UNHCR and Praxis as follows:

---

\(^5\) The only program with ‘gender dimension’ the CCK has funded so far is a knitting program.
The political stances taken by the Serbian Government in respect to Kosovo and its IDP citizens have meant that displaced individuals remain without prospects for a durable solution. The position of the Serbian authorities vis-à-vis IDPs remains largely political and does not adequately address the most existential rights and needs of the IDPs (UNHCR & Praxis 2007:6).

As the government is only willing to consider return as a solution for the problems of IDPs, the position of the Serbian authorities on the Kosovo issue should be pointed out. The status of Kosovo is an extremely sensitive issue politically in Serbia. The position of the Serbian authorities is that Kosovo is a part of Serbia and giving Kosovo independence is not accepted as a solution. According to the International Crisis Group (ICG) “the official position has not changed in the seven years since Milosevic was deposed, and there is no indication it will do so within this political generation, no matter what pressures brought to bear” (ICG 2007:8). The most recent solution⁶ presented by Belgrade on this matter confirms this statement. One of the reasons for the Serbian authorities’ unwillingness for compromise is the belief that Kosovo is the cradle of the Serbian civilization and therefore a lot of the Serbian sense of nationhood is related to the geographic area Kosovo constitutes (OSCE 1999:1).

To conclude this chapter, the actor’s triangle is shown again, this time outlining the relations between the different levels:

---

⁶ In early November 2007 Prime Minister Vojislav Kostunica and President Boris Tadic presented the Hong Kong model as an acceptable solution for Kosovo (B92 2007 [www]).
The conclusions drawn from the triangle are that there is great activity regarding assistance and empowerment of IDPs from mid-level and down, but less activity between mid-level and up. There also seem to be lack of cooperation and engagement from the state-level with mid-level actors, and also limited assistance from the state-level to the grass-root level. Regarding the grass-root level, it is represented by IDP associations working on a mid-level.

Figure 3: Relations of Actors

State-level: Cooperation with mid-level organizations. Assisting grass root level.

Mid-level: Cooperation with state level. Assistance and empowerment of grass root level. Representation of grass root level.

Grass-root level: Receiving assistance from state-level and mid-level.
5. Human Security Analysis

The following chapter is based on the empirical findings of the two-month field study conducted in Belgrade. The analysis treats the two first research questions of the study; the factual and experienced human security situation of Roma IDPs and IDPs in collective centers. The chapter starts off with economic security, and ends with personal security. In each sub chapter IDPs in collective centers and Roma IDPs are treated separately in order to make it possible to highlight differences and similarities between the both groups. Also, if gender differences are found these are pointed out in the end of each sub chapter.

Fifteen questionnaires were answered during the field study. Of those participating eight were female, and seven male. The average age was 25, the median age 22. All participants came originally from Kosovo, and they have all been displaced since 1999.

One interview was made with a Roma IDP. Other sources used to describe their human security situation are informal conversations with two other Roma men at the field visit, statements made by the interviewed organizations and a documentary film about Roma. I recognize that it is not possible to draw general conclusions on one single interview, especially not in regard of experienced security, however the interview is only used as a complement to other sources, and the findings point out tendencies of the human security situation and nothing else.
5.1 Economic Security
Economic security includes basic income, employment, adequate housing and education. In the following section the results of the questionnaires and interviews made in the field study, mixed with the findings of various reports are given.

5.1.1 Basic Income
In this study basic income is defined as a regular income of some sort, whether from an employee or from social safety nets, covering all necessary expenses (rent, food, bills, hygienic tools, basic clothing). The research question concerned the average number of IDPs receiving a basic income, covering necessary expenses.

When it comes to IDPs living in collective centers they have some of their expenses, such as rent and utility bills, paid for by the Commissariat of Refugees. This fact has by some of the representatives interviewed in this study been a reason to evaluate their economic security as pretty good, especially compared to those IDPs living in rented accommodation who pay for all of their expenses. Also, some attitudes encountered regarding this issue are that because IDPs in collective centers do not pay these expenses they have the possibility to save up some money which they later can build houses with, or rent their own apartments, and that they so to say “take advantage of the system” when they do so.

However, the most common answer received from the interviewees was that IDPs in collective centers are struggling to make ends meet. This is also supported by the answers given from IDPs themselves in the survey conducted during the field study.
Chart 1: Regular Income of IDPs in Collective Centers

As seen in chart one, five IDPs stated they had a regular income which they received from an employee, five IDPs received income from other sources, one through social benefits, three IDPs did not receive any income at all, while one IDP could not answer the question.

Those who stated they received a regular income were instructed to answer a sub question on whether their income covered all of their necessary expenses, and out of twelve answers (the respondent answering ‘Do not know’ answered this question as well, therefore the numbers do not match), eleven stated the income did not cover all necessary expenses.

Chart 2: Income Cover Expenses

7 The majority of the charts in this study only illustrate the answers from the questionnaire; it should be noted that they do not point out any statistical relevance.
The findings of the survey and the interviews are that even though the majority of IDPs living in collective centers do receive some sort of income, it does not cover the expenses they believe to be necessary, hence the average number is considered as low.

Regarding their experienced economic security, they were asked to answer how they felt about their monthly economy (see chart three). In the questionnaire the answers ranged from very secure to very insecure. Attitudes and feelings are always difficult to estimate, and the result from this question verifies this fact, since one third of the respondents choose the option “neither secure, nor insecure”. These answers could also be the result of lack of interest in answering the questionnaire, or the question was perceived as ambiguous. However, eight respondents claimed to be either “insecure” or “very insecure”, while only two respondents stated that they felt “very secure” and “secure”. Even though the answers did not point out clearly that their monthly economy is a cause of worry, the conclusion drawn from the question is that this component of human security is not one of the areas where IDPs have feelings of safeness.

![Chart 3: Feelings about Monthly Economy](chart.png)
Moving on to the basic income of Roma IDPs. According to Group 484(a) (2006:88) Roma belong to the poorest group of IDPs. From the interviews made in the field study it is clear that Roma IDPs struggle to survive economically. They earn money on a daily basis, usually about one to two euros per day (interview IDP; Pretty Dyana 2004\(^8\)), money that does not cover all of their basic expenses. When interviewing a Roma IDP living in a Roma settlement outside of Novi Sad, he explained that he, except for the small amount of money he earns on selling goods at the market every day, receives about 50 euros from the social welfare center. This is not enough money to cover the expenses of buying wood, food and diapers for his children. In this particular Roma settlement about fifty Roma had had the opportunity to work at an archaeological site, but the man interviewed explained it was impossible for him to work there since the salary was paid with fifteen days delay. If his family were to survive, he had to be either paid beforehand or at the end of the day.

However, to receive social benefits are not common among Roma IDPs. According to a survey conducted by UNDP and UNHCR (2007) about the socio-economic status of IDPs, only 17.4 percent of Roma IDPs receive family financial support and 17.8 percent receive child allowance. To conclude, the average number of Roma IDPs with basic income is also low.

Regarding their experienced safety, income is an area of insecurity. When asked about the major problems of his every day life, the Roma IDP interviewed said it was to make ends meet so he could take care of his family. This statement is, according to Marijana Matović, Project Coordinator at Praxis, a typical answer of Roma IDPs.

\(^8\) The documentary film Pretty Dyana was shot in fall 2002, but released in 2004.
The only difference found between women and men regarding basic income is that men, because of the patriarchal family structure, are more often beneficiaries of help than women are, this according to Vučić at DRC.

5.1.2 Employment

From a human security perspective it is vital for a person of working age to have an employment, and the question at issue is how the employment is among IDPs, in regard to unemployment rates and access to labor market.

The unemployment rate of the general IDP population is 35 percent (UNDP & UNHCR 2007). Those who have an employment most usually work in the zone of grey economy or as day laborers, which let them survive from day to day, but put them in a vulnerable position (Group 484(a) 2006:98; IDP Interagency Working Group 2005:41). Also, IDPs are often forced to take those kind of jobs the local population do not want, such as highly physical jobs, and they are often paid less than the local population (interview manager of collective center Krnjača; Group 484 n.d:30).

The result from the survey confirms the unemployment rates found in the overall population of IDPs; one third of the respondents did not have a job. Out of those with job the majority had temporary employment (see chart four and five).
Regarding the experienced safety of this component, the results are unclear. In the survey respondents with employment were asked how they felt about their current job, and those without were asked about how they felt about the prospects of finding a job (see chart six and seven). The former question resulted in a clear majority of “neither safe nor insecure”, which again proves the difficulty in estimating a feeling. The latter question showed a pretty equal result between positive and negative feelings, with only a slight overweight of the negative feelings.
Chart 6: Feelings of Current Job

With these results it is difficult to estimate whether employment is a source of insecurity among IDPs living in collective centers. However, since income and employment in many cases are connected to each other, and the income their jobs give them, is not enough to pay for their expenses, it is possible to conclude that it is not an area where they feel safeness. It should be noted that it is not clear if it is an area which is highly worrisome for them either.

The unemployment rates of Roma IDPs are just as gloomy as the one for the general IDP population, being at approximately 30 percent (UNDP & UNHCR 2007).

Roma IDPs do not differ from the rest of the Roma population when it comes to activity, even though they are not employed they make their living through collecting cardboards, glass bottles, iron, aluminum and copper they find in garbage dumps, which they later sell (Pretty Dyana 2004). They also go through garbage in order to find second hand things or other items which they try to sell at the market. For example, to sell second hand items was what the Roma IDP interviewed did to survive. It is common to see Roma driving around in vehicles looking like skeletons or with horse carts collecting these items. However, during the visit to the Roma settlement Veliki Rit, two Roma men expressed
their concern of how the local government hindered them from making a living because they had recently banned horse carts from the city center of Novi Sad. Similarly, the government of Serbia has started giving those Roma who drive vehicles tickets because they lack traffic documents and driving licenses (Pretty Dyana 2004). This makes it even more difficult for Roma IDPs to earn a daily living.

It is clear that unemployment is a source of insecurity among Roma IDPs, they live from day to day, earn a living on an every day basis, and also face discrimination from the rest of the society due to the fact that they are Roma. The attitudes against the Roma population from the local population and also from the authorities have been and still are severely limiting their chances of being part of the Serbian society (Commission of the European Communities 2007:16).

To sum up, the unemployment rates among both groups are high, and access to the labor market limited. This forces many IDPs to work in the grey economy or to find other ways, such as selling goods at the market, to make a living.

According to the unemployment figures presented by UNDP and UNHCR (2007), women suffer from higher unemployment rates than men do, especially Roma women. As seen in chart eight, the unemployment rates of female non-Roma are nearly fifty percent, while the rate of female Roma passes the fifty-line. In the survey conducted for this study, the same tendency was shown; out of the ten respondents with job, four were female. The reason for the higher unemployment rates among women is the traditional family role of women, which makes it more difficult for them to find a job, not only because they have to stay home with the family, but also because they do not have the same possibility to get out
as much as men do, and therefore have a smaller network (Pavlov, Volarević & Petronijević 2006:8).

![Chart 8: Unemployment Rates by Group and Gender (UNDP & UNHCR 2007).](image)

5.1.3 Adequate Housing

The housing component has been divided into two variables, firstly, it is vital to live in an adequate accommodation, and secondly, it is also important to know it is possible to stay in an accommodation as long as there is a need of staying there. The question at issue is under what conditions IDPs live.

The collective centers in which IDPs live were in the beginning planned as accommodation for those refugees who came to Serbia during the Balkan wars, but were open up for IDPs in 1999. In 2003 the government started to close down all collective centers in Serbia, as a way of solving the problems of refugees and IDPs (Government of the Republic of Serbia, 2002:12). But as there were, until just recently, no housing programs available for IDPs, the closure of the centers has proven to be difficult for IDPs. According to Guteša & Vučinić at UNHCR many IDPs have had to move up to five times the last couple of years, leaving them in a bad mental shape. They also explained that the
closing of the centers has taken longer than the government anticipated. The reason for this is that as more centers are closed down, it becomes more and more difficult to find suitable accommodation for those left. Today those left in the centers are the most vulnerable cases, such as single mothers, alcoholics and those with health problems to name a few.

The quality of the centers differs from collective center to collective center, but in general the hygiene standard is low, and the living space is small. It is common that several family members have to live together in a 15 square meter small room (Group 484 n.d:24). An IDP living in a collective center in Belgrade explained her housing condition as follows:

“I am from the Kaludjerica camp and I think it is the worst camp. Sewage runs right next to our door. Our children make up most of the patients, they are the majority in the health care centres. It is so polluted, so dirty, it is necessary for you to come and visit us and help us. (IDP in Belgrade).” (Group 484 n.d:25).

The two centers visited during the field study, Krnjača and 7th July, accommodated about 113 and 127 IDPs each, from the former two IDPs participated in the survey, while 13 IDPs participated from the later.

The inhabitants shared toilets and showers, and also the living space for each family was very small. When asked what they thought about their accommodation, the majority answered that it was insufficient (see chart nine). They were also asked if they knew they could stay in their present accommodation for one year. All respondents, except for one, stated that they did not know if they could stay for such a long time. In connection to this question, they were asked to write down how long they knew they could stay. Only half of
the respondents answered this question, but those who answered said they either did not know (four respondents), that they could stay for a few months (one) or over the winter (two). Those two who knew they could live in their present accommodation over the winter lived in another collective center then the other respondents.

Chart 9: Sufficiency of Accommodation

The two respondents answering that their accommodation was sufficient or barely sufficient also lived in another collective center than the other respondents. The number of respondents from the centers is too few to be certain of a connection, but the case could be that the collective center in which these two lived had a higher standard then the other one.

The IDPs were also asked if they had any other accommodation opportunities if they had to change accommodation in the future (see chart 10). Those who answered yes or maybe were then asked to answer where they could live (see chart 11).
Chart 10: Possibility of Other Accommodation
Chart 11: Location/type of Other Accommodation

The results of this question were a bit surprising since six respondents claimed to have the opportunity to move into their own houses. The reasons for this is that Drobnjak at Hi Neighbour said it is difficult for young IDPs in collective centers to find private accommodation since they do not have any financial opportunities to rent or buy it, and considering the median age of the respondents, the answers should not have been so positive. It is also a question of why they still are living in the collective center if they have own houses to move to in Serbia proper. However, there is a possibility their houses are under construction, and also the question, which was discovered afterwards, could be open for interpretation. The question only asked about “the future”. This could mean that the displaced had the aim of moving back to Kosovo to their own property or that they plan to integrate in Serbia proper and build a house there. A better option might have been to ask about the “near future” or even make it more precise, asking for one or two year’s time.

The conclusion drawn regarding the housing of IDPs living in collective centers is that it is inadequate; to live at such a small space, sharing hygiene facilities with several other families might be a temporary solution, but they have been living under these conditions for
eight years now, which is not considered to be a good solution. Also, the strategy of closing down collective centers creates unnecessary insecurities for the IDPs living there, especially since those housing programs which recently opened up for IDPs as well, only help a limited number of IDP households (UNHCR 2006:437).

Before moving on to the housing conditions of Roma IDPs, this component is evaluated as either a source of safeness or insecurity for IDPs. One of the questions in the survey asked the respondents if they felt secure or insecure about their current housing (see chart 12).

![Feelings about current housing](chart.jpg)

**Chart 12: Feeling about Current Housing**

As seen in the chart, the majority of IDPs stated that they felt either insecure or very insecure when thinking about their current housing. This is confirmed by UNHCR and Praxis (2007:28), which found in a recent study that inadequate housing is the chief concern of the general IDP population. To conclude, this component is an area in which IDPs have feelings of insecurity.
The housing conditions Roma IDPs live under are appalling, usually they live in illegal settlements without electricity, water and sewage systems (Pavlov, Volarević & Petronijević 2006:45). These conditions force the Roma population to use any skills or creativity possible to cope, one example of their coping mechanisms is shown in the documentary film Pretty Dyana (2004). In the film a Roma man proudly shows how he uses car batteries, which he finds in the garbage to produce electricity so his family can watch TV.

It is common that Roma IDPs move into existing Roma communities, which usually are located in the near area of garbage dumps, under bridges or in open fields. They live in scrap-metal and cardboard shacks, in shabby and deserted barracks or storage houses, in containers or even in junk car bodies. Because they are living on illegal premises, they are not illegible to humanitarian assistance or basic social infrastructure (IDP Interagency Working Group 2005:51).

The Roma settlement visited during this field study had about 3,000 inhabitants, most of them IDPs from Kosovo. Even though they seemed to have electricity, at least in the house where the mobile team set up their provisional office, there were no signs of running water in the house. As with most of the Roma settlements in Serbia it was illegal and the local government had, according to three Roma men, threatened to evict them from the

---

9 The reason for showing these pictures are to highlight what words cannot describe alone.
10 It should be noted that a small number of Roma IDPs live in collective centers as well, but the overall majority live as described in this study.
premises at several occasions, but so far no one had actually been forced to move. Evidently, the local government cannot evict anyone if they do not provide them with an alternative housing (Matović, Praxis).

To conclude, Roma IDPs live in dreadful housing conditions, and since they mostly live in illegal settlements they are under subject of threats to move constantly.

As with IDPs living in collective centers, finding adequate accommodation is the chief concern of Roma IDPs, this according to surveys conducted in Roma settlements (IDP Interagency Working Group 2005:51). Hence, this is an area in which Roma IDPs have feelings of insecurity.

5.1.4 Education
This component of human security treats the access to, and fulfillment of primary schooling for children of school age. In this section the question of what problems IDP children face in their access to primary education is treated.

According to figures presented by the IDP Interagency Working Group (2005:48) 92 percent of displaced children living in Serbia proper are enrolled in school, which is about
five percent below the population average. The managers of the two collective centers visited confirmed that all children living in the centers went to school. Hence, to have access to primary education is not considered as a problem for IDPs living in collective centers (IDP Interagency Working Group 2005:48).

No interviews were made regarding the feelings of safeness or insecurity related to primary education of children, but considering the high levels of enrolment this should not be a matter of concern for IDP households.

Considering Roma IDP children and basic education, the story is completely different; the majority of displaced children living in Serbia do not attend school. UNDP & UNHCR (2007) estimate that about forty percent of Roma IDP children are enrolled in primary school, while less than ten percent has continued on to secondary school (see chart 13).

[Chart 13: IDPs, education of school children (UNDP & UNHCR 2007).]

The reasons for the low percentage of IDP Roma children enrolled in primary education could both be considered as “structural” and as a result of attitudes from Roma themselves. Considering the structural reasons, they are, for instance, facing obstacles to access school because of chronic illnesses, poverty, prejudices from the local population and language and cultural difficulties (IDP Interagency Working Group 2005:52). They also have difficulties accessing primary education because the lack of documents (Vučić, DRC).
They are frequently subject to discrimination and racial segregation at school, and also previous research show that Roma children often experience violence and insults at school, and that they are in many cases put in separate desks or classes by their teachers (IDP Interagency Working Group 2005:52).

The second reason, the attitudes of Roma themselves, is probably as vital as the first reason. When a Roma father was asked why he puts his son in school, he answered that his son had to learn Serbian, and that other suburbs in Belgrade give children who attend school money, shoes, t-shirts or something similar. However, his son had only received some shampoo, and therefore he reasoned that it was no use of continuing sending him to school. On the contrary, he had to give his son fifty to sixty dinars (less than one euro) every day for school, and in school his son only had some milk to drink and a croissant to eat, so “by the time he gets home, he is hungry again” (Pretty Dyana 2004).

To not consider primary education as necessary is not only the attitudes of adults, it is also encountered among young IDPs:

No, I don’t regret it. Why should I regret it? I decided myself. They came one morning and asked me if I wanted to go to school. I said I didn’t, and then they left” (Boy around 12 years old, answering if he regrets not going to school) (Pretty Dyana, 2004).

However, there were also one father explaining he sent his son to school so his son “could learn something and get a job”, hoping his son would get a better life that way (Pretty Dyana, 2004).
It is very common that Roma children, especially boys, help their fathers to go out and collect cardboards from dumpsters. This is either done instead of attending school, or a task they do after coming home from school. As a 14-years-old boy puts it:

I am thirteen going for fourteen and I go to grade one [high school]. Better than than nothing. When I get home, I change to other clothes, I eat some bread, I rest a little, and I go to work” (Pretty Dyana, 2004).

The problems Roma IDP children face in their access to primary education are multiple, ranging from lack of documents, to structural obstacles such as poverty and illnesses, to the attitudes of Roma IDPs themselves and the society surrounding them.

It is difficult to say whether Roma IDPs feel insecurity regarding primary education. If they do not see it as important for the future of their children, and if they prefer their children to help them earning a living instead, they might not pay much attention to primary schooling. However, the difficulties of accessing education because of obstacles such as poverty together with the discrimination and segregation their children face in school could be a source of insecurity, but there are no empirical data to support either of these theories.

5.2 Personal Security
Personal security is divided into three sub categories; physical violence (including mugging, battering, gang violence, sexual violence and police-violence), psychological violence (for example bullied, teased, mentally and emotionally abused) and neglect. The two first sub categories include actually being subject of these forms of violence, or fear
being subject of them. The last one – neglect – is defined as not to live in constant feelings of being neglected by the society. The research question refers to how common it is with physical and psychological violence and also neglect among IDPs.

Generally, for IDPs living in collective centers, there are no indicators that they are more often subject to any kind of violence compared to the overall population. None of my interviewees believed that the personal security of IDPs in collective centers were a problem. The result from the survey conducted verifies this when it comes to physical violence; two respondents out of fifteen answered they had been subject of physical violence after their displacement, more precisely gang violence. However, the picture regarding psychological violence differed (see chart 14).

![Chart 14: Subject of Psychological Violence](image)

**Chart 14: Subject of Psychological Violence**

As shown in the chart, six persons out of fifteen in total, said to be subject of psychological violence\(^\text{11}\), the majority part being male. Those who answered yes to the question were instructed to answer how often they were subject of psychological violence.

\(^{11}\) In the questionnaire the examples of psychological violence were bullying, teasing and mental and emotional abuse (See Annex two). However, the respondents were not asked to define what kind of violence they had been subject to, nor who abused them. The reason for this is the sensitivity of the issue.
Out of six answers, two stated “every day”, three answered “once every week”, while one person did not know. Naturally, it is not possible to draw any distinct conclusions from this sample, but still the figures cannot be ignored. Even though IDPs living in collective centers normally are not subject to visible violence, such as battering, the invisible type of violence is present, and important to pay attention to.

Furthermore, even though the level of physical violence is low, and not considered to be a problem, on the question of whether the respondents are worried about their physical safety, nine out of thirteen, claimed they were (see chart 15).

![Chart 15: Worried of Physical Safety](chart.png)

This is a surprisingly high number given the facts at hand. This could in fact verify how the perceptions of people are not always the same as what the reality is. Even though the basic needs of IDPs in collective centers are covered, it is impossible to know how they feel emotionally (Drobnjak, Hi Neighbour), hence although they are relatively safe from physical threats, they are afraid emotionally for their security. Also, from a study recently made by Hi Neighbour\(^\text{12}\), involving one hundred young IDPs in collective centers, 11.5 percent of the respondents answered on the question what they believe to be most difficult

\(^{12}\) A PowerPoint-presentation (in Serbian) of this study is available through the author.
in their contemporary life, that they are afraid of their fathers, because they were involved in the war (Drobnjak, Hi Neighbour). This could also be an explanation to the answers in the questionnaire.

Lastly, there is also the issue of feeling neglected from the society. Research conducted by Group 484 (n.d:24) show that some IDPs experience that they are left on their own, and also treated as second-rate citizens by the local society and the Serbian authorities. This question was also raised in the questionnaire, and as shown in chart 16, six out of fifteen said they experience neglect from the society.

![Chart 16: Experienced Neglect from Society](chart.png)

The conclusion drawn is that it is not common for IDPs living in collective centers to be subject of physical violence, but in spite of this they do not have feelings of safeness in this area. Further on, it seems to be relatively common for IDPs to be psychologically abused, and also there are some tendencies pointing in the direction that some of them constantly experience neglect from the local society and the Serbian authorities.

From the interviews with Banda at OSCE and Rakić at Group 484, it became clear that the personal security of Roma IDPs differ from other IDPs, they are more often subject to
physical violence because they look different with their dark complexions, many have Muslim names and many speak both Serbian and Albanian (Group 484(a) 2006:87).

There are reports of Roma being subject of police violence, verbal and physical harassment and discrimination (Group 484(a) 2006:107). Also Rakić at Group 484, said there are indicators saying that Roma fall victims of human trafficking as well.

The Roma IDP interviewed in this study had himself personal experience of violence. He was once chased by a gang of skinheads after he had completed a night shift when working in Novi Sad. Fortunately, they never caught him. When asked if he feared for his physical security, he said that he did not, but he also said that he avoids going to “the Wolf’s mouth”, that is, certain places are not safe for him to be.

During the interview he also said he thought the future would be even worse than it is now, and the reason for this is that “nobody sees us”. This is probably a statement most Roma would agree with, Roma IDPs not making an exception. The negligence from the society concerning the living conditions of Roma is extensive. They have been living under similar conditions for decades, and nearly no initiatives have been taken to improve it. Recently the government started “the Decade of Roma”, with the aim to integrate the Roma population into the Serbian society (Commission of the European Communities 2007:16), but according to Matović at Praxis this will take a lot of work, not only to change the attitudes of the local population, but also the attitudes of Roma.

To conclude, it is fairly common for Roma IDPs to be subject of physical and psychological violence, and also common for them to experience neglect from the local society and the Serbian authorities. The components that make out personal security
provide no feelings of safeness for Roma IDPs, on the contrary, they have to avoid certain areas in the community in order to maintain their personal security.

Before moving on to the next chapter I believe it is of importance to mention the occurrence of SGBV as well. Although there are limited research on SGBV and IDPs in Serbia, other research have shown the disadvantaged position refugee and IDP women have when it comes to SGBV. This is often due to deteriorated family structures, which could lead to domestic violence perpetrated by, for instance, an alcoholic husband (Pavlov, Volarević & Petronijević 2006:40-1). According to Anna Lidström, Field Coordinator, at Kvinna till Kvinna, some of their partner organizations working with violence against women, say that women IDP are especially exposed to violence since they have more difficulties in receiving support and help in the municipalities in which they are living.

5.3 Critique of the Human Security Concept

From the field experience gained of the human security concept as a methodological and theoretical tool it is clear that the concept does suffer from several shortcomings.

The primary difficulty is that the definition of human security, especially the broader definition with all threats it encompasses, is too vague and abstract and therefore becomes a nearly impossible tool to work with practically. The rather small field of research done, particularly case studies, does not give any assistance or advice of how to operationalize the concept to something more pragmatic. In most cases it feels like the concept has been thrown into a study or paper just for the sake of it, but then it has not been used properly.

Secondly, what is particularly true for the broader definition is the wide scope of fields it covers; from subjects encompassed in natural science, to subjects included in social
science. On several occasions during the field study the feeling of intruding other fields of studies, such as human rights, became evident. To fit all material to Peace and Conflict Studies seemed a great challenge, and caused a lot of puzzling.

Thirdly, from the beginning the concept was created top-down instead of bottom-up; the basic idea of human security was to use it as a policy tool for international and national actors (Shinoda 2004:11). Because the concept did not emanate from the bottom, the gap between the actual human security on the ground, and human security as a policy tool could be too wide and incompatible with each other. It might be more suitable as a policy tool, to use the label human security on a macro level on issues in order for them to move up the political agenda – also known as securitization – instead of using it as an academic tool or an approach suitable for the micro level (Mack 2004:49).

With so many shortcomings, and with so many challenges in order to make it work methodologically and theoretically in research, what could be the benefits, which make it worth the effort? This study has found the following reasons to keep evaluating and developing the concept:

- It is centered on individuals instead of states
- It uses a bottom-up approach
- It is interrelated to human development

Regarding the criticism of its unclear relation to conflicts and real threats, this paper argues that it should be seen the other way around. Human security should not be a concept used only to explain dynamics of conflicts and violence as security studies does, instead it should focus on peace. Let me elaborate shortly on this idea.
Human security covers areas that are not explicitly connected to the idea of security as we usually apply it. It gives great importance to economic, political and social opportunities of people, and the deprivation of these opportunities are explained as lack of human security. Hence, after a conflict, or even in the purpose of preventing conflicts, these opportunities are often considered to be vital in order to gain a stable society and in the long run durable peace. To achieve these other priorities than military expenditures and strong national borders are needed, the attention should instead shift to the security of humans and their development. Therefore, it might be the case that human security is not a question of pure security or conflict studies, but a question for studies in the field of conflict prevention or peace building.
6. Main Reasons for the Inability to Change the Contemporary Static Human Security Situation

The following chapter treats the last of the research questions set out in the beginning of this study. This question treats, as the heading implies, the main reasons for the inability of actors directly involved with IDPs to change the static human security situation of IDPs.

Six reasons have been identified as the most important ones for why the human security situation has been stagnant the last eight years; the government’s policy of return; transition of the Serbian society; lack of documents; the ‘status’ of IDPs; agency of IDPs and relations between different levels. These reasons are not only connected directly with IDPs, but also to the mid and state-level of the actor’s triangle (shown in figure 3, page 36). This is done because the premises of changing the human security situation are not only found in the agency of IDPs themselves, but also in the context surrounding them.

6.1 The Government’s Policy of Return

Ever since the IDPs became displaced in 1999 the government of Serbia has advocated for their return to Kosovo. Other solutions, such as integration, are only considered by the government when conditions for return are established (Group 484(a) 2006:18; 86). However, the issue of Kosovo’s future status, which is one of the major obstacles for creating conditions for durable return, has turned out to be a protracted conflict of interests between the Serbian government and the Albanian majority in Kosovo. Both parties have since 1999 been standing stomping in two different corners, refusing to give up their
incompatible claims. In the meantime many of the displaced people living in Serbia, whose future lives depend on the final status of Kosovo, sinks deeper into poverty (Group 484(a) 2006:86).

Since there are no realistic options for return for IDPs, and the government nevertheless has continued to advocate for their return, no long-term help have been provided to IDPs. For the sake of simplification, assistance given to IDPs could be divided into two groups, (1) basic humanitarian assistance and (2) assistance of empowerment. The first group consists of help aimed at survival of IDPs, to keep them with basic clothing, food, wood, and accommodation. This kind of assistance leaves IDPs as recipients with limited possibilities to improve their own situation, and merely lets them survive from day to day. The other group is instead directed at empowering IDPs, to help them help themselves. An example of this kind of assistance is vocational training, aimed to improve IDPs professional skills or to help them with self-employment (Rakić, Group 484).

For the human security situation of IDPs, the first group of assistance creates conditions to only sustain the situation in which people already are, which means that the poor human security situation Roma IDPs and IDPs in collective centers found themselves living under when they became displaced has been stagnant instead of improving. The other group on the other hand should generate conditions for improving the human security situation, since this kind of help creates opportunities for changes. However, this has not been the case, and in those instances where some changes have been done, these have only been small scale. The explanation lies mainly in the return policy. Those projects, which deal with this form of assistance have because of the policy been limited to short or mid-term visions, and undertaken on ad hoc basis (UNHCR & Praxis 2007:41).
Why the government’s policy affects local and international organizations to this extent is due to the political aspect of return and integration. To deal with return and integration is political issues, alleviating the living situation of IDPs on the other hand, is seen as a non-political issue:

But the government cannot allow NGOs to deal with political issues. If an NGO tries to influence political issues by humanitarian engagement then that would be a gross violation of their purpose. Since return and integration are political issues NGOs cannot expressively influence or press for either of them, if they do that they step over the line. They cannot influence people of what choices they are to make, people have to decide on their own (Blagojevic, CCK).

Hence, to deal with these issues are politically sensitive and therefore organizations working with the assistance of IDPs cannot openly promote either of them, instead they have to formulate their activities after what is approved instead of what they believe is needed. 13

6.2 A Society in Transition
The Serbian society is since the overthrow of the former president Milošević in 2000 experiencing a political transition. This transition has meant many alterations of the political structure of the Serbian government, the Serbian parliament and also the previous union between Serbia and Montenegro (Banda, OSCE).

13 It should be pointed out that this study does not argue for integration as a solution to increase the human security situation of IDPs, but to improve the human security situation calls for measures which are closely related to what in many cases could be seen as attempts to promote integration (author’s comment).
For instance, the last parliamentary election held in Serbia\(^\text{14}\), resulted in a long period of political uncertainty since the parties could not agree on the forming of a new government. Not until May 2007 a new government was successfully formed; a coalition between the Democratic Party, the Democratic Party of Serbia and New Serbia and G17+. (Commission of the European Communities 2007:7).

The forming of the new government was also followed by a period of uncertainty politically, which has resulted in little work progress of the parliament and limitation of its capacity. Furthermore, following a reconstruction of the ministries, the new government now consists of six more ministries than the former one (Commission of the European Communities 2007:7). Because of the new ministries, responsibilities for various issues have changed between ministries, but often the coordination between them need to be improved (Commission of the European Communities 2007:31; Banda, OSCE).

Another occurrence that affected the political structure is the dissolution of the union between Serbia and Montenegro in 2006. Due to the dissolution the ministry of Minorities and Human Rights ceased to exist (Banda, OSCE).

The relation between these changes and the human security situation of IDPs might call for some clarification. The climate this political transition creates has proved to be difficult to work in for those organizations involved with improving the living situation of IDPs. For a long period there has not been anyone in charge for all ministries, and to go from ministry to ministry in order to lobby for changes is a time consuming process. Also, because there is uncertainty of who will be in charge of what, or which ministry will have responsibility of what, agreements made with one minister might be overturned when the ministries

\(^{14}\) The election took place in January 2007 (Commission of the European Communities 2007:6).
responsibilities change or when the next minister takes office. In this working climate only small concrete changes take place, but these do not, according to Banda at OSCE, provide the bigger picture with much good.

6.3 Lack of Documents
The third reason for the static human security situation is lack of documents, a reason well recognized and which attracts a lot of attention from the local and international organizations working with IDPs. The reason for this is that working with IDPs rights during displacement has proven to be an avenue for change, since integration is deemed a political sensitive issue (Rakić & Ilić 2006:38).

All citizens of Serbia need a wide range of various documents to prove their legal identity. This is essential for them in order to exercise their rights as citizens and also to fulfill their civic obligations (UNHCR & Praxis 2007:18). As IDPs are citizens of Serbia, they do not constitute an exception, and therefore they need to possess at least the following documents; IDP card, Birth Certificate, Marriage Certificate, Death Certificate, Citizenship Certificate, ID card, work booklet and Years of Service “M-4 form”. These are considered to be the most important documents for IDPs to have in their contact with local and international authorities (UNHCR & Praxis 2007:18-9).

For example, if a person do not have a work booklet, which is a record of his or her employment with detailed information on education and work experience, he or she cannot access unemployment benefits, pension rights or get assistance for accessing new employment (UNHCR & Praxis 2007:19).

15 The Death Certificate is needed to give access to a deceased family member’s possessions.
Many IDPs lack these documents because they either lost them or had to leave them behind when they fled from Kosovo (Norwegian Refugee Council 2005:167). In the task of obtaining these documents IDPs face various obstacles, such as dislocated registry offices, complicated bureaucratic procedures and lack of resources and willingness of local authorities to facilitate document issuance (Rakić & Ilić 2006:41-2).

Roma IDPs face additional difficulties because many of them have not been registered from the beginning, which deprives them of all their civil rights; they are considered as stateless in the eyes of the law (IDP Interagency Working Group 2005:49; Rakić & Ilić 2006:41). Persons, who have never been registered, need to go through a court procedure of subsequent registration. This procedure is both time-consuming and complicated, and according to Rakić & Ilić (2006:43) there are few cases that have been successfully resolved.

The difficulties for IDPs, especially Roma IDPs, to access their legal rights because of lack of documents have major effects to their human security situation. For instance, this deprives them of benefits, which they need for their daily survival, and it also forces them to take employment in the informal economy, which limits their prospects of having a gainful and secure employment.

6.4 The ‘Status’ of IDPs
This reason is a bit more obscure than the others; it is not as clear cut and involves different problems emanating from the fact that IDPs are rendered the ‘status’ IDPs.

In fact, to be clear, there are no legal documents in Serbia defining the status of IDPs, and what kind of assistance and protection they are entitled to (UNHCR & Praxis 2007:14).
Therefore, strictly speaking, it is not possible to claim that IDPs have a legal status. But for the sake of simplification, this word is used anyways, but not as a legal term.

The problems originating from the status of IDPs, are possible to discover on both the state-level and grass-root level in the Serbian society. Both instances have an impact on the human security situation of IDPs, which is explained further in the end of the section.

From the government’s point of view what is problematic is first and foremost the lack of a legal definition of IDPs. Instead of having a specific status they are supposed to be treated equally with other citizens of the Serbian society. However, according to Banda at OSCE, IDPs need a legal status recognizing them for their vulnerability. They did not choose to move within the borders of Serbia, not as someone who moves from one town to another, instead they were forced to flee from their homes to another part of Serbia, and they should receive a status after this. When the authorities recognize them as IDPs, they are prevented from accessing all rights they should have, instead of giving them these rights (Banda, OSCE). As they are treated like all other citizens of the state the responsibility for them fall under different ministries, but there are little administrative coordination on issues related to IDPs. According to UNHCR and Praxis “the absence of a comprehensive approach towards IDPs in Serbia, has resulted in major gaps in the enjoyment of their rights and in the provision of social assistance” (2007:15). The conclusion of this is that the lacking of legal status makes it harder for IDPs to get the kind of help they are in need of because they were forced to flee from their homes.

However, even though they lack a legal status, they are recognized as a group with specific needs since they did not choose to flee from their homes in Kosovo. Because of this they are given basic assistance, such as money from social funding and coal for the
winter, but since Serbia in general is an impoverished society and the budget is already over-stretched, the resources for this kind of activities are poor (Radić & Blagojevic, CCK).

Also, IDPs are treated as one single group, and even though Roma IDPs live under harsher conditions than other IDPs they are not differentiated from the rest. Hence, even though there are groups within the IDP population, which has other problems than the rest of the IDP population this is not taken into consideration when assessing the need of IDPs.

Being recognized as an IDP does not only create problems at the state-level, but also at the grass-root level of the society. According to Björn Mossberg, counselor at Sida, the general population of Serbia often has negative attitudes towards IDPs. Their attitudes do not grant IDPs with any support or help, especially not for Roma IDPs, since the relationship to Roma is the same as it was fifteen, twenty years ago; that is low. These attitudes have been a result of the huge influx of refugees during the Balkan wars. When these refugees came there was generally a lot of sympathy directed towards them because they had been violently driven away from their countries. At the time when the first wave of IDPs came, there was a kind of satiation among the population in regard to receiving more people of need, and also some locals perceived them as rich because they had had the possibility to sell their property (Mossberg, Sida).

The status – or lack of it – of IDPs has been part of the stagnant human security situation. Firstly, if IDPs are not recognized in the eyes of the law as a vulnerable group with specific needs, the protection and assistance of them stays on an ad hoc and basic level. For instance, they have not been subject to positive discrimination, which might be needed in order to give them an adequate chance to both contribute with something to the society in general and also to lift themselves out of poverty. Secondly, Roma IDPs granted
the status of IDP are not given special treatment even though they face additional problems compared to other IDPs. Thirdly, the attitudes of the society affects IDPs prospects of becoming an active part of the society, if they are treated as second-class citizens they do not have the same prospects to engage in activities which improve their situation. This is especially important for Roma IDPs because they already suffer from discrimination and low status due to the fact that they are Roma.

6.5 Agency of IDPs
As pointed out, the capability of a person to develop is dependent on the circumstances under which he or she is living, if the personal agency is limited or not (Sen 1999:17).

Considering the components of human security dealt with in the last chapter, there is more or less only one component which both groups of IDPs can influence by using their own agency; education. They can either choose to enroll their children in school, and continue encouraging them to go, or they can let them stay home. The only time when they face severe problems to enroll their children in school is when they lack documents.

Primary education is not considered as a problematic area for IDPs in collective centers, but for Roma IDPs this is a major source of insecurity. As pointed out, Roma children quit school, or do not enroll at all, for several reasons, one being their own attitude towards education. Although the question of access to primary education is more complex than overcoming their own attitudes, this is a field in which they can use their agency in a positive way. Also, the consequence of not engaging in primary education is severe, it leads to less chances of employment in the future, and thereby also less chances of basic income
and adequate housing, hence already as children the agency of Roma IDPs becomes limited.

Regarding basic income, employment and adequate housing, these are all components both groups – but again especially Roma IDPs – have limited capabilities to influence themselves. Since the Serbian government has started closing down the collective centers, those who still live there are the most vulnerable cases, those who have no where else to go, and because of the high unemployment rates, and their low income, they do not have enough assets to either rent an apartment or to build their own houses. Further, the scarcity of jobs in the Serbian society makes it difficult for IDPs in general to get a profitable and secure employment, and therefore they have to rely on temporary jobs or social benefits which do not pay for all of their expenses.

The agency of IDPs in collective centers are not only created or limited from things outside of their control, but also from their own attitudes, as Vučić, DRC, explains:

They are becoming very not active, as years are passing, they are getting used from receiving food from someone, and they’re waiting for a resolution provided from somebody else, they are lacking initiative to do anything for themselves, they are waiting for somebody else to push them to do something.

For Roma IDPs the situation is even worse, they mostly live in illegal settlements, which hinder them to get access to electricity or running water, and because many of them lack documents they do not have the possibility to influence the legalization of the settlements either. Further on, except for the problems caused by lack of documents in
regard to basic income and employment, they face discrimination from society, which limits their agency significantly.

The possibility of IDPs in collective centers and Roma IDPs to change their personal security is also limited. These components are influenced by the general crime rates in Serbia, as well as the attitudes directed from the society towards IDPs. As far as Roma IDPs are concerned, they face prejudices and stereotypes from the general society that increase the likelihood of them being subject to all form of violence and also to neglect.

Personal security is not considered to be a major threat to IDPs in collective centers, except for the negligence from the society they encounter. This is also something they have limited agency to change, since the neglect emanates from the prejudices the local society have of them, and if IDPs do not get the chance to become an active part of this society they are not likely to change these attitudes either.

Another agency factor which should be mentioned in this context is the IDP associations. As mentioned before the purpose of these organizations is to find solutions to their own problems. This is an initiative which proves the willingness and ability of IDPs to change their own situation; however, these organizations most probably face the same difficulties as other local and international organizations.

The conclusion is that the immediate agency of both IDP groups, but especially that of Roma IDPs, is limited. The control of their own capabilities to influence the components of human security mostly lies out of their reach, in the hands of the state-level (as shown in the sections on the policy of return and a society in transition), but also in the hands of the local society and to a small extent in their own attitudes.
6.6 Relations between Different Levels

The last reason dealt with in this study is the relationship between the different levels of the actor’s triangle. In order to show the activity between the different levels, the triangle showed earlier is used again, with an additional explanation.

The arrows illustrate the level of activity between the different actors.

From the state-level down to the grass-root level there is minor activity, such as social funding and basic assistance. There is limited cooperation between the mid-level and state-level.

For instance the state-level uses the mid-level to come in contact with the grass-root level and also it supports various projects (Radić & Blagojevic, CCK). The mid-level lobbies for changes in the state-level. The most activity is found from the mid-level down to the grass-root level, while there is only minor activity from the grass-root level up to the mid-level, this in form of IDPs engaged in IDP associations. No activity was found between the grass-root level and the state-level, except for the IDP associations, but these are counted as mid-level activities.

Except for the activities and relations found between the different levels, there are also cooperation between different institutions and organizations in every level. For instance, ministries within the government share the responsibility of issues related to IDPs, and organizations have joint cooperation with other local and international organizations.

What was puzzling during my field study was that even though there was so much activity going on in the mid-level down to the grass-root level, no larger changes have been done the last eight years. A lot of local and international organizations are involved in IDP related work, some focusing on their human rights, other with alleviating their living
situation during displacement. The projects are many, the positive steps forward few. The question is why this is the case.

I found two explanations to this. The first one is that there seem to be lack of trust between the different levels of the actor’s triangle. Beginning with the grass-root level, according to Group 484 (n.d:19) there are municipalities where IDPs openly show their lack of trust towards NGOs, because they have had negative experiences of empty promises before. This attitude was also encountered during my field visits to the two collective centers. It was evident how tired they were of having questions asked about how they lived, and even though I was there in the presence of an NGO representative engaged in helping refugees, this did not help. In addition to this, many IDPs feel that the help they have received from international organizations are insufficient (Group 484 n.d:20). In the questionnaire used in the field study, an open question asked whether they had received any help from a local or international organization, only five persons answered this question, but those who answered said no.

There also seem to be a great deal of mistrust from the mid-level (NGOs in particular) up to the state-level of the triangle. At several times I encountered the attitude among NGOs that the government was not willing to help them, and that they could not rely on the government’s assistance to improve the situation of IDPs. If this were to be done, it was without the help of the government. At the same time they recognized that changes need to be done on all levels of the society, such as legal changes, which have to be done at state-level. However, when considering what could be done practically, activities including the government were not regarded as implementable (Serbian Refugee Council, round table 2007-11-22).
The mistrust goes both ways in this case; there also seems to be lack of trust from the state-level down to the mid-level. Based on my field experience I believe the government of Serbia in many instances feels threatened by the activities of NGOs. NGOs are dealing with a politically sensitive issue of the government, and therefore the government appears to be guarding its interests precautionary, making sure they do not step over the line.

The second explanation treats the concurrence between NGOs. As pointed out, there are many NGOs working with IDPs, but there is only limited funding. The international assistance has decreased the last years, and the funds to organizations have been cut down as well. This means that much time of NGOs is spent searching and applying for new sources of funding. It also means that NGOs have to compete about the funding available. This could be a reason for why all this activity from NGOs are not as efficient as it could have been, and also to why all of their efforts have been more or less insufficient to improve the human security situation of IDPs.

There is also lack of cooperation and coordination between the different ministries of the government in regard to IDP issues, which has been touched briefly before in this study (Banda, OSCE). Regarding the cooperation and coordination between different NGOs and international organizations these have, according to Guteša and Vučinić at UNHCR improved significantly the last years due to the decreasing number of organizations working with IDPs.

In conclusion, if changes are to be done cooperation along with coordination must be present at all levels of the actor’s triangle. This has clearly not been the case as found in this case study. Naturally this is a consequence of many things, but one of them seems to be the lack of trust, which is present between the different levels. If there is no trust present,
effective cooperation is difficult to achieve, and therefore the mistrust plays a part in the stagnant human security situation among IDPs in Serbia. The Serbian government is *de facto* responsible for the protection and assistance of IDPs since they are displaced within its borders, and if the government are not incorporated in the work of improving IDPs human security situation, only a few concrete improvements will take place. At the same time, if the government does not trust those that are working directly with IDPs, they are not able to conduct their work efficiently. Hence, the importance of trust goes both ways.

Further, since the NGOs are working with similar things, and have so much knowledge and experience in the field, they could probably achieve more positive results if they coordinated their activities even more, and also showed a united front in their contacts with the government. Today there is already a working group consisting of parties in the question of IDPs (The IDP Interagency Group), which could be an even more efficient tool in the contacts with the government and in coordinating the activities of the local and international organizations. But as it is now, their work has more likely been part of the reason behind the stagnant human security situation.
In this chapter the various human security components analyzed earlier are put together to outline a comprehensive picture of the situation. The concept human security is also tied together more thoroughly with the capability approach in order to give an understanding of how IDPs capabilities to develop are affected by their human security situation.

Overall, the factual human security of IDPs living in collective centers is poor, especially in terms of their economic security. Their human security is daily threatened by the fact that they have inadequate housing, low incomes and high rates of unemployment. However, in regard to their physical safety and primary education of children their security is considered as relatively good.

Regarding the factual human security of Roma IDPs it is worse than that of IDPs living in collective centers. As they lack security in all economic and personal components of human security their human security is considered as very poor.

To estimate the experienced human security situation of these two groups has been difficult. To be able to clearly describe their feelings of insecurity and safeness more time and interviews would have been needed in the field. However, it is possible to draw the conclusion from the questionnaires handed out and interviews made with other organizations, that in the great majority of human security components IDPs living in collective centers do not have feelings of safeness. Also, many indicators show they experience insecurity in several fields, such as inadequate housing and physical safety.
When it comes to the experienced human security of Roma this is based on one interview with a Roma, interviews with organizations and a documentary film. The findings of this material point out their feelings of insecurity especially in areas such as employment, adequate housing and physical security. Therefore the conclusion is that the experienced human security situation within both groups is poor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IDPs</th>
<th>Factual HS</th>
<th>Experienced HS</th>
<th>Total HS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IDPs in CCs</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roma IDPs</td>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Very poor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: The Human Security Situation of IDPs.

Putting the factual and experienced human security together leads to the conclusion that both groups live under a poor human security situation, although the human security of Roma IDPs is worse. Also, considering the empirical data, there seem to be differences in the level of human security among women and men. Women in many instances face insecurity regarding basic income, employment and physical violence more often than men do. Among women IDPs, Roma IDP women have the worst human security.

The reasons behind the human security situation of IDPs in collective centers and Roma IDPs are the same, but in addition to what causes the poor human security situation for the former group, the human security of Roma IDPs is severely affected by the prejudices and stereotypes of Roma prevalent in the Serbian society, which cause systematic discrimination of them as a minority group.

Further, the differences between the two groups in regard to their level of human security create consequences in praxis; the practical means and initiatives to help each group must be estimated in the light of the group’s individual circumstances. To treat all
vulnerable IDPs as one single entity, when they in fact are not, has consequences for the results of the initiatives. The same reasoning goes for treating women and men as one group with the same needs, when in fact they face different obstacles, or the obstacles are more severe for one group.

As a consequence of the poor human security situation both groups of IDPs in this study have limited agency to make positive changes on their own. The control of the human security situation, such as creating opportunities for employment, engaging in the overall society, and providing durable solutions for housing, has been out of IDPs immediate control. The direct control has instead been scattered between the different levels of the actor’s triangle, but mostly been in the hands of the state-level. Because of the policies and laws of the state-level, conditions for the mid-level to be able to provide IDPs with adequate and efficient assistance have been restricted.

Hence, it is possible to conclude that the human security situation affects the individual agency of IDPs. What also affect their capabilities to use their own agency are the freedoms they enjoy fully or to a limited extent. For individuals to be capable to use their agency efficiently they have to enjoy a certain set of instrumental freedoms, and unfreedoms must be removed. In this particular case both groups at least on the paper have all instrumental freedoms set out by Sen. However, the number of Roma IDPs without documents are high, and these individuals do not enjoy any of these freedoms. Further, even though both groups, with adequate documentation, can enjoy the instrumental freedoms, in reality they face unfreedoms such as lack of employment and lack of economic and social security, and in the case of Roma, even lack of basic education.
To conclude, IDPs poor human security situation and their lack of freedoms mean that they do not have the opportunity or capability to use their own agency to help themselves and others, to change their own situation into something they themselves value. All their efforts go to the daily struggle of making ends meet, to survive, which put them in a position where they need assistance from others to lift themselves out of poverty. This leads me to the conclusion:

*Poor Human Security Situation + Lack of Freedoms + Limited Agency = Inadequate Capabilities to Develop*

If IDPs do not have the capabilities to help themselves increase their human security situation and enjoy freedoms they have limited prospects to develop in the Serbian society. The stagnant human security situation they have found themselves in ever since they became displaced have further severely limited their chances of using their own agency to develop, and not enough assistance have been provided for them in order to draw them out of poverty either. Thus, the consequences for living under a poor human security situation are that the individual agency of IDPs becomes limited, and this in turn limits their prospects of developing.

Not only IDPs are affected by this, but also the Serbian society. With such a large group of people not able to make positive contributions to the society, also influences the political stability in Serbia and in the long run the development of the overall society.
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Annex 2

Questionnaire used to collect data on human security\textsuperscript{16}.

\hspace*{1cm}This section treats your economic security.
\hspace*{1cm}Please make sure you fill in the boxes correctly. Thank you!

1. Are you \hspace*{0.5cm} Male \hspace*{0.5cm} Female?

2. How old are you? ___ years.

3. Where are you originally from? Kosovo \hspace*{0.5cm} Other

4. For how many years have you been displaced totally? ___ years.

5. How do you feel when thinking about:

a) your monthly economy?: Very secure
Secure
Neither secure nor insecure
Insecure
Very insecure

b) your current housing?: Very secure

\textsuperscript{16} The Serbian translation of the questionnaire is available through the author. Please note that the layout in this paper differ slightly from the original questionnaire.
Secure □
Neither secure nor insecure □
Insecure □
Very insecure □

If you have income generating work (if not, please go to question d):

c) how do you feel when thinking about your current work?
Very secure □
Secure □
Neither secure nor insecure □
Insecure □
Very insecure □

If you do not have an income generating work:

How do you feel when thinking about:
d) the chances of getting a job in the near future?
Very positive □
Positive □
Neither positive neither negative □
Negative □
Very negative □

6. Do you have a regular income?

□ Yes, through employment □ Yes, through social benefits
□ Yes, through other □ No
□ Don’t know

IF YES, does your income cover your necessary expenses?
7. Do you have a job?
   ☐ Yes ☐ No

IF YES, what kind of employment do you have?
   ☐ Permanent employment ☐ Temporary employment

8. What do you think about your current accommodation?
   ☐ Sufficient ☐ Barely sufficient
   ☐ Insufficient ☐ No opinion

9. Do you know for sure that you can stay in your current accommodation for another year?
   ☐ Yes ☐ No

IF NO, For how long do you know you can stay? ____________

10. Do you have any other accommodation opportunities if you in the future have to change accommodation?
    ☐ Yes ☐ Maybe ☐ No

IF YES and MAYBE, where (several alternatives are possible)?
    ☐ In a rented accommodation ☐ With friends or family
    ☐ Another Collective Center ☐ In own house

11. Do you feel like you are in a position to change your living conditions, in that case, how?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

90
12. Have you received help from a local organization or an international organization? If, yes, in what way?
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________

The following section treats your personal security.
Please make sure you fill in the boxes correctly. Thank you!

1. Have you been subject to physical violence after your displacement?
   ☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Don’t know

   IF YES, what kind of violence have you been subject to (several alternatives possible)?
   ☐ Mugging  ☐ Sexual violence
   ☐ Battering  ☐ Police-violence
   ☐ Gang violence  ☐ Other

   How often have you been subject to this kind of violence?
   ☐ Every day
   ☐ Once every week
   ☐ Once a month
   ☐ Once a year
   ☐ Don’t know

3. Do you experience that you are subject to psychological violence (for example bullied, teased, mentally and emotionally abused)?
   ☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Don’t know

   IF YES, how often do you experience that you are subject to psychological violence?
Every day
Once every week
Once a month
Once a year
Don’t know

4. Do you experience that you are neglected by the society?

☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Don’t know

5. Are you worried for your physical safety?

☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Don’t know

Thank you for your participation!