

**A HISTORY OF MAYUKWAYUKWA REFUGEE SETTLEMENT,
1966 – 2013**

**BY
NALUMINO LENIN NAMWANYI**

**A dissertation submitted to the University of Zambia in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in
History**

The University of Zambia

Lusaka

October, 2016

DECLARATION

I, Nalumino Lenin Namwanyi, declare that this dissertation represents my own research work and that it has never been submitted for any degree at this or any other university.

Signature

Date

COPYRIGHT

All rights reserved. No part of this dissertation may be reproduced or stored in any form or by any means without prior permission from the author or the University of Zambia.

APPROVAL

This dissertation of Nalumino Lenin Namwanyi is approved as fulfilling the partial requirements for the award of the degree of Master of Arts in History by the University of Zambia.

Date

Signed:.....

.....

Signed:.....

.....

Signed:.....

.....

ABSTRACT

This study attempts to reconstruct the history of Mayukwayukwa Refugee Settlement. It examines the role and function that was played by the settlement between 1966 and 2013. By 2013, the refugee settlement was the oldest in Zambia. It is illustrated in the study how most of the changes that occurred concerning policies followed in the handling of refugees in Zambia were pioneered at Mayukwayukwa up to 2013 when Zambia began integrating former Angolan refugees locally. The study highlights the background to the refugee problem in Zambia and how Mayukwayukwa was established as a temporal settlement to host Angolan refugees in Zambia. Various frameworks are examined to demonstrate why it was necessary to establish agricultural based refugee settlements in Zambia like Mayukwayukwa in the 1960s. The study illustrates how the settlement continued to exist through changing social, economic, political and ideological policies and atmosphere from 1966 to 2013. These were changing times in and around the host nation Zambia. The experiences at Mayukwayukwa in the period under discussion provided lessons on how Zambia hosted refugees. The study demonstrated how the experiences at Mayukwayukwa influenced the development of Zambia's refugee policies. Also discussed were the attempts to repatriate the Angolan refugees back to their country when the atmosphere seemed conducive. Last to be discussed were the procedures that were undertaken to finally change the policy and to integrate the former Angolan refugees locally in Zambia. The study concluded that there was a strong relationship between the development of Mayukwayukwa Refugee Settlement and that of Zambia's refugee policy from 1966 to 2013. Also concluded is that various factors contributed

to the establishment of refugee settlements in Zambia. Last to be concluded is that many attempts were made towards the repatriation and local integration of refugees from Mayukwayukwa Refugee Settlement.

DEDICATION

To my late father, Grant Siiya Sitali Namwanyi, my wife, Maureen Chimbala
Namwanyi and my children, Tabo, Natasha and Tumelo.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am grateful to the members of staff at the University of Zambia in the Department of History whose guidance and support was invaluable in the writing of this dissertation. Their professional and objective contributions cannot be over emphasised. Special mention goes to my supervisor, Prof. Mwelwa Chambika Musambachime, for his support and selfless patience. Prof. B. J. Phiri, Dr. E.K. Chiputa, Dr. W.T. Kalusa, Dr. W.S. Kalikiti, Mr. F.E. Mulenga, Dr. K. Krishna and Prof. F.B. Musonda all made it possible for me to continue with this work. Also greatly saluted are the efforts of two late academic icons of my studies, Dr. C.M. Chabatama and Dr. B.S. Siamwiza.

Equal gratitude is extended to the members of staff of various departments and organisations who opened their doors and archives for my research. Their vast knowledge and patience humbled me. These include members of the University of Zambia Special Collection, National Archives of Zambia, United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, Ministry of Home Affairs Commissioner for Refugees and the administration at Mayukwayukwa Refugee Settlement.

My wife, Maureen, and children, Tabo and Natasha deserve very special acknowledgement for bearing with me during the time I was researching and writing this work. I was not always there but Maureen covered for me and never showed failure in her support for what I was pursuing. My mother, Catherine Namwany and the entire family gave the support I needed. My postgraduate classmates played a great role in the birth, growth and molding of the idea which became the topic of this

dissertation. These were the brilliant Mr. Kumwenda, Edina Lungu, Kebby Mwelanyika, Eunice Moono, Ivy Chimfwembe, Mirriam Fulenge, Tryphena Cheelo, Joseph Mulenga, Sakwiba Muyunda, Vincent Kayombo, Desteriah Nyanga, Enala Lufungulo, Yvonne Kabombwe, Abigail Kanjuye, Patrick Malama and Jovy Katongo. Your input cannot go unmentioned. Thank you all.

ABBREVIATIONS

BRE	Barotse Royal Establishment
CCZ	Christian Council of Zambia (later Council of Churches in Zambia)
CORD	Christian Outreach Relief and Development
DAR	Development Assistance and Refugees
DLI	Development through Local Integration
DRC	Democratic Republic of Congo
FNLA	<i>Frente Nacional de Libertacao de Angola</i> (National Front for the Liberation of Angola)
FRELIMO	<i>Frente de Libertacao de Mozambique</i> (Front for the Liberation of Mozambique)
GRZ	Government Republic of Zambia
HIV-AIDS	Human Immune Virus-Acquired Immuno Deficiency Syndrome
ICARA	International Conferences on Assistance to Refugees in Africa
IMC	Inter-Ministerial Committee
IOM	International Organisation for Migration
IZDA	Integrated Zonal Development Approach
LDC	Local Development Committees
LWF	Lutheran Word Foundation
MCH	Mother and Child Health
MPLA	<i>Movimento Popular de Libertacao de Angola</i> (Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola)
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
NRE	Nkoya Royal Establishment
OAU	Organisation for African Unity
RAD	Refugee Aid and Development

RO	Refugee Officer
SRS	Self Reliance Strategy
TDA	Targeted Development Assistance
UN	United Nations
UNAVEM	United Nations Angola Verification Mission II
UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
UNITA	<i>Uniao Nacional para a Independencia Total de Angola</i> (National Union for the Total Independence of Angola)
VDC	Village Development Committee
WFP	World Food Programme
ZCRS	Zambia Christian Refugee services (A Lutheran World Federation programme)
ZI	Zambia Initiative

LIST OF FIGURES AND TABLES

Figures

- Figure 1: The Entrance to Mayukwayukwa Refugee Settlement 65
- Figure 2: The Issuing of the First Permanent Residency Permit 104

Table

- Table: Former Angolan Refugees Local Integration Statistics as of December 2013..... 108

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Contents	Pages
ABSTRACT.....	iv
DEDICATION.....	viii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	viii
ABBREVIATIONS.....	x
LIST OF FIGURES AND TABLES.....	xiii
CHAPTER ONE.....	1
INTRODUCTION AND HISTORICAL BACKGROUND.....	1
CHAPTER TWO.....	29
FRAMEWORKS TO THE REFUGEE SETTLEMENTS IN ZAMBIA.....	29
CHAPTER THREE.....	65
MAYUKWAYUKWA'S EXISTENCE IN CHANGING TIMES.....	65
CHAPTER FOUR.....	88
MAYUKWAYUKWA AND THE ATTEMPTS AT LOCAL INTEGRATION.....	88
CHAPTER FIVE.....	114
CONCLUSION.....	114
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	119

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION AND HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The subject of this study is Mayukwayukwa Refugee Settlement located in Kaoma District in the in Western Province of Zambia. The focus is on the role and function the settlement played in the history of refugees in Zambia in the period from 1966, when the settlement was established, to 2013 when the Zambian government earnestly began granting former Angolan refugees with Permanent Residency Permits for local integration. By then, Angolans had ceased to be regarded as refugees and many had been repatriated back to their country of origin.

The background of the study is that in 1966, barely two years after independence, Zambia began receiving increasing influxes of Angolans fleeing from the liberation war taking place in Angola. The Zambian Government established a temporal refugee settlement at Mayukwayukwa in Mankoya (now Kaoma) District.¹ Up to 2013, Mayukwayukwa was still operational as one of Africa's oldest refugee settlements. It had hosted refugees from Angola, the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) – (formerly Republic of Zaire), South West Africa (now Republic of Namibia), Burundi, Rwanda and even Sudan.² However, in spite of managing this task very well, little has been written by scholars about the history of the development of Mayukwayukwa Refugee Settlement and the role it had played between 1966 and 2013.

Kaoma District where Mayukwayukwa is located is found in western Zambia. It is one of fifteen districts in Western Province. It is 400 kilometres from Zambia's capital city, Lusaka, and 184 kilometres from Mongu, the provincial headquarters of Western Province.³ Access from both Lusaka and Mongu to Kaoma is by all-weather roads. The district is located in the area lying between latitude 14° and 16° south and between longitudes 24° and 26° east. It covers an area of 23, 313 square kilometres and lies on an average altitude of 1,213 meters.⁴ It experiences sufficient annual distribution of rainfall of about 800mm – 1000mm between November and April. Temperatures in Kaoma can be as high as 34° C in the warm dry period of October to November and as low as 5° C in the cool dry period of June to July.

Kaoma is the most fertile district in the province with 60% of the land being arable and accounts for most of the marketable surplus production in maize and groundnuts in the province.⁵ This is also partly because the district is not part of the Buluzi Flood Plain and is not affected by the annual flooding like most of the districts in the province. Moreover, it is more developed than the other districts in the province in terms of communications and road networks. The soils are predominantly well drained sandy loam with varying topsoil depth of 100 – 150mm in relatively flat uplands. The lower parts of the district have more of the sandy clay loam soils. Agriculture in the district is mainly subsistence based with semi commercial farming activities being on the rise. The major crop grown is maize which constitutes well over two-thirds of arable crops. Other common crops grown include cassava, millet, sorghum, ground nuts, cotton, mixed beans, tobacco and soya beans. Pastoral farming

is restricted in the district because it is near the tsetse infested parts of the Kafue National Park.

Mayukwayukwa Refugee Settlement, as described by the Refugee (Control) Act of the Republic of Zambia, is that piece of land, about 40 kilometres west of Mangango Mission Station, situated at the confluence of the Luena and Luampa Rivers, in Kaoma District of Western Province of Zambia.⁶ The settlement is 85 kilometres from Kaoma's main business centre and has a geographical size of 163 square kilometres, in which resided a total of 11,532 refugees as of December 2013 (69 people per square kilometre).⁷ The settlement by 2013 was being run with input from the Zambian government under the Ministry of Home Affairs, United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), and implementing partners both government and non - governmental organisations.⁸

The history of refugee hosting is well documented as it is common in Africa and other parts of the world. It was an integral part of humans to move from one area to another to escape conflicts such as wars, raids and insecurity; famine, hunger, droughts and floods; and attacks by wild animals. They also moved to look for resources such as fertile land, salt, good hunting and fishing grounds and minerals such as iron ores.⁹ Sometimes, they moved in small groups and were hosted as guests for a short or long period until they became absorbed in the host community. And in some cases, they moved as a large group that could be accommodated for a short period. Some remained with the hosts permanently. Others moved on to find new areas to settle in

while others went back to their original lands when it was conducive. These movements took place among the ethnic groups around western Zambia and the neighbouring territories of Angola, DRC, Zimbabwe, Namibia and others.

During pre-colonial and in colonial times, Africans had a tendency to migrate from oppressive situations. For instance, the Barotse ruler, Litunga Mulambwa, hosted the Mbunda people who had migrated and crossed over from present day Angola. In the colonial times, the migrants were quick to notice the differences in the colonial systems which often led to flights from colonies where tyranny was rife to where it was more conducive.¹⁰ In post-independence times, a good example is that of the Zambians belonging to the Lumpa denomination who fled into present day DRC fearing persecution in Zambia.¹¹ The number of these Zambian refugees in 1968 was about 15,000 and therefore forced the government of that country to request for UNHCR assistance the same year.¹² At the beginning of 1971, DRC was hosting 10,000 Zambian refugees at Kaniama Refugee Settlement in the Shaba region.¹³ Of these, 9,000 were successfully repatriated back to Zambia by the end of 1972 with less than a thousand remaining as self-supporting.¹⁴

Zambia had its first experience of a refugee inflow in 1965 when some 5,000 refugees from Mozambique crossed into Eastern Province.¹⁵ In 1966, Zambia experienced an inflow of refugees from Angola.¹⁶ These were fleeing as a result of the war of liberation in Angola being waged by the *Movimento Popular de Libertacao de Angola* (MPLA), the *Frente Nacional de Libertacao de Angola* (FNLA) and the *Uniao*

Nacional para a Independencia Total de Angola (UNITA) forces against Portuguese Colonialist forces in Angola. Many people fled from the area because of the actions of both the nationalist forces and the Portuguese colonialist forces.¹⁷ The unstable situation forced the Angolans to leave that part of the country into DRC and Zambia's Western and North Western Provinces. In Western province, the hardest affected were Kalabo and Senanga Districts.

The newly independent Zambian government responded hurriedly to these inflows of Angolan people by establishing two temporal refugee settlements called Lwatembo in Zambezi District and Mayukwayukwa in Kaoma District in 1966. Both were established without proper viability surveys. Lwatembo closed shortly after in 1971 mainly due to poor soils and the failure of communal farming.¹⁸ Mayukwayukwa was meant to accommodate the refugees that crossed the border and settled themselves in the Western Province border areas of Kalabo and Senanga Districts. Initially, the refugees in Kalabo and Senanga did not report themselves to the Zambian government authorities but settled themselves in the Zambian villages. The Zambian authorities were compelled to move the refugees away from the border areas for various reasons which included security concerns and the wish by the State to make the refugee problem visible in order to attract international assistance.¹⁹

The area where Mayukwayukwa Refugee Settlement was situated was originally under Chief Mutondo of the Nkoya Royal Establishment (NRE). Before the settlement was established, there were few villages in the area.²⁰ In 1966 when the refugee problem arose in Western Province, the area was selected probably because it had very few occupants and was far enough from the border area. Kaoma had a population density of 2.4 people per square kilometre with a growth rate of 2% per annum.²¹ Chief Mutondo, working in conjunction with the government authorities, facilitated for the Zambian villagers to be moved to the areas

across the Luena River.²² Over the years, more land was made available for the settlement's expansion.

Although Mayukwayukwa faced almost similar problems that led to the closure of the settlement at Lwatembo, it survived the challenges and was still operating in 2013 as the oldest refugee settlement in Zambia. Other refugee settlements that were later established in Zambia include Meheba in North Western Province, Nangweshi in Western Province, Kala and Mwange in Northern Province, and Nyimba and Ukwimi in Eastern Province. Among these, only Meheba and Mayukwayukwa were still operational up to the end of the period of interest to this study. This study addresses questions like how Mayukwayukwa Refugee Settlement had participated socially with the other communities, and how it had remained unclosed all this time. Of interest to this study is the history of Mayukwayukwa as a refugee settlement and how its existence influenced the development of Zambia's refugee policy in the period under discussion.

According to United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), over ninety per cent of the occupants of Mayukwayukwa were from Angola's Moxico and Cuango Cubango Provinces.²³ The earliest groups of fleeing Angolans consisted mostly of the Mbunda, Luvale, Chokwe, Luena, Mashi and Luchazi. There were similar ethnic groups already settled in western Zambia which had a history of migrations into Zambia in the pre-colonial times and throughout the colonial period.²⁴ After Zambia's independence, people that fled into its territory were treated as refugees. For a definition, this study uses the 1969 Organisation of African Unity

(OAU) Convention's Article 1 which defines a 'refugee' as any person:

who, owing to well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or opinion, is unable or owing to such fear, is unwilling to avail himself of the protection of that country, or who, not having a nationality and being outside the country of his former habitual residence as a result of such events, is unable or, owing to such fear is unwilling to return to it.²⁵

The refugees were required to stay in refugee settlements like Mayukwayukwa by the government. Also addressed in this study is how the refugees were received by the host communities. This includes the development of Zambia's refugee policy up to 2013 when UNHCR had announced the termination of the refugee status for Angolans the previous year. The year 2013 was historical because Zambia began to employ local integration of former refugees as a durable solution for the first time. Such an examination will help in the appreciation of the history of Mayukwayukwa Refugee Settlement and the role it played in the development of Zambia's refugee policy.

The character of refugees as perceived by the world including Zambia has changed over time and situations. The social, economic and political developments which Zambia has undergone have to be understood in order to appreciate Mayukwayukwa's historical development over the years. Of importance for instance, was the signing of international instruments like the United Nations 1951 Convention, the United Nations 1967 Protocol and the 1969 OAU Convention by Zambia in 1969.²⁶

In Zambia, the perception of the refugees was also influenced by Zambia's first

Republican President, Kenneth Kaunda's philosophical and political stance on Humanism and the struggle to liberate neighbouring territories from colonial rule. The core of Kaunda's Humanism was the respect for all human beings created in the image and likeness of God and mutual cooperation and support in society. Humanism was man – centred.²⁷ Politically, he strongly supported the liberation struggle against colonial rule in the region. Zambia as a front line state, perceived refugees as victims of colonial rule.

There are two main types of settlements for refugees, organized or planned settlement schemes and spontaneous settlement or self-settlement. As the term suggests, spontaneous settlements are unplanned and are also largely unassisted by government authorities. Settlement schemes like Mayukwayukwa are organised with the help of the host governments and international humanitarian agencies like the UNHCR and its cooperating partners. Refugee settlements like Mayukwayukwa are often agriculture-based where the government's target was to make the refugees self-sufficient as quickly as possible.²⁸ Refugee camps on the other hand are distinguished from settlements in that the occupants rely on handouts of food and supplies with little or no prospect or attempt for the refugees to achieve self-sufficiency.²⁹

Settlements and camps are often, depending on the numbers and urgency of the situation, established in haste in response to a refugee crisis. Planned rural settlements often share the characteristic that they are placed in peripheral areas and on land that has not been used by the local population. This might mean that they are badly placed

to attain economic self-sufficiency therefore putting pressure on host governments and humanitarian agencies like UNHCR and its cooperating partners for sustenance. Jacobsen points out that the longer the refugee situation persists, the more likely it is that the overall budget for that programme shrinks and levels of assistance decline.³⁰ Despite being underdeveloped, Zambia provided refuge to thousands of refugees at Mayukwayukwa for over four decades.

During the period under discussion, refugees received humanitarian assistance from various agencies. Over the years, this humanitarian effort led to improved livelihoods among the refugees, most of whom utilised the opportunity to attempt to rebuild their lives. However, the continued assistance to the refugees over the years and Zambia's economic challenges led to a situation where the refugees' living standards were perceived to be better than those of the hosting local communities. The local communities in Western Province hosted the refugee community. They lived in peaceful co-existence. A situation where the host communities were poorer than the refugees resulted in discontent and affected the social stability that existed.

A strain of such nature on the social relations between the hosts and the refugees made the whole refugee problem very problematic for everyone. This situation was coupled with the failed attempts to repatriate Angolan refugees in the 1990s especially in 1992 and the period between 1995 and 1997.³¹ The decade experienced the collapse of two peace agreements of 1991 and 1994 which led to resumption of fighting, which in turn, resulted in the return of refugees that had been repatriated

back to Angola to flee back into Zambia.³² These failed repatriations left a feeling of distrust among the Angolans for future repatriations. This decade probably led to the realisation by stakeholders that refugees would remain in Zambia for many years to come. Hence, a shift in refugee policy began to appear in Zambia. Local integration as a solution became a consideration where temporal settlement and eventual repatriation was the mainstay of the Zambian government policy since the 1960s.

The outcome of this policy shift was that, in 2002, the government embarked on an initiative called the “Zambia initiative” (ZI) to address the problems of poverty and also to create an improved and conducive situation for refugees to become productive members of the host communities.³³ The main aim of the ZI was to integrate refugees into the host communities while helping the local region to develop through the support of small-scale projects in agriculture, health, education, and infrastructure within the affected areas in Western Province, in particular around Mayukwayukwa and Nangweshi. This, it was hoped, would lead to integration, peace, security and stability in the region. This can be pointed out perhaps as the Zambian government’s first major step towards the local integration of refugees that was sought after by UNHCR and its donors. The ZI was supported by UNHCR and various donor countries as it was seen to be in line with the creation of a suitable environment for local integration as a durable solution for a protracted refugee situation like that for Zambia.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Mayukwayukwa Refugee Settlement had continuously been hosting refugees for forty seven years despite Zambia's deteriorating economic status. By 2013, Mayukwayukwa was the oldest refugee settlement in Zambia and was hosting refugees from neighbouring countries even before Zambia developed a refugee policy of its own. Little has been written about how the experiences at the early refugee settlements like Mayukwayukwa influenced the development of Zambia's refugee policy and vice versa. The problem is that the existence of Mayukwayukwa is not prominent in the written history of Zambia or as a topic of academic research by scholars. Driven by this awareness, this study illuminates how Mayukwayukwa developed from a temporal refugee settlement to becoming the oldest refugee settlement in Zambia. Also highlighted is how the early settlements influenced Zambia's refugee policy in the changing social, economic and political landscape of Zambia from 1966 to 2013.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The objectives of the study are to:-

1. Examine the relationship between the development of Mayukwayukwa Refugee Settlement and that of Zambia's refugee policy from 1966 to 2013;
2. Examine the frameworks behind the establishment of refugee settlements like Mayukwaukwa in Zambia.
3. Discuss the efforts towards the repatriation and the local integration of refugees from Mayukwayukwa Refugee Settlement.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Although a lot of works have been written on refugees in other aspects, there has been very little academic research on Mayukwayukwa Refugee Settlement outside of UNHCR sponsored research and policy documents. There are no academic studies available which are specifically on the history of Mayukwayukwa as a refugee resettlement. However, there are notable academic works on the Angolan refugee situation in Zambia which highlight some aspects of the development of Mayukwayukwa Refugee Settlement over time. The major ones are Art Hansen's 'Once the Running Stops: The Socio-economic Resettlement of Angola Refugees, 1966-72'³⁴ and Oliver Bakwell's 'Refugee Repatriation or migrant villagers?'³⁵ Both Hansen and Bakwell have gone on to publish books based on their doctorate research findings. Also notable is Wamburakwao Sapao's Masters of Arts thesis entitled 'A Social and Economic History of Displaced People: The Maheba Refugee Settlement Experience 1971-1994' submitted to the University of Zambia in 1996.³⁶

The work of the Cheke Cha Mbunda Association is significant to this research in relation to the understanding of the background and nature of the pre-colonial, colonial and post-independence movements of groups like the Mbunda into Zambia's Western Province. Like Axel Fleisch, the Cheke Cha Mbunda write that starvation, lack of personal safety, hardships and the liberation struggle against colonial rule in Angola gave impetus for continued flight into Zambia.³⁷ Musambachine's 1989 article on the other hand is important in that it demonstrates how even Zambians had the

tendency to migrate from oppressive situations in the colonial period.³⁸ He explains that some Zambians in the border areas fled into neighbouring territories like Angola and Belgian Congo as a result of what they believed were oppressive tax regimes introduced by the British South Africa Company in North Eastern Rhodesia and North Western Rhodesia especially after the imposition of cash tax payment in the territories.³⁹ In his work, he concentrates on the flight of Zambians across the Congo border.

In reference to the 1966 refugee influx, Art Hansen, in his anthropological study writes that an historical study of Zambia's border area reveals that the refugee movement is only the latest in a series of migrations of the same peoples from the same areas in Angola into the Zambian locality. He points out that the continuing migration is well documented for the colonial period (1907-1964) and populated the border area.⁴⁰ It focuses on the Luvale refugees of North Western Zambia. This, like his other works, is important to this research in that it sheds light on the self-settled Angolan refugees whose lives he compares with those in organised settlements especially Meheba. In 'Refugee Dynamics: Angolans in Zambia 1966-72', Hansen's focus is still on the self-settled Luvale refugees in post-independence Zambia but he describes the background to the refugee movement into western Zambia and briefly looks at the lives in the government schemes.⁴¹

Although most of Oliver Bakewell's academic studies are also on the self-settled Angolan refugees in Zambia, his 2002 'Review of the CORD Community Services for

the Angolan Refugees in Western Province of Zambia' is important in the understanding of Mayukwayukwa Refugee Settlement and the Zambian government policies towards refugees.⁴² It is noted in the work that Zambia's insecure environment in the 1960s and 1970s as a result of its involvement in the region's liberation struggle shaped the Refugee (Control) Act of 1971 as the first legislation passed to cope with the growing numbers of refugees in Zambia.⁴³ The work also provides a description of Mayukwayukwa as a refugee settlement in the 1990s. Also of importance is that the work analyses the refugee population at Mayukwayukwa in the 1990s and its economy which is rural based, revolving around household plots of 2.5 hectares of land. He observed the constraints of poor soils as a result of the occupants being tied to the same piece of land for a long time were a hindrance to high productivity. Like his 1999 doctorate thesis, the main focus of this work is also on the state of Angolan refugees in the 1990s.

In his thesis,⁴⁴ Bakewell, like Hansen and Michael Barret,⁴⁵ examines the self-settlement of Angolan Refugees that refused to settle in designated refugee settlements like Mayukwayukwa, Nangweshi and Maheba in preference to self-settlement. He provides some reasons why some refugees avoided the established settlements like Mayukwayukwa. In relation to self-repatriation of refugees from the settlements, Allen Armstrong's argument in his work is that the refugees' nostalgic longing to return to their native countries must be interpreted as an indication of inadequate opportunities and facilities in the settlements.⁴⁶

Wamburakwao Sapao's study⁴⁷ is important to this study in that it is the only available historically researched work on a refugee settlement in Zambia. His study focuses on the social and economic activities of the refugees at Maheba Refugee Settlement in North Western Province of Zambia. It is of interest is that it sheds light on the challenges that were experienced at Mayukwayukwa and Lwatembo settlements in the transitory stages between 1966 and 1971. It provides insights on the economic and social grievances of the refugees at the two settlements. However, Sapao's study focuses on Maheba Refugee Settlement in the period between 1971 and 1994. It therefore leaves a wide gap in the history of the refugees in the period from 1994 and up to 2012.

Michel Agier has a book entitled **Managing Undesirables**, with a chapter entitled 'Surviving, Reviving, Leaving, Remaining: The Long Life of Angolan Refugees in Zambia'. Like Sapao, Agier's main focus is on Meheba, Zambia's long time most populous settlement, but in the period around the 2001-2 refugee crisis. The anthropologist writes that the Angolan refugees in 2002 all distrusted repatriation because they were discouraged by the experience of two previous unsuccessful attempts to end the war, and two abortive returns. This is in reference to the peace agreements that were signed in 1991 and 1994 which were broken months or years that followed, forcing the *retornados* to go back to the camps they had left.⁴⁸ Also of interest is how he elaborates how the new arrivals were received in the transit areas. After some weeks, he continues, the refugees were placed in the empty forests with a plastic sheet, beddings and kitchen utensils so that the ground could be prepared for

agriculture and the formation of villages of about a thousand persons.

In a study, 'Refugee Integration in Older Refugee Settlements in Africa', presented at the 1990 meeting of the American Anthropological Association, Berry Stein and Lance Clark state that the ideal refugee settlement particularly from UNHCR's point of view consists of two main phases. The first was the land settlement phase where a selected site was prepared for the refugees to move in and work on their individual sites with the assistance of tools, seeds as well as food rations that were provided until the refugees achieved the expected self-sufficiency in two to five years.

The second phase was the consolidation and integration phase in which the completion of infrastructure development at the settlement was done and there was a deliberate promotion of a sense of community among the refugees. The whole idea in this phase was to integrate the settlement into a larger social, political and economic life of the host country.⁴⁹ This study is vital in the understanding of the ideal situation of the establishment of refugee settlements with the view of locally integrating the refugees in the host countries. The authors conclude that this has not been so because of the divide between the mostly low-income host countries and the rich donor countries that assist UNHCR regarding responsibility for the refugees. Host countries had long and consistently maintained that refugee settlements were temporal and that the refugees would eventually be repatriated. UNHCR and the donor countries, on the other hand, consistently think in terms of the durable solution of refugee integration into the host countries and the termination of international assistance.

Shelly Dick's study examines Angolan among other refugees in Zambia. Like Hansen, Bakewell and Sapao, she mentions how refugees have been living at Mayukwayukwa since 1966. The work is important to this research in that it sheds light on how the Zambian government established Mayukwayukwa Refugee settlement in which each household was allocated land for cultivation and was expected to produce its own food. This was opposed to other Zambia refugee camps like Nangweshi, Kala and Mwanze where little or no land was allocated for cultivation.⁵⁰ The work puts emphasis on UNHCR and Zambian government's development of the new local integration policy called the ZI in 2002. She observes that the ZI was embarked on by the stakeholders with the assumption that not all refugees would go home.

Johan Brosche and Maria Nilsson's work illuminates the changing objectives of hosting refugees by the Zambian government over the years. It points out that the first President of Zambia, Kenneth Kaunda, was notable in his dedication and support for the independence struggles in the region and the refugee issues that followed. His policy was based on an anti-colonial interest. The objectives for housing refugees by the Zambian government after 2004 were more humanitarian than political. Just like Dick's work, this study is of importance in that it sheds light on some changes of government policy towards the refugee problem over the years.⁵¹

Brosche and Nilsson's work also highlights the fact that the Zambian government has

a regulation ruling that an international actor cannot directly operate a refugee camp or settlement in Zambia. This implies that UNHCR has to go through a local implementing partner to run a refugee settlement scheme. At Mayukwayukwa, UNHCR has had implementing partners like African Humanitarian Agency (AHA), Lutheran World Federation / Zambia Christian Refugee Services (LWF / ZCRS) and Christian Outreach Relief and Development (CORD).⁵²

Mwanza and Seshamani's paper⁵³ is important in that it is an academic work written by scholars familiar with Zambia's situation. The paper illuminates the socio-economic aspects of Zambia's hosting of refugees in the 1980s and how Zambia tried to cope with the burden of refugees when the economy was in a grave crisis. The work illuminates the fact that the inflow of a few thousand refugees hardly had a toll on Zambia's economy. However, after the 'dual shock' to which the economy was subjected by the oil shock of 1973 and the copper shock of 1974, a declining trend set in. They explain that by the early 1980s, the economic situation in Zambia had become critical. The work emphasises that ironically, it was precisely during this period of sharp economic deterioration that the pace of refugee influx into Zambia stepped up. The literature is important to ones understanding of the impact of the economic crisis on the refugees already resident in the country and, conversely, the impact of new refugees on the socio-economic life of both the resident refugees and the indigenous population.

Karen Jacobsen's work is of importance to this study in that it focuses on economic

survival in refugee camps and settlements. Although it focuses on East African refugee camps, it sheds light on some experiences of refugees who live in camps and settlements, and how they survive declining levels of humanitarian assistance. She writes that refugee situations that become protracted experience gradual and sometimes sudden reduction in humanitarian assistance including food rations which sometimes become serious problems.⁵⁴

The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees has operated in Zambia since 1966 and has a rich stock of published and unpublished materials. UNHCR publications include works on refugees in general, like the Universal and Regional instruments⁵⁵ governing the concept of refugees and displaced people. It also has materials specific to Zambia like mid-year reports, annual reports and many other working documents. For instance, in 'Zambia: Analysis of the Gaps in Protection of Refugees', UNHCR bemoans that although Zambia has an open door policy towards asylum seekers which ensures that those arriving at the frontier seeking protection are admitted, She has a severe lack of female officials to interview women, especially in remote areas.⁵⁶ There are also UNHCR Global Reports for instance, that are made on every country that the UNHCR operates in and include important information like current operation highlights, working environment, achievements and impact, work with other stakeholders and many other important details.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The study is guided by the concept propagated by Karen Jacobsen's findings that, the

longer the protracted refugee situation persists, the more likely it is that the overall budget for the programme shrinks, assistance reduces and the refugees become invisible to the public eye.⁵⁷ Mayukwayukwa Refugee Settlement had operated for over forty seven years and had faced many challenges as refugees continued to flee from their troubled countries into Zambia. The settlement came into existence as a temporal measure and was not properly planned for. The exacerbation of the refugee problem led to many challenges as Mayukwayukwa developed into a refugee settlement. The experiences at the settlement as the situation became prolonged were used by stakeholders as a lesson in the handling of other refugee situations and the formulation of policies and strategies. This study uses Jacobsen's approach to examine the development of Mayukwayukwa and its role in the handling of refugees in the period between 1966 when the first Angolan refugees arrived and 2013 when the Zambian government began locally integrating former Angolan refugees after cessation of Angolan refugees was announced by the international community in the previous year.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Part of the research was conducted in the University of Zambia Library especially the Special Collections sections where published and unpublished primary and secondary sources were consulted. The next part of the research was done at the National Archives of Zambia (NAZ). The focus there was on records like old newspapers, magazines, Hansards, agricultural and cooperatives reports, and other documents available. Another part of the data collection was done through consultation at the

offices of the Commissioner for Refugees under the Ministry of Home Affairs, UNHCR, OXFAM and the Zambia Red Cross Society. Of great importance was the field research in Kaoma District where records at Mayukwayukwa Refugee Settlement were consulted and interviews with refugees who have been residents at the settlement for a long time were conducted. Equally informative were interviews with the host community. Lastly, the data collected was qualitatively analysed and historicised before writing down the findings.

ORGANISATION OF THE STUDY

This dissertation is divided into five chapters. The first chapter is the introduction and the historical background of the study. This chapter also attempts to review the works of other scholars which were relevant to the study. The second chapter discusses the underlying frameworks that necessitated the establishment of Mayukwayukwa Refugee Settlement and other refugee hosting areas in Zambia. To merely state that the establishment of refugee hosting areas in Zambia was as a result of influxes of refugees and Zambia having acceded to international and regional instruments like the 1951 United Nations Convention and the 1969 Organisation of African Unity Conventions relating to refugees is not enough and overlooks other important factors.

Discussed are factors like Zambia's first Republican president, Kenneth Kaunda's political and philosophical ideas. Kaunda's strong support for the liberation movements against colonial rule in Africa contributed to Zambia's open door policy towards the earlier refugees that were seen as the victims of the liberation struggles.

He also pursued a policy of humanism that was centred on man and his wellbeing. The wellbeing of refugees were of primary importance. In the chapter is also argued that cultural factors equally contributed to the establishment of these refugee hosting areas in that it is in the nature of most African cultures to welcome people from far and near. This was because movement of people in Africa was very common. Also discussed in brief are the other refugee settlement and camps that were established in Zambia in the period of interest and how they fared.

Chapter three focuses on the existence of Mayukwayukwa Refugee Settlement in the changing times in the period of under discussion. This is in reference to the changing economy in the host country, the development of refugee policies and political atmosphere within and outside Zambia. Discussed are the challenges and the resilience of the refugees to attain self-sustenance in the early years from 1966 to 1973. Also discussed in the chapter is how the settlement operated between 1973 and 2000. This was the period after UNHCR declared that the refugee settlement had attained self-sustainability and handed over the full responsibility of running the settlement to the *Zambian* government. The last discussion in the chapter is on the role that the settlement played in the period after 2000 when Zambia hosted its peak refugee population.

The fourth chapter discusses how the refugee and host communities lived alongside each other for over four decades considering that the host area was rural with limited development in key areas like education, health, transport, sanitation, markets and

infrastructure. The refugees in the settlement on the other hand had had continued humanitarian and donor attention since the 1960s aimed at improving these same sectors. Highlighted is how the Zambia Initiative (ZI) was initiated to reduce the disparities that emerged in wellbeing of the residents of the two communities. The ZI projects aimed at benefiting both the refugee and the hosts.

The chapter also discusses the efforts to repatriate refugees back to their countries of origin whenever the refugee generating atmosphere seemed to calm down. Repatriation was the most preferred solution to the refugee problem for the Zambian government as opposed to the integration of refugees locally. The argument is that refugees often voluntarily repatriated on their own and sometimes with minimal assistance and incentives from home governments, host government and humanitarian agencies especially after territories gained independence. This was what was expected and what occurred in the cases involving refugees from Zimbabwe (1980) and Namibia (1990). The Mozambican and South African refugees also repatriated after democracy was introduced in their countries in 1990 and 1994 respectively.

It is also demonstrated in this chapter that the case for the Angolan refugees at Mayukwayukwa was different in that the repatriations that were organised in the 1990s failed because war broke out again and again in Angola as peace agreements failed to cement peace. Also discussed is the ZI that was embarked on by the Zambian government after it was clear that the host communities were poor and that the refugees would stay longer as the protracted Angolan refugee situation continued.

Illuminated are the development efforts that were made to alleviate poverty among the host communities and also to facilitate the integration of refugees.

The chapter examined the experiences at Mayukwayukwa in reference to the cessation of Angolan refugee status which saw Angolans ceasing to be recognised as refugees by UNHCR and the world at large. Focus is on the fate of over 10,000 former refugees still in Zambia that felt they did not want to go back to Angola. Some of these refugees pointed out that they had grown too old in Zambia and had no strength to be able to start a new life in Angola. Others claimed they had been born and raised in Zambia, the only home they knew, while others pointed out that they were married to Zambians and wondered what nationality would be slapped on their children. Last to be discussed is the procedure and criteria that were employed by the government of Zambia for the local integration of some 10,000 former Angolan refugees who had valid claims for not going back to Angola. In conclusion, the fifth chapter summarises the findings and salient points of the whole paper.

ENDNOTES

- ¹ UNHCR, **Report of the UNHCR to the General Assembly**, Supplement No. 12 (A/6711), 1st January 1968, para. 163.
- ² UNHCR, **UNHCR Zambia Newsletter**, (UNHCR, 2013), p. 24.
- ³ <http://www.kaoma.climatemps.com/map.php>
- ⁴ <http://www.kaoma.climatemps.com/map.php>
- ⁵ A. Muna, 'Animal Power for Weed Control in Kaoma District, Zambia,' in Starkey, P. and T. Simalenga, (eds) **Animal Power for Weed Control: A Handbook**, (Wageningen: Technical Control for Agricultural and Rural Cooperation, 2000), p. 207.
- ⁶ Republic of Zambia, Laws of Zambia, Chapter 120 Section 4(1)
- ⁷ This figure which is used in the UNCHR Zambia Operation Fact Sheet for 1st March 2014 consists of refugees from various countries that were residing at Mayukwayukwa settlement by December 2013.
- ⁸ UNHCR, **UNHCR Zambia Newsletter**, (UNHCR, 2010), p. 18.
- ⁹ M. Berrett, 'Social Landscapes and Moving People: The Mysterious Meaning of Migration in Western Zambia', **New Issues in Refugee Studies**, Working Paper No. 78, 2003.
- ¹⁰ M. C. Musambachime, 'Escape from Tyranny: Flight Across the Rhodesia – Congo Boundary 1900 – 1930, **Transafrican Journal of History**, (vol.18, 1989), p. 147.
- ¹¹ B. Stein, 'Refugee Integration and Older Refugee Settlements in Africa', (American Anthropological Association, 28th November 1990), No page numbers @ www.msu.edu/course/pls/461/stein/FINAL.htm [Accessed 22/05/14]
- ¹² UNHCR, **Report of the UNHCR to the General Assembly**, Supplement No. 12 (A/7612), 1st January 1970, para. 119.
- ¹³ UNHCR, **Report of the UNHCR to the General Assembly**, Supplement No. 12 (A/8412), 1st January 1972, para. 105.
- ¹⁴ UNHCR, **Report of the UNHCR to the General Assembly**, Supplement No. 12 (A/9612), 1st January 1975, para. 114.

-
- ¹⁵ UNHCR, **Report of the UNHCR to the General Assembly**, Supplement No. 11 (A/6311/Rev.1), 1st January 1966, para. 140.
- ¹⁶ The number of Angolan refugees in Zambia estimated at about 100 at the beginning of 1966 increased to nearly 2,800 by the end of the year after more refugees crossed into Balovale, Kalabo and Senanga Districts.
- ¹⁷ J. A. Marcum, **The Angolan Revolution: Exile Politics and Guerrilla Warfare (1962 – 1976)**, vol. 2, (Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1978), pp. 145-6
- ¹⁸ UNHCR, **Report**, (A /8412), 1972, para. 161.
- ¹⁹ Richard Black, 'Putting Refugees in Camps' in **Forced Migration Review**, 2 (August 1998), p. 6.
- ²⁰ UNHCR, 'Zambians and Refugees Awarded for Exemplary Service on World Refugee Day', **UNHCR Magazine**, 3, 4 (2013) p. 14.
- ²¹ Central Statistics Office (CSO), **2000 Census: Western Province, Vol.9**, (Lusaka: Central Statistics Office, 2004) p. xvii
- ²² UNHCR, 'Zambians and Refugees Awarded', p. 14.
- ²³ The percentage was arrived at based on the annual reports of the UNHCR to the General Assembly of the United Nations in the period of interest.
- ²⁴ Cheke Cha Mbunda Cultural Writers Association, **The History and Cultural Life of the Mbunda Speaking Peoples**, (Lusaka: University of Zambia, 1994), p. 64.
- ²⁵ J. Colombey (ed), **Collection of International instruments and Other Legal Texts Concerning Refugees and Displaced Persons, vol. II**, (Geneva: UNHCR, 1995), p. 4.
- ²⁶ UNHCR, **Report of the UNHCR to the General Assembly**, Supplement No. 12 (A/8012), 1st January 1971, para. 25.
- ²⁷ B. J. Olivier, 'Kaunda's Zambia', **Africa Insight**, 11, 1 (1981), p. 33.
- ²⁸ UNHCR, **Report**, (A /8012), 1971, para. 76.
- ²⁹ Stein, 'Refugee Integration and Older Refugee Settlements' No page numbers @ www.msu.edu/course/pls/461/stein/FINAL.htm [Accessed 22/05/14]
- ³⁰ K. Jacobsen, **The Economic Survival in Refugee Camps**, (Bloomfield: Kumarian Press, 2005), p. 23.

-
- ³¹ M. Agier, **Managing Undesirables: Refugee Camps and Humanitarian Governments**, (Cambridge: Policy Press, 2011), p. 118.
- ³² Agier, **Managing Undesirables**, p. 118.
- ³³ UNHCR, **Zambia Initiative: Refugee Hosting Community Development Programme**, Donor Mission Report (15 – 28 March 2002), p. 3.
- ³⁴ A. Hansen, 'Once the Running Stops: The Socio-economic Resettlement of Angolan Refugees (1966 – 1972) in Zambian Border Villages', (PhD Thesis, Cornell University, 1977).
- ³⁵ O. Bakewell, 'Repatriation: Angolan Refugees or Migrating Villagers?', (PhD Thesis, University of Barth, 1999).
- ³⁶ W. Sapao, 'A Social and Economic History of Displaced People: The Maheba Refugee Settlement Experience, 1971 – 1994', (M.A. Dissertation, University of Zambia, 1996).
- ³⁷ Cheke Cha Mbunda Cultural Writers Association, **The History**, p. 18.
- ³⁸ Musambachime, 'Escape from Tyranny,' p. 147.
- ³⁹ Musambachime, 'Escape From Tyranny,' p. 151.
- ⁴⁰ Hansen, 'Once the Running Stops,' p. 26.
- ⁴¹ A. Hansen, 'Refugee Dynamics: Angolans in Zambia 1966 to 1972', **International Migration Review**, 15, 12, (Spring – Summer, 1981), p. 175.
- ⁴² Christian Outreach Relief and Development (CORD) is a United Kingdom based agency that aims to address the needs of vulnerable and marginalized people, especially children, displaced communities and refugees.
- ⁴³ O. Bakewell, 'Review of the CORD Community Services for the Angolan Refugees in Western Province of Zambia', (UNHCR, 2002), p. 9.
- ⁴⁴ Bakewell, 'Repatriation: Angolan Refugees or Migrating Villagers?'
- ⁴⁵ M. Berret, 'The Social Significance of Crossing State Borders: Home, Mobility and Life Paths in the Angola – Zambia Borderland' in S. Jansen and S. Lofving (eds), **Struggles for Home: Violence, Hope and the Movement of People**, (London: Berghahn Books, 2009).

-
- ⁴⁶ A. Armstrong, 'Refugee Wellbeing in Settlement Schemes', **Journal of Refugee Studies**, 1, 1 (1988), pp. 57 – 73.
- ⁴⁷ W. Sapao, 'A Social and Economic History of Displaced People: The Maheba Refugee Settlement Experience, 1971 – 1994', (M.A. Dissertation, University of Zambia, 1996).
- ⁴⁸ Agier, **Managing Undesirables**, p. 118.
- ⁴⁹ Stein, 'Refugee Integration and Older Refugee Settlements' No page numbers @ www.msu.edu/course/pls/461/stein/FINAL.htm [Accessed 22/05/14]
- ⁵⁰ S. Dick, 'Changing the Equation: Refugees as Valuable Sources Rather than Helpless Victims', **The Fletcher Journal of International Development**, 18 (2003), p. 23.
- ⁵¹ J. Brosche and M. Nilsson, 'Zambian Refugee Policy: Security, Reparation and Local Integration', Minor Field Study, (Uppsala University, 2004), p. 13.
- ⁵² Brosche, et al, 'Zambian Refugee Policy,' p. 13.
- ⁵³ A. M. Mwanza and V. Seshamani, 'Refugees an Important Aspect of the Human Dimension of Africa's Economic Crisis: Zambia Case Study', (Cambridge: ASAUK Conference, 1988).
- ⁵⁴ Jacobsen, **The Economic Survival**, p. 23.
- ⁵⁵ Colombey, **Collection of International instruments**, p.4
- ⁵⁶ UNHCR, **Zambia: Analysis of the Gaps in Protection of Refugees**, (UNHCR, September 2007), p. 7.
- ⁵⁷ Jacobsen, **The Economic Survival**, p. 23.

CHAPTER TWO

FRAMEWORKS TO THE REFUGEE SETTLEMENTS IN ZAMBIA

The first refugee settlements in Zambia became operational in 1965. The establishment of the refugee settlements like Mayukwayukwa Refugee Settlement was necessitated by a number of factors that cut across international, legal, cultural, ideological and political lines. These included international instruments that the newly independent state found itself obliged to adhere to like the universal 1951 United Nations (UN) Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees and its 1967 Protocol. At regional level, there was the 1969 Organisation for African Unity (OAU) Convention Governing Specific Aspects of Refugee Problems in Africa. At a national level, refugee settlements were necessitated by the enactment of the Refugee (Control) Act of 1970. Other factors that contributed to Zambia's handling of refugees were the nature of the African culture of receiving people, and the first Republican President, Kenneth Kaunda's philosophical and political beliefs.

The UN 1951 Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees was an instrument that was adopted on 28th July 1951 to regulate the status of refugees.¹ It consolidated previous international instruments relating to refugees and provided the most comprehensive codification of the rights of refugees yet attempted on an international level. It also laid down the basic minimum standards for the treatment of refugees and the granting of more favourable treatment without prejudice by States. The 1951 Convention was to be applied without discrimination based on to race, religion or country of origin.

The Convention had certain provisions that were considered so fundamental that no reservations could be made to them by any member state. These include the definition of the term “refugee” and the principle of “non refoulement”. Non refoulement meant that no contracting state should expel or return (“refouler”) a refugee, against his or her will, in any manner, to a territory where he or she feared persecution. The 1951 Convention defined a refugee as:

a person who was unwilling to return to his country of origin because of (a) “events occurring in Europe before 1st January 1951”; or (b) “events occurring in Europe or elsewhere before 1st January 1951 owing to well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion.”²

The Convention included refugees that were specifically generated by events that occurred during Second World War up to 1951. According to this definition, most of the refugees in Africa were not recognised as such. Zambia found itself in a situation where it was obliged, by virtue of being a member of the United Nations, to work within the 1951 Convention. Zambia had pledged to respect the principles and resolutions of the United Nations Organisation. By joining the UN, the Government of Zambia declared that it would continue to be bound by the terms of the 1951 Convention, the application of which had already been extended to its territory before independence.³

In 1966 engulfed with an influx of refugees from Mozambique and Angola in 1966, the Zambian government had confidence in the systems of the United Nations Organisation and its agencies. This confidence in the system was evidenced by an

invitation that the Zambian government extended to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) to establish an office in Zambia. Following the invitation, UNHCR established an office in Lusaka in May 1966 to render assistance in solving the refugee problem.⁴ The High Commissioner had already pledged to consider the practical aspects of the refugee situation without being bound by the definition of refugees. He considered it his duty to take an interest in any given refugee problem provided that its scope and character justified special action by the international community through his office.⁵ UNHCR was present in Zambia and at Mayukwayukwa from 1966 to 2013.

Zambia's confidence in the United Nations system also stemmed from the fact that UNHCR had by 1966, already shown commitment in extending its mandate to Africa. In May 1957, UNHCR affirmatively responded to a crisis in Tunisia concerning some 85,000 Algerian refugees who had crossed the border during the previous two and a half years.⁶ The refugees fled after the start of the war of independence in Algeria. This was the first occasion in which UNHCR emergency assistance was extended to a Third World territory. To fully appreciate the development, one has to bear in mind that Algeria, at that time, was a French colony. The causes of the refugee flight from Algeria were the colonial conditions obtaining there. France initially objected to UNHCR's involvement in Algeria because of fears that the crisis would draw international attention. The colonial power claimed that Algeria was an integral part of France and that a solution would be found internally to repatriate the refugees back to Algeria.⁷ The resistance by the French was eventually overcome through a

combination diplomacy and demonstration of moral authority by the efforts of the UN family. The Algerian refugees were assisted through an emergency relief programme that eventually aided over 180,000 refugees.⁸ The UNHCR's assistance to the Algerian refugees marked an important step in the organisation's development. It also gave small nations confidence by proving that the UN would pursue its mandate even against major world powers like France.

By 1966, the international community was acknowledging that the refugee problem had shifted from Europe to Africa and Asia. It was in Africa that the major part of the UNHCR's refugee problems was found. Africa then, had an estimated fast growing refugee population of 730,000 arising from independence struggles and civil wars.⁹ The solution that was mostly applicable to the refugee problem in Africa and preferred by UNHCR was the integration of refugees in rural settlements that were established.¹⁰ The Zambian government established rural refugee settlements in line with the UNHCR but with the hope that the refugees would be repatriated quickly. This was evidenced by the fact that Zambian laws did not include any provision supporting the naturalisation of refugees to become Zambian citizens.

In order to rectify the anomaly with regards to the definition of refugees which clearly did not cover refugees fleeing into its territory, Zambia teamed up with other UN member States in 1966 to push forward a draft resolution. This draft resolution, submitted to the United Nations General Assembly proposed to facilitate for the approval of a protocol that would extend the scope of the 1951 Convention

definition.¹¹ It was proposed that the definition of the term ‘refugee’ would be amended so as to include all refugees around the world. Refugees would be regarded as such regardless of whether they were generated by 1951 or not. It was desirable that equal status and attention be enjoyed by all refugees covered by the definition irrespective of when they became refugees. The submission was made on 7th December 1966 by the following fifteen member states: Zambia, Algeria, Burundi, Congo (Brazzaville), France, Guinea, Libya, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Pakistan, Sudan, Tunisia, Tanzania and Yugoslavia.¹² This draft resolution resulted in the birth of the UN 1967 Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees which entered into force on 4th October 1967.¹³ The Protocol extended the scope of the 1951 Convention by removing the dateline of “1st January 1951” contained in the definition. By accession to the 1967 Protocol, States undertook to apply the substantive provisions of the 1951 Convention to all refugees without the limitation of date. It eliminated the major short-coming of the 1951 Convention by extending its scope to all persons who were refugees at that time and any time to come. The Protocol gave the 1951 Convention a broader and more universal character that made it applicable to new groups of refugees like those found in Africa.

The OAU was also concerned about the problem of refugees in Africa. At the 1965 Summit Conference at Accra, the organisation arrived at a resolution that member States should accede to the 1951 Convention while the OAU Convention on refugees was still being worked on.¹⁴ This was an expression of appreciation for the assistance provided by UNHCR so far. Zambia also attended the OAU Summit that was held in

Addis Ababa in October 1966 at which the refugee situation in Africa was discussed. The member States deliberated over a draft refugee convention prepared by a committee of legal experts tasked to localise the 1951 Convention in Africa.¹⁵ The OAU wanted to come up with a convention specifically made to assist with the problem of refugees from the African perspective. The member States also wanted a convention that would become an effective regional complement to the 1951 Convention.

The OAU Convention Governing the Specific Aspects of Refugee Problems in Africa was adopted by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government at its Sixth ordinary Session held in Addis Ababa on 10th September 1969.¹⁶ It entered into force on 20th June 1974 in accordance with the resolution which stated that the Convention should come into force upon the deposit of instruments showing that one-third of the member states had ratified it.¹⁷ The OAU Convention defined a refugee as a person who:

owing to persecution or well founded fear of persecution for reasons of race, colour, religion, political belief or membership of a particular social group: (a) leaves the state of which he is a national, or the country of his nationality, the state of which he is a habitual resident; or (b) being outside such a state or country, is unable or unwilling to return to it or to unveil himself of its protection.¹⁸

The passing of the 1969 OAU Convention acted as the final catalyst that made the Government of the Republic of Zambia in the same year to accede and become party to the 1951 Convention, the 1967 Protocol and the 1969 OAU Convention.¹⁹ These

instruments greatly influenced the treatment and finding of solutions for the refugee problem in Zambia.

These international instruments led to the enactment of Zambia's own refugee legislation in the form of the Refugee (Control) Act of 1970. This was the only piece of legislation that was passed in Zambia that dealt directly with refugees. It was passed by Zambia's National Assembly on 28th August 1970 in order to implement some of the provisions that were laid down by the international instruments. The Act was the embodiment of the refugee policies that had been pursued by the Zambian government in the early refugee settlements like Mayukwayukwa, Lwatembo and Nyimba from 1965 until 1970. The challenges, achievements and the general experiences at these early settlements from the time of Zambia's first contact with the problem of refugees to the time of the enactment of the Act played a major role in the shaping of this piece of legislation on refugees in Zambia.

The Act legitimised and strengthened the existence of refugee settlements that were already operational at that time by providing constitutional guidelines in accordance with the laws of Zambia. For instance, the Act required that all refugees should reside in a designated refugee reception area like a settlement or camp. It made it a legal requirement that refugees should report themselves to the nearest relevant authorities upon entry into Zambia so that the refugees could be guided to the refugee reception areas. This law was definitely intended to discourage the settlement of refugees

among the local communities which was common in Zambia. The Act regulated all refugee activities in Zambia with only a few amendments made.

The political ideology pursued by the President Zambia then, Dr. Kenneth Kaunda, was another important factor in the establishment of rural settlements for refugees like Mayukwayukwa. Although still in its infancy, the ideology of Humanism played a major role. The philosophy of Humanism had notable history with philosophers like Protagoras, Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, Hegel and Josiah Royce.²⁰ Basically, the theme of Humanism was man - centred and revolved around man and his wellbeing. Corliss Lamont defined it as a representation of a specific and forthright view of the universe, the nature of human beings, and the treatment of human problems.²¹ Kaunda's Humanism sought to create a society that placed the human person at the centre of all activity, social, economic and political.²²

Kaunda argued that Humanism stemmed from the structure of traditional African societies in which the vast majority of Africans lived in contact with nature and kept the element of their culture alive.²³ This was in reference to the extended family system that constituted a social security system that followed a natural pattern of personal relationships rather than being the responsibility of an institution. The tribal society as Kaunda put it was an accepting community in which social qualities weighed more than individual achievements and that it was a mutual society organised to satisfy the basic human needs of all members, therefore, discouraged

individualism.²⁴ He also believed that it was an inclusive society in which relationships involved some degree of mutual responsibility on widely spread basis.²⁵

According to the principle of man-centredness, society and its institutions were nothing more than tools in man's struggle for survival. Man was valued and respected above everything else and regardless of his social status, skin colour, creed, race or religion.²⁶ Refugees in the context of Kaunda's Humanism were seen as human beings needing the assistance of fellow human beings. Bound by the tenets of Kaunda's Humanism, Zambia had to accommodate the refugees fleeing across its borders.

Kaunda was also bent on assisting whoever was opposed to or affected by the colonial administrations still holding on to the dominance over the Africans. The refugees that necessitated the establishment of early refugee settlements were fleeing from the aggressive activities resulting from the liberation wars against colonial forces in Angola, Mozambique, Southern Rhodesia, South West Africa and the apartheid regime in South Africa. Kaunda pursued an open door policy for refugees. It was probably a way of aiding in the liberation struggles of these people and assisting the victims of colonialism.

The cultural factor also played a role in the establishment of refugee settlements like Mayukwayukwa. In African culture, migrant strangers were guaranteed some degree of hospitality so long as they could associate themselves to an existing local clan. It

was a custom among the Bantu ethnic groups to extend their hospitality to guests. The Bantu whose origins can be traced to the Cameroon highlands have long evidenced history of migrations into Central and Southern Africa. It was common for them to move to different places because of various reasons. Over time, their culture evolved mechanisms to extend hospitality to strangers that were sometimes not related by ethnic ties. Mechanisms like the clan 'Mukowa' system evolved whereby a man's clan totem could assure him of warm hospitality in faraway lands. Elizabeth Colson referred to it as 'clan hospitality' in reference to the Tonga whom she says seemed to be adept at relating themselves to some clan no matter where they went and could fit strangers into their clan system.²⁷

In this cultural system, one's clan was as important as his ethnicity in the absence of ethnic relations. When found in unfamiliar distant places, what was important was one's ability to perform a recital, invoking his clan which was normally a genealogy linking the person to the clan's leaders or founders. It then became the cultural responsibility of the local people belonging to that clan to take care of their clansman in terms of hospitality and social introductions.²⁸ Some of the people that were fleeing from Angola into western Zambia in 1966 belonged to ethnic groups that were also found in Zambia like the Chokwe, Mbunda, Luvale, Luchazi, and Mashi. These were given warm hospitality by the local communities because of ethnicity. Those that did not have ethnic relations probably attempted to solicit for clan hospitality among the locals. A lot of refugees settled among the Zambian villagers.²⁹

The Government of the Republic of Zambia could not ignore this fact that persons fleeing into or out of Zambia's territory had always enjoyed some form of warm hospitality. Moreover, even the colonial administration of the territories in the region had tolerated the cross-border movements for various reasons like labour and to increase the tax revenues. Among the Zambians, the refugees of the post-independence years were seen as tribesmen or clansmen from across the border. These borders were erected with the coming of colonial rule. The Zambian government was bound to safeguard the wellbeing of these refugees as opposed to leaving them to settle in the local villages. Refugee settlements were established by the government very far from the border for the hosting of refugees in an orderly manner. This was in pursuit of the policy of encampment by the Zambian government.³⁰

The UNHCR and its donor partners have often borne the brunt of accusations for insisting on the encampment policy in which refugees are put in organised camps and settlements. However, it is the host countries which ultimately decided whether to settle refugees in organised settlements or to allow them to settle on their own among the locals.³¹ The Zambian government policy was to settle of refugees in settlements. It also determined the size and location of the settlements. The decisions concerning the settlements were more often influenced by social, political, cultural, and environmental considerations among others. Some African countries like Tanzania, Botswana and Burundi pursued policies that allowed refugees to settle themselves among the local communities.³² Unlike Zambia at that time, these countries viewed

naturalisation through the local integration of the refugees as a durable solution to the refugee problem.

The organised refugee settlements were mostly preferred to keep track of the refugee population's demographics, movements and utilisation of local resources. Additionally, organised refugee settlements were practical for effective service delivery, accountability, identification of individuals, cost effectiveness of relief operations and general monitoring.³³ Security concerns also forced the state to move the refugees away from the border areas where they could easily attract the attention of the warring parties and therefore threaten the peace enjoyed by Zambians.³⁴ The settlement of refugees away from the border also ensured that no military groups allied to the refugees could launch attacks from the *Zambian* territory.

The establishment of refugee settlements was also necessary if the State was to attract the attention of the international humanitarian community to the problem of refugees. The refugee problem became more visible when the refugees were put in organised settlements. Refugees that were settled among the local villagers were difficult to identify for assistance purposes. Visibility of refugees was important in that the host nations benefitted from international assistance. International assistance helped to reduce the burden of hosting refugees for the state. It was the hope in the early years that the stay of the refugees in Zambia would be short and that the liberation wars would soon come to an end, giving birth to independence and peace for the affected nations. This would guarantee safety and security for the refugees to return to their

countries of origin. Thus, settling of refugees in organised settlements and camps was implemented as a durable strategy by the Zambian state.

However, there were some refugees that were allowed to settle in areas outside of the refugee settlements and camps. These were accommodated in urban centres. Most of these were students and political asylum seekers from South Africa, Namibia and Zimbabwe. These refugees benefitted from the assistance of their respective liberation movements. They were also assisted by the efforts of bodies like the OAU Coordinating Committee for the Liberation of Africa, the office of United Nations Commissioner for Namibia, the International University Exchange Fund and the Christian Council of Zambia.³⁵

The period between 1966 and 2013 saw the establishment of five agricultural based refugee settlements and three refugee camps in Zambia. The refugee settlements were Nyimba, Lwatembo, Mayukwayukwa, Maheba and Ukwimi. The refugee camps were Kala, Mwanze and Nangweshi. All the refugee settlements were rural and agricultural based. The refugees in the organised settlements were given farm plots to settle on and were expected to produce food for themselves after some time. The refugees in the camps on the other hand were provided with food supplies and were not expected to become self sufficient in food production. This was because the refugees in the camps were not provided with enough land to practice sustainable agriculture. The agencies involved provided care and maintenance programmes to sustain the refugees in camps in terms of food.

At inception in 1966, refugees in the early settlements in Zambia were given farming plots to be worked on communally. Refugee households were not allowed to produce crops individually but as a unit of many households whose proceeds were to be shared equally among the households. This was similar to what was obtaining in most other newly independent African states that were trying to come up with their own interpretation of the Non-Aligned movement as opposed to Western capitalism or Eastern communism. However, in 1970, the state reversed its position and allowed each refugee household to utilise individual farm plots.³⁶ This was necessitated by the failure of the communal farming system. Both the Angolan and Mozambican refugees in the settlements were not used to the communal system. They faced a lot of challenges which resulted in poor harvests.³⁷

The refugees in the agricultural settlement were assisted with agriculture implements like tools, seeds, fertilizers and pesticides for two years with the aim of making them self sufficient within that time. In addition, the refugees in the settlements were provided with extension services from agriculture experts. Other services that were provided to the refugees included education, health and security from the relevant government agencies and Non-Governmental Organisations.

The first refugee settlement in Zambia was created in December 1965 at Nyimba. The area for the settlement was bordered in the east by the Great East Road and Nyimba Hospital in the west.³⁸ Nyimba was part of Petauke District in Eastern Province of the

Republic of Zambia. The settlement at Nyimba was established to accommodate refugees fleeing from the liberation struggles in Mozambique. The liberation war in Mozambique was launched in September 1964 by the *Frente de Libertacao de Mozambique* (Front for the Liberation of Mozambique – FRELIMO) against Portuguese forces.³⁹ According to a Reuter Press release on 5th January 1966:

Refugees from the Portuguese East African colony of Mozambique began crossing the border into neighbouring Zambia about a month ago, soon after disturbances at Zumbo when, it was reported, a number of people were killed.

The 1,000 or so who fled their homes in the first few days have since grown to an estimated 6,000, most of them old men, women and children. Many have brought their own livestock – cattle, goats, sheep and pigs – with them.

A new camp to accommodate many of the refugees is being constructed at Nyimba, about 200 miles from east of Lusaka, the capital, by the Zambian government.⁴⁰

Initially, the refugees crossing into Zambia settled themselves among the local communities where there existed ethnic ties and where cultural factors like clan hospitality could be called upon. The government embarked on a campaign of gathering the reluctant refugees from the villages to the settlement at Nyimba.⁴¹ The government with the help of UNHCR and other partners like World Food Programme (WFP) and Red Cross Society attended to the immediate needs of the refugees.

By the end of 1966, 150 hectares of the land given to the refugees at Nyimba was under cultivation.⁴² This was after the refugees were assisted with farming implements. The government made it compulsory at the settlement for refugees to engage in communal farming.⁴³ It was hoped that the refugees at the settlement would become self-supporting by the middle of 1968.⁴⁴ The infrastructure at the settlement

was improved by the construction of water towers and an access road from the main highway to the settlement. Other improvements were the building of schools and health facilities in the area.⁴⁵

However, the settlement at Nyimba faced some challenges that delayed its attainment of self sufficiency. A challenge was that refugees did not remain in the settlement long enough to be self reliant. A lot of refugees continued to cross into eastern Zambia while others repatriated back to Mozambique. For instance, of the estimated 5,000 Mozambican refugees at the beginning of 1966, 4,000 repatriated back to their country while 1,000 new arrivals crossed over into Zambia.⁴⁶ In 1969, the government provided food rations for Mozambique refugees whose numbers fluctuated between 1,300 and 2,000.⁴⁷ The other challenge that arose was that the refugees lacked familiarity with communal farming. This was despite the fact that they had bumper maize harvests at the settlement as early as the first year there.⁴⁸ They were used to the traditional farming system where households produced crops on individual farm plots.

Security also proved to be a challenge at Nyimba because the settlement was too close to the border. Moreover, the Nyimba refugees were actively in support of the freedom struggle in Mozambique by supplying food and labour to the freedom fighters.⁴⁹ Zambian authorities were aware of the activities and movements of the Mozambicans between Nyimba and the Mozambique border areas. Available correspondence showed that there was a problem of security at Nyimba because of its

proximity to the border. In a letter written to the Commissioner for Refugees in 1972, the District Secretary of Petauke, H. S. Lubinda, wrote that “the present camp at Nyimba is a security risk and poses a danger to the administration of refugee relief operations.”⁵⁰

The solution to the security problem was to transfer the refugees at Nyimba to Sasare Farms. This was a farm block that had been planned to house Watchtower refugees from Malawi. At the end of 1972, some 20,000 refugees from the Malawi Watchtower sect fled into Zambia’s Eastern Province in fear of persecution from the Government of Malawi.⁵¹ The Zambian government prepared Sasare Farms for the refugees. However, the refugees returned to Malawi the same year as a result of the efforts by the Zambian government in obtaining guarantees from their Malawian counterparts that the refugees could return and live peacefully.⁵² At the beginning of 1974, the government intensified its intentions to begin resettling Nyimba refugees to Sasare Refugee Settlement after the rains. However, the planned settlement of refugees at Sasare never transpired because peace and transfer of power was signed between the Portuguese and FRELIMO in the September 1974 Lusaka Accord.⁵³ Most of the Mozambique refugees repatriated voluntarily back to Mozambique by 1975 when that country gained its independence leading to the closure of the settlement at Nyimba.

The second settlement was Lwatembo. It was established as a refugee settlement in 1966 to host refugees fleeing into Zambia from the liberation wars in Angola. It was

located in Zambezi District in North Western province. It was established on a piece of land, about twenty kilometres east of Zambezi Boma and three kilometers north of the M8 road.⁵⁴ The agricultural based rural settlement was originally designed to accommodate 2,000 refugees. However, by the end of 1966, the population of Angolan refugees at the settlement was more than 3,300.⁵⁵ This resulted in beginning of problems at the settlement in the year of inception.

The immediate problem was that there was a shortage of arable land for agriculture for a lot of the refugees.⁵⁶ As a solution to the problem, the authorities transferred 1,750 of the refugees out of Lwatembo to the settlement at Mayukwayukwa.⁵⁷ Mayukwayukwa which was designed for a population of 1,500 only had 500 refugees accommodated there before the transfer of the refugees from Lwatembo.⁵⁸ Another problem which Lwatembo suffered was that the soil was not good enough to provide a viable future for agriculture. This was a result of the fact that no proper soil surveys were conducted before inception to ascertain the viability of the area as a refugee settlement based on agriculture. A team of experts from the Food and Agriculture Organisation that surveyed the early Zambian settlements at Nyimba, Lwatembo and Mayukwayukwa in 1969 recommended that the government should allocate more land to the refugees.⁵⁹ They also suggested that the refugees must be allowed to engage in individual farming. The refugees at Lwatembo, like those at Mayukwayukwa and Nyimba, were not accustomed to the communal farming that was imposed on them by the government.

In 1970, the government decided to change the agriculture policy for refugee settlements from communal farming to individual holdings.⁶⁰ It was expected that the change in policy would provide greater motivation for the refugees to be more productive. This did not change much at Lwatembo because the settlement was earmarked for closure. The settlement was due to close because of unfavourable conditions and poor quality soils. The settlement never attained the self sufficiency that was originally envisioned for 1968. Lwatembo Refugee Settlement was closed down in 1971 when all its refugees were transferred to Maheba Refugee Settlement which became fully functional the same year.⁶¹

Maheba was the fourth agricultural refugee settlement to be established in Zambia. The third refugee settlement to be established was Mayukwayukwa, in 1966. Maheba was located in Solwezi District of North Western Province. It was situated some seventy kilometres south west of Solwezi Boma. The land was rectangular in shape, bounded in the west by the Meheba River. It extended up to the Protected Forest Area No. 105 in the north. The boundary in the south and south-east was the Mwafwe River. Maheba was established with an area of approximately 580 square kilometres.⁶²

Maheba Refugee Settlement became operational in 1971 to cater for Angolan refugees following the closure of Lwatembo in the same year. Other than those that were transferred from Lwatembo, already mentioned, the excess refugees at Mayukwayukwa were also transferred to Maheba leaving only 1,500.⁶³ Later arrivals

from Angola were taken to the settlement at Maheba. Maheba was established with better preparation than Nyimba, Lwatembo and Mayukwayukwa. Proper surveys were done to analyse the viability of establishing an agriculture-based refugee settlement which was intended to accommodate 10,000 refugees. Proper site selection was critical for future attainment of self-sufficiency. The three chief characteristics of a suitable settlement site were good soils, adequate rainfall (or a source of irrigation water), and sufficient drinking water.⁶⁴ Maheba qualified based on positive results in the above aspects. From inception, refugees at Maheba were given family plots of 5 hectares on which to grow crops.⁶⁵

The refugee population of 6,250 at Meheba in 1972 was encouraged to seriously engage in crop production. A variety of crops and vegetables were grown with good results. Initiatives were started in other non-crop income generating activities like poultry and fish farming. Improvement in food production at the settlement continued until after 1974 when prospects of Angolan independence seemed higher. The repatriation of hundreds and the possibility of repatriation in the near future had an unsettling effect at the settlement. This was evidenced by lack of enthusiasm among the refugees for increasing agricultural output.⁶⁶ The situation only improved after 1976 when the situation in Angola worsened again due to a civil war. This saw a new influx of Angolan refugees at the settlement. Refugees realized that they would not return home soon.

More land was cleared to equip the settlement for more agricultural activities. Measures for self-sufficiency were put in place to assist the Maheba refugees whose numbers had reached 12,700 in 1977.⁶⁷ The measures included the provision of agricultural equipment and fertilizers. The road network was also improved for marketing purposes. A farmers' cooperative was established to sell produce and assist in acquiring of agriculture inputs like seeds, fertilizers, insecticides and even equipment. In addition, there were improvements in terms of education and health. Training was extended to the refugees in skills like carpentry, baking, home crafts and sewing. The presence of considerable numbers of urban refugees among the new arrivals necessitated the planning for more diversified activities such as light industry and small businesses at the settlement.⁶⁸

Maheba was declared as a self sufficient settlement by the UNHCR in April 1982.⁶⁹ With this declaration, international assistance provided through UNHCR ceased and the responsibility for further assistance to the refugees rested with the Zambian government. This meant that refugees would receive services at the same level as the nationals in the surrounding villages. The declaration of self sufficiency is normally followed by the handover by the UNHCR to the host government of full responsibility of the refugee settlement. In 2013 at the end of this study, Maheba Refugee Settlement was hosting a total of 17,622 occupants from different countries. These included the following refugees: 6,127 Congolese, 1,513 Rwandese, 703 Burundese, 307 Somalis; and 6,778 former Angolan refugees.⁷⁰

Although the settlements at Nyimba, Lwatembo, and Mayukwayukwa began performing their roles of hosting refugees earlier, their existence became legitimised under the laws of Zambia by the Declaration of Reception Areas Order. This was embodied in Statutory Instrument 133 of 1971 under the Refugee (Control) Act of 1970.⁷¹ This Instrument by the Minister determined the areas to be used for the purpose of hosting refugees. When this Instrument came into being, Lwatembo was in the process on being shut down and the opening of the settlement at Maheba was underway. Maheba Refugee Settlement was also legalised by the same Instrument.

Ukwimi was the last agriculture-based refugee settlement that was established in Zambia covered by the scope of the study. Ukwimi Refugee Settlement was, probably, one of the best implemented agricultural settlement programmes for refugees in Africa.⁷² The international humanitarian community widely promoted it as a model for development assistance to refugees. It was created in 1987 by Statutory Instrument 86 under the Refugee (Control) Act.⁷³ Ukwimi was located in Petauke District in Eastern Province. The rectangular 150 kilometre square area that was prepared for the establishment of the settlement had the Lusandwa River and Kisangani River as boundaries on the north and west respectively.⁷⁴ Subsequent extensions doubled the area to make it 300 kilometer squares.⁷⁵ It was situated 62 kilometres from Petauke Boma.

Ukwimi Refugee Settlement was established to accommodate refugees fleeing from the Mozambique civil war. The intensification of the internal conflict in Mozambique

in 1985 resulted in the influx of 3,000 Mozambican refugees in Zambia's Eastern Province. Most of these refugees were peasant farmers that fled from Tete Province of Mozambique.⁷⁶ This continued in 1986 and 1987 until 23,000 refugees were spread along the border districts of Chadiza, Petauke and Katete.⁷⁷ The Zambian government together with UNHCR in 1987 decided to move the refugees from the border areas to the newly formed Ukwimi Refugee Settlement. The Zambia Red Cross Society was tasked to be in charge of the transportation of the refugees to the new settlement since it had been responsible for the relief operations in the border areas.⁷⁸

The planning of the settlement at Ukwimi was done well. Even the infrastructure was of a higher standard compared to the earlier settlements.⁷⁹ The challenges that had been encountered at the other refugee settlements equipped the stakeholders at Ukwimi to plan adequately. The settlement was set up in form of neatly demarcated groups of villages in which house plots were separated from farming plots. The refugee households were on arrival each allocated 2 hectares of land and a plot for a family house. They were also provided a settlement start-up kit for the first two years. At inception, the refugees at Ukwimi were expected to be self sufficient by the year 1990. The projected target year for self sufficiency was later pushed to 1991. This was because of an initial low turnout of refugees at the settlement. For instance, only 3,000 refugees were settled at the settlement after a year of operation due to their reluctance to move from the border.⁸⁰

The refugees benefitted from extensive infrastructure investment and development which included schools, clinics, markets, bore hole water points, grinding mills, a police station, a guest house and staff houses. The settlement was furnished with road infrastructure that was quickly done and of a good standard. A 67 kilometre road was constructed to link the settlement to Petauke town. In addition, feeder roads spanning a length of 290 kilometres were constructed to link villages with other units within Ukwimi. This advantaged the refugees who had undergone skills training at the settlement and especially the ones that had been introduced to some income generating activities like piggery and poultry. These activities needed a good link to the market. Most of the refugees underwent training in skills like sewing, weaving, carpentry and brick.

Ukwimi was closed down as a refugee settlement in 1995 after the removal of all the refugees there. The facility was subsequently handed to GRZ on 24th March 1995.⁸¹ The closure and handover of the settlement followed a series of events that had started with the repatriation of 2,500 refugees back to Mozambique on a trial basis organised by UNHCR in 1993.⁸² In 1994, UNHCR in close coordination with GRZ undertook a repatriation programme that saw the voluntary repatriation of 17,000 Mozambican refugees from Ukwimi back to their country of origin.⁸³ The few non-Mozambican refugees that were at Ukwimi were moved to Maheba Refugee Settlement. The Government of Zambia in association with UNHCR decided to reopen Ukwimi Refugee Settlement in 2001 for the relocation of Angolan refugees that were actively involved in political and military activities in their country before

fleeing into Zambia.⁸⁴ The settlement received refugees from other settlement and camps that were deemed a security risk. By June 2002 the population at Ukwimi was at 2,412 persons.⁸⁵ Ukwimi was deactivated and closed down for the second time in 2008.

Kala and Mwange were refugee camps that had a lot in common and were often referred to as a unit of two. The two camps were both established almost at the same time in the northern Zambia to host refugees from the DRC. Mwange Refugee Camp was situated in Mporokoso District in Northern Province. It was opened in May 1999 when refugees from the DRC began entering Zambia in March the same year. The refugees were fleeing from the volatile security situation in their country. There was intensified fighting between government troops and rebels in the DRC. Kala Refugee Camp was opened on 19th August 2000 to accommodate refugees from the DRC. The opening of Kala was necessitated by the fact that Mwange Refugee Camp, which was opened the year before, was full. The new camp was located in Kawambwa District of Luapula Province and situated 201 kilometers from the DRC border. Kala Refugee Camp was equipped to accommodate a refugee population of 25,000.⁸⁶

At inception, Kala and Mwange Refugee Camps were tailor-made as care and maintenance refugee camps to host refugees that were never expected to become self sufficient in food production. This was mostly because there was not enough land allocated to the refugees for sustainable agriculture. There were also no other opportunities that were available to the refugees to guarantee self sufficiency. The

refugees depended on the humanitarian agencies for their basic sustenance supplies like food, clothing, education and others. Refugees at both camps benefitted from WFP food baskets of maize, beans, salt and vegetable oil. The food basket consisted of 2,100 kilocalories per person per day which was considered enough.⁸⁷ However, the refugees showed efforts of attempting to supplement on what they received from the refugee humanitarian agencies.

The Zambian government planned to convert Mwanze Refugee Camp into an agricultural settlement in 2000. Plans were made to allocate 10,800 hectares of land to the refugees to enable them to engage in sustainable agricultural activities as a means of achieving self reliance in food production.⁸⁸ The aim was to reduce dependency on WFP food rations. The refugees at Kala and Mwanze engaged in agriculture in an introduced gardening programme where land was available. Mwanze was never converted into an agricultural settlement but an additional 5,400 hectares of land was allocated to the refugees in 2002.⁸⁹ Kala Refugee Camp, on the other hand, was extended by the allocation of 1,457 hectares of land for agricultural purposes in 2000. This land allocation benefitted 1,029 Kala refugee households.⁹⁰ As a result of these efforts, tangible strides were made in the production of food among the refugees in both camps. For instance, in 2002 when WFP distributed only 50 per cent of the programmed food rations for the refugees due to funding shortfalls, the refugees at Mwanze Refugee Camp sold 35 metric tons of beans.⁹¹

Both Kala and Mwanze were vacated and closed down by the end of 2010. This was due to successful repatriation of the refugee population. A total of 43,188 refugees from the two camps were repatriated back to the DRC between 2007 and 2010.⁹² The repatriation was facilitated by the government of Zambia, in collaboration with the authorities in the DRC, UNHCR and International Organisation for Migration (IOM). The refugees that were not willing to return to their home country were relocated to Meheba Refugee Settlement which was located some 1,500 kilometres away. In total, 2,087 Congolese refugees were relocated from the two camps to Maheba the same year.⁹³

Nangweshi Refugee Camp was created in January 2000 to host refugees fleeing from Angola. The refugee camp was situated on the western bank of the Zambezi River in Shangombo District in Western Province. It was located 120 kilometres from the Angolan border.⁹⁴ The original refugees that found themselves at Nangweshi were mostly from the UNITA supporting Jamba area of Cuando Cubango Province. These refugees fled after the 1999 MPLA offensive against UNITA that led to the eventual fall of the UNITA head quarters in Jamba by 2000.⁹⁵ The refugees that crossed into the region at this time were guided to transit centres in Shangombo and Kalabo Districts of western Zambia. Both these transit centres were at risk because they were too close to the border. The Zambian authorities, UNHCR and IOM tried to settle the refugees elsewhere quickly. This proved to be a difficult task because the road conditions were bad and impassible in the rain season. The situation sometimes got so

bad that even airlifting of refugees from these areas was suspended because runways became flooded.⁹⁶ They were finally transported to the refugee camp at Nangweshi.

The first crop of refugees at the camp was estimated to be about 14,812 by mid 2001.⁹⁷ This group of refugees was peculiar in that it was largely an urban population with high levels of education. This group of refugees consisted of people who were professionals, with a number that had served in the UNITA administration.⁹⁸ The later influx which began arriving around October 2001 was rural in nature and did not comprise a lot of educated refugees.

The presence of refugees that were seen to have been too politically involved or were former military personnel created tension at Nangweshi Refugee Camp. The Government in agreement with UNHCR sent all those that were deemed too political to Ukwimi Refugee Settlement which was reactivated in 2001 to specifically host such refugees. The prospects at Ukwimi were better in terms of opportunities for the refugees to produce food for themselves. This was because the refugees had more access to land.

The operations at Nangweshi led to the opening of an office in Mongu, the provincial head quarters of Western Province. This was aimed at decentralising its operations and also for closer monitoring.⁹⁹ The refugees at Nangweshi received food rations from WFP and were not expected to become self sufficient due to the fact that there was no land for them to grow enough for their sustenance. The refugees, however,

embarked on backyard gardening to supplement their food basket. Some engaged in income generating activities such as poultry, sewing, knitting and basket weaving.¹⁰⁰ The agencies involved in assistance of refugees at Nangweshi faced a lot of challenges in the extension of care and maintenance operations because of the location and access to the camp.

The Zambian government closed down Nangweshi Refugee Camp in November 2006. The reason was that the camp was located in an area that was too remote. This generally caused a lot of difficulties in giving humanitarian assistance as a result of bad terrain, seasonal floods and impassable roads.¹⁰¹ The refugees at the camp were given the option to either repatriate to their homeland or to relocate to Mayukwayukwa where they would receive land and better prospects for self reliance. The task of moving the refugees regardless of their choice was taken up by the Zambian authorities, UNHCR and IOM. In October 2006, out of the 15,000 Angolan refugees at Nangweshi, 4971 were relocated to Mayukwayukwa, and 2,140 were repatriated to Angola.¹⁰² The rest repatriated themselves on their own. The assets at the camp were handed over to the Zambian government.¹⁰³ These included several office blocks, staff houses, a police station, a guest house, two clinics, eight primary and two secondary schools, a mechanical workshop, water points and hammer mills.¹⁰⁴

In conclusion, it can be stated that the establishment of organised refugee settlements in Zambia was necessitated by a number of factors which worked as a framework on

how the Zambian government accommodated the refugees flowing into its boundaries. Mayukwayukwa existed as a product of many factors and was unique in its own right. This is stated in light of the fact that the settlement was never modeled by the tenets of international or national law, but by a blend of many factors that came into play. The existence of other refugee settlements and camps that were established in Zambia in the period under discussion lent some lessons to the stakeholders on how best to host refugees. In the same vein, the refugee settlement at Mayukwayukwa benefitted greatly from the experiences of the other refugee settlements. The settlement went through many changes in and around Zambia but continued to exist as others closed down. The experiences and existence of Mayukwayukwa as a refugee settlement, discussed in the next chapter, did not occur in isolation of other refugee hosting areas in Zambia.

ENDNOTES

- 1 United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), **Convention and Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees**, p.5
- 2 UNHCR, **Convention and Protocol**, p.5
- 3 UNHCR, **Report of the UNHCR to the General Assembly**, Supplement No. 12 (A/8012), 1st January 1971, para. 25.
- 4 United Nations (UN), **Activities of the United Nations and its Family of Agencies in Zambia**, (Lusaka: United Nations Development Programme, 1967), p.40
- 5 UNHCR, **Report of the UNHCR to the General Assembly**, Supplement No. 12 (A/5511Rev.1), 1st January 1964, para. 70.
- 6 A. Betts, G. Loescher, and J. Liner, **The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR): The Politics and Practice of Refugee Protection**, (New York: Routledge, 2008), p. 25.
- 7 Betts, et al, **The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees**, p. 26.
- 8 Betts, et al, **The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees**, p. 26.
- 9 UNHCR, **Report of the UNHCR to the General Assembly**, Supplement No. 12 (A/6711), 1st January 1968, para. 86.
- 10 UN, **Year Book of the United Nations** (1966), p. 399.
- 11 UN, **Year Book** (1966), p. 403.
- 12 UN, **Year Book** (1966), p. 403.
- 13 J. Colombey, (ed), **Collection of International Instruments and Other Legal Texts Concerning Refugees and Displaced Persons**, vol. 2, (Geneva: UNHCR, 1995), p. 39.
- 14 UNHCR, **Report of the UNHCR to the General Assembly**, Supplement No. 12 (A/6311), 1st January 1966, para. 63.
- 15 UNHCR, **Report**, (A/6711), 1968, para. 73.
- 16 Colombey, **Collection of International Instruments**, vol. 2, p. 3.

-
- 17 Colombey, **Collection of International Instruments**, vol. 2, p. 3.
- 18 Colombey, **Collection of International Instruments**, vol. 2, p. 4.
- 19 UNHCR, **Report**, (A/8012), 1971, para. 25.
- 20 C. Lamont, **The Philosophy of Humanism**, (New York: Humanist Press, 1997), pp. 33 – 36.
- 21 Lamont, **The Philosophy**, p. 33.
- 22 This study refers to it as Kaunda’s Humanism because Humanism was not enshrined in the constitution of Zambia. Even the constitution of Kaunda’s political party, United National Independence Party, referred to it as African Socialism.
- 23 B. J. Olivier, ‘Kaunda’s Zambia’, **Africa Insight**, 11, 1 (1981), p. 33.
- 24 K. D. Kaunda, **Humanism in Zambia: and a Guide to its Implementation, Part 1**, (Lusaka: Zambia Information Services, [No publication year]), p. 5.
- 25 Kaunda, **Humanism in Zambia**, p. 5.
- 26 GRZ, Ministry of Development Planning and National Guidance, ‘Hand-Outs on Humanism’, (Lusaka, November 1972), p. 9.
- 27 E. Colson, ‘The Plateau Tonga of Northern Rhodesia’, in E. Colson and M. Gluckman, **Seven Tribes of British Central Africa**, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1959), p. 131.
- 28 R. Papstein, ‘From Ethnic Identity to Tribalism: The Upper Zambezi Region of Zambia, 1830 – 1981’, in L. Vail, (ed), **The Creation of Tribalism in Southern Africa**, (Oxford: University of California Press, 1989), p. 373.
- 29 A. Hansen, ‘Refugee Dynamics: Angolans in Zambia 1966 to 1972’, **International Migration Review**, 15, 12 (Spring – Summer, 1981), p. 175.
- 30 Republic of Zambia, Laws of Zambia, Chapter 120 Section 4(1)
- 31 Jeff Crisp and Karen Jacobsen, ‘Refugee Camps Reconsidered’ in **Forced Migration Review**, 3 (December 1998), p. 28.
- 32 B. Stein, ‘Refugee Integration and Older Refugee Settlements in Africa’, (American Anthropological Association, 28th November 1990) @ www.msu.edu/course/pls/461/stein/FINAL.htm [Accessed 22/05/14. No page numbers]

-
- 33 Richard Black, 'Putting Refugees in Camps' in **Forced Migration Review**, 2 (August 1998), p. 6.
- 34 Black, 'Putting Refugees', p. 6.
- 35 UNHCR, **Report of the UNHCR to the General Assembly**, Supplement No. 12 (A/32/12), 2nd September 1977, para. 162.
- 36 UNHCR, **Report of the UNHCR to the General Assembly**, Supplement No. 12 (A/7612), 1st January 1970, para. 160.
- 37 UNHCR, **Report**, (A/8012), 1971, para. 137.
- 38 Chapter 120 Section 4(1) of the Laws of Zambia
- 39 P. Briggs, **Mozambique**, (Guilford: The Globe Pequot Press, 1997), p. 14.
- 40 Reuters, 'Zambia: Refugees from Mozambique Flee to Zambia. Being Rehoused by Government', 5th January 1966.
<http://www.itnsource.com/en/shotlist/RTV/1966/01/05BGY506020337/?5>
[Accessed 12/03/14]
- 41 NAZ/EP 4/20/82, Frelimo File, Mbita, E. C., District Secretary, Katete, to Chief Immigration Officer, Lusaka, 22nd September 1971.
- 42 UNHCR, (A/6711), 1968, para. 167.
- 43 UNHCR, **Report**, (A/8012), 1971, para. 137.
- 44 UNHCR, **Report**, (A/6711), 1968, para. 167.
- 45 UNHCR, **Report**, (A/6711), 1968, para. 168.
- 46 UNHCR, **Report**, (A/6711), 1968, para. 165.
- 47 UNHCR, **Report**, (A/8012), 1971, para. 137.
- 48 UNHCR, **Report of the UNHCR to the General Assembly**, Supplement No. 12 (A/7211), 1st January 1969, para. 176.
- 49 NAZ/EP 4/20/82, Frelimo File, V. M. Moonga, Immigration Officer in Charge, Petauke, to Chief immigration Officer, Lusaka, 8th October 1973.
- 50 NAZ/EP 4/20/82, Frelimo File, H. S. Lubinda, District Secretary, Petauke, to

the Commissioner for Refugees, Lusaka, 5th March 1972

- 51 UNHCR, **Report of the UNHCR to the General Assembly**, Supplement No. 12 (A/9012), 1st January 1973, para. 50.
- 52 UNHCR, (A/8412), 1972, para. 116.
- 53 Briggs, **Mozambique**, p. 15.
- 54 Republic of Zambia, Laws of Zambia, Chapter 120 Section 4(1)
- 55 UNHCR, **Report**, (A/6711), 1968, para. 163.
- 56 UNHCR, **Report**, (A/7211), 1969, para. 179.
- 57 UNHCR, **Report**, (A/7211), 1969, para. 179.
- 58 UNHCR, **Report**, (A/6711), 1968, para. 163.
- 59 UNHCR, **Report**, (A/7612), 1970, para. 186.
- 60 UNHCR, **Report**, (A/8412), 1972, para. 160.
- 61 UNHCR, **Report**, (A/8412), 1972, para. 161.
- 62 Republic of Zambia, Laws of Zambia, Chapter 120 Section 4(1)
- 63 UNHCR, **Report**, (A/8412), 1972, para. 160.
- 64 Stein, 'Refugee Integration', [No page number]
- 65 UNHCR, **Report of the UNHCR to the General Assembly**, Supplement No. 12 (A/9012), 1st January 1973, para. 118.
- 66 UNHCR, **Report of the UNHCR to the General Assembly**, Supplement No. 12 (A/31/12), 1st January 1976, para. 158.
- 67 UNHCR, **Report of the UNHCR to the General Assembly**, Supplement No. 12 (A/33/12), 12th September 1978, para. 156.
- 68 UNHCR, **Report**, (A/32/12), 1977, para. 159.
- 69 UNHCR, **Report of the UNHCR to the General Assembly**, Supplement No. 12 (A/3812), 1st January 1983, para. 110.

-
- 70 UNHCR, 'UNHCR Operation in Zambia: Fact Sheet', (1st March 2014), p.1.
- 71 Republic of Zambia, Laws of Zambia, Chapter 120 Section 4(1)
- 72 R. Black, T. Mabwe, F. Shumba and K. Wilson, 'Ukwimi Refugee Settlement: Livelihood and Settlement Planning for Mozambicans in Zambia', (unpublished report, Oxford Refugee Studies Programme, 1990), p. 1.
- 73 Republic of Zambia, Laws of Zambia, Chapter 120 Section 4(3)
- 74 A. M. Gray, 'Emplacing Displacement: Cultural Landscapes of Refugee – hosting in Ukwimi, Zambia', (PhD Thesis, University of Kansas, 2009), p. 181.
- 75 Black, et al, 'Ukwimi Refugee Settlement', p. 2.
- 76 Lassially-Jacob, V. 'Refugee – Host Interactions: A Field Report from Ukwimi Mozambican Refugee Settlement, Zambia', **Refuge**, 13, 6 (October 1993), p. 24.
- 77 M. B. Anderson, **Ukwimi Refugee Settlement: A Gender Case Study**, (UNHCR, 1991), p. 4.
- 78 Anderson, **Ukwimi Refugee Settlement**, p. 6.
- 79 Black, et al, 'Ukwimi Refugee Settlement', p. 6.
- 80 Anderson, **Ukwimi Refugee Settlement**, p. 4.
- 81 UN, 'UNHCR Activities Financed by Voluntary Funds: Report for 1994 – 1995 and Proposed Programmes and Budget for 1996', 12th July 1995, (A/AC.96/846/part1/23), para. 6.
- 82 UN, 'UNHCR Activities Financed by Voluntary Funds: Report for 1993 – 1994 and Proposed Programmes and Budget for 1995', 19th August 1994, (A/AC.96/825/part1/23), para. 6.
- 83 UN, 'UNHCR Activities', 12th July 1995, para. 3.
- 84 UNHCR, **Mid – Year**, (2001), p. 129.
- 85 UNHCR, **Mid – Year Progress Report**, (2002), p. 130.
- 86 UNHCR, 'Thousands of Angolan Refugees in Zambia Wait for Resettlement as Camps Reach Capacity', **News Stories**, 28th January 2002.
- 87 UNHCR, **Mid – Year Progress Report**, (2001), p. 130.

-
- 88 UNHCR, **Mid – Year Progress Report**, (2000), p. 115.
- 89 UNHCR, **Mid – Year**, (2002), p. 131.
- 90 UNHCR, **Mid – Year**, (2001), p. 130.
- 91 UNHCR, **Mid – Year**, (2002), p. 131.
- 92 UNHCR, ‘Curtains Close on Mwange and Kala Refugee Camps’, **UNHCR Zambia Newsletter** (2010), p. 9.
- 93 UNHCR, ‘Curtains Close’, p. 9.
- 94 Kris Janowski, ‘Zambia: Angolans Transferred Away from Border’, Briefing Notes, 17th March 2000 @ <http://www.unhcr.org/3ae6b81c20.html> [Accessed 16th June 2014]
- 95 Integrated Regional Information Networks (IRIN), ‘Angola – Zambia: Security Fears Among Refugees’, **Humanitarian News and Analysis**, 10th August 2001 @ <http://www.irinnews.org/printreport.aspx?reportid=24751> [accessed 28th July 2014]
- 96 Janowski, ‘Zambia: Angolans Transferred Away from Border’.
- 97 UNHCR, **Mid – Year**, (2001), p. 129.
- 98 O. Bakewell, 'Review of the CORD Community Services for the Angolan Refugees in Western Province of Zambia', (UNHCR, 2002), p. 13.
- 99 UNHCR, **Mid – Year**, (2000), p. 114.
- 100 UNHCR, **Mid – Year**, (2001), p. 129.
- 101 UNHCR, ‘Zambia’s Nangwesh Camp Closes After Last Group of Angolans Move Out’, **News Stories**, 20th November 2006 @ <http://www.unhcr.org/4561d52b2html> [Accessed 2nd March 2014]
- 102 UNHCR, ‘UNHCR Closes Refugee Camp, Gives Assets to Zambia’, **News Stories**, 21st December 2006 @ <http://www.unhcr.org/458aa75a4html> [Accessed 10th January 2014]
- 103 Tikambenji Njovu Munkombwe, Program Assistant, UNHCR, Lusaka, interviewed on 12th January 2015.
- 104 UNHCR, ‘UNHCR Closes Refugee Camp’.

CHAPTER THREE

MAYUKWAYUKWA'S EXISTENCE IN CHANGING TIMES



Figure 1

Mayukwayukwa Refugee Settlement, whose entrance is shown in *figure 1* above, existed throughout the scope of this study. The chapter illustrates the existence and experiences of the settlement at Mayukwayukwa in changing times between 1966 and 2013. These were changing times in that the political, ideological, economic, conceptual policies and atmosphere changed in and around the host nation Zambia. Since these policies and atmosphere were the core of the establishment of the settlement, any changes affected its existence.

The settlement at Mayukwayukwa encountered a lot of challenges in the early years. The initial challenge was that the refugees were reluctant to move to the new settlement in 1966. This was evidenced by the fact that the settlement which was

tailored to host a total of 1,500 refugees only had 500 occupants by the end of 1966.¹ Lwatembo Refugee Settlement on the other hand was overcrowded with 3,000 instead of the envisioned 2,000 refugees. Refugees shunned going to Mayukwayukwa probably because news of the hardships of the refugees at the earlier established settlement at Lwatembo had spread. Lwatembo acquired a bad reputation regarding bad conditions, health and deaths because ailing refugees were put in one place where they could receive treatment. Once refugees entered the settlement, they could no longer move out without permission from the authorities. As a result, overcrowding and psychological stress in the new environment inevitably led to high death frequency among new ailing refugees.²

The refugees that crossed over from Angolan territories that were further inside the country were often malnourished and weak.³ This was because of the long distance and hardships they endured on the journey to their refuge in Zambia. Among the initial emergency relief services that were provided to the refugees at Mayukwayukwa were the provision of medical aid and food rations. The relief providers faced the challenge of poor transportation infrastructure. The lack of passable roads connecting Mayukwayukwa to the rest of the country made transporting of emergency relief goods and services very difficult.

The Zambia Red Cross provided the emergency medical services while World Food Programme (WFP) provided the food rations that were distributed by Zambia Christian Refugee Service (ZCRS).⁴ The organisation that was operating and

registered in Zambia as ZCRS was an international Christian faith based non-governmental organisation that was internationally known as the Lutheran World Federation (LWF). It acted as an implementing partner in the tripartite running of Mayukwayukwa Refugee Settlement that included the Government of Zambia and UNHCR. The government provided the necessary administrative staff and security while UNHCR provided the technical personnel and funding.

The initial challenge of low numbers at Mayukwayukwa was overcome by the transfer of excess refugees from Lwatembo to Mayukwayukwa. In the period between April 1967 and March 1968, UNHCR and the government transferred a total of 1,750 refugees to Mayukwayukwa.⁵ This transfer solved the problems of low numbers at Mayukwayukwa and the overcrowding at Lwatembo which was housing more than 3,650 refugees. The settlement at Mayukwayukwa was reorganised to accommodate the transferred refugees by the clearing of more land for cultivation.⁶

From inception, the procedure at the settlement was that when refugees arrived, they were taken to reception areas within the settlement where emergency relief services were provided. After the vital demographic statistics were recorded, each refugee household was given a plot to build family accommodation. Since the Angolan refugees were rural in character and the fact that Mayukwayukwa was modeled as a rural settlement, the refugees initially built mud, pole and thatch houses. The houses were no different from the ones found in the surrounding host communities. These

houses were built using local materials that were available in the area. The refugees were given start-up kits to establish homes.

The start-up kits included full food rations of maize, dried fish, beans, cooking oil, salt and milk for the children.⁷ Also provided were kitchen utensils like pots, plates, knives, spoons and buckets. Other items provided for new entrants and continuously for the vulnerable refugees were clothing, blankets and soap. Land for agricultural purposes was also provided to the refugees at Mayukwayukwa. Free farming tools and inputs like hoes, seeds, fertilizer and even pesticides were provided for farming. The strategy was to empower the refugees to become self reliant food crop producers as soon as possible.

There was quick progress made at the settlement in the early years. For instance, the 1967/8 farming season saw about 26 hectares (64 acres) of land being cleared and sown with crops by the refugees.⁸ There was a further improvement in the next farming season where 81 hectares (200 acres) were planted with different crops like maize, beans, cassava and groundnuts.⁹ Other improvements that included the continued construction of infrastructure like houses for staff and teachers, a rural health centre and schools. By the 1968, there were 430 refugee children in school.¹⁰

However, the Zambian policy concerning agriculture in refugee settlements in the early years, as mentioned in previous chapters, favoured compulsory communal agricultural production. This method of production proved to be a challenge to the

refugees. Refugee households were expected to work together in groups on communal plots to produce their own food crops. Communal agricultural production at the refugee settlement was part of the national programme in Zambia that was aimed at ending the nation's reliance on the small group of European farmers and emergent African farmers that were dominating the food production sector at independence and after. The programme of producer cooperatives and communal production units was initiated in 1965 as a vehicle for bringing thousands of peasants into the cash economy producing marketable surpluses.¹¹

The refugees at Mayukwayukwa were not familiar with communal farming practices.¹² The problem was that the refugees were accustomed to the traditional method of producing food as individual household units. In the period between April 1968 and March 1969, the government attempted to alleviate this problem by agreeing to allocate individual household plots of land so that the refugee households could grow crops of their choice.¹³ The plan was that the individual household plots would be worked on in addition to the communal cultivation. This, however, did not solve the problem because the allocated household plots were only quarter of an acre in size. These pieces of land were too small for any meaningful agricultural ventures.¹⁴

Among the early major changes at the settlement was the government's decision to reverse the land utilisation agricultural policy for refugee settlements in 1970.¹⁵ The policy was changed from communal farming to which the refugees were

unaccustomed to individual household holdings. The development saw the allocation of 5 hectare farm plots to individual households to cultivate as they pleased. These changes were influenced by the hardships that were encountered by the refugees as a result of the compulsory communal agricultural system at settlements like Lwatembo, Mayukwayukwa and Nyimba.

Another significant development that occurred was with regards to the administration of the refugee settlement. This was the enactment of the Refugee (Control) Act of 1970. A requirement of this law was that persons seeking refuge in Zambia should obtain entry permits within seven days of arrival on Zambian soil. After the acquisition of entry permits, refugees were then expected to proceed to designated refugee areas. It was made law that refugees were to reside only in designated refugee areas. The Act also legitimised the existence of Mayukwayukwa Refugee Settlement as a designated refugee hosting area under the laws of Zambia.¹⁶ The administration of each refugee settlement was under a Refugee Officer (RO).¹⁷ The RO was the most senior representative of the government at the settlement and was appointed from the office of the Commissioner for Refugees. This was a department of the Ministry of Home Affairs that was responsible for refugee matters.

The major task of the RO was to ensure that settlement was administered in an orderly and efficient manner. The control of the refugees at the settlement was also cardinal in his duties. It was in his job description to ensure that there was good reception, treatment, health and general well being of the refugees in the settlement.

He was even authorised to use his discretion to issue entry permits to refugees. All activities at the settlement had to be sanctioned by him including projects, assemblies, entries and departures of refugees and non refugees. The RO had authority over all other Zambian government officials working in the settlement as well as the NGO staff and of course the refugee leadership structure.

The top refugee leadership structure at Mayukwayukwa consisted of Village Development Committees (VDCs). The settlement was demarcated into sectors which were commonly known as villages or camps. Each village had a VDC comprising a chairperson, a vice chair person and a secretary. The VDC was elected by the refugees in routine elections that were observed by the RO's office and UNHCR representatives. The VDC chairperson was the head of the village and the point of contact for the RO, UNHCR and NGOs working in the settlement area.¹⁸ Also present at the settlement were Neighbourhood Watch Committees to help maintain security in the villages. These Neighbourhood Watch Committees consisted of refugees and had the support of the police.

A point to note is that the Zambian authorities avoided the recognition of traditional leadership structures among the refugees at the settlement. For instance, in 2002, there was a refugee who was a senior chief of the Mbundu at the settlement.¹⁹ He was not allowed to carry out his duties as a chief because of the ethnic diversity of the refugees at the settlement. This was to avoid ethnic divisions in the refugee villages.

Refugee villages at Mayukwayukwa were formed according to the arrival of refugee groups as opposed to following ethnicity. The oldest villages were made by the early caseloads of refugees that settled in the sixties and seventies. This caseload consisted mainly of the Mbunda, Chokwe and Luchazi ethnic groups from Moxico Province OF Angola. The arrivals of 1999 were mostly of Mbundu ethnicity from the inland central highlands of Angola. These were placed in 20 new villages adjacent to the old caseload while those that followed after 2000 were placed in an extension to the settlement. The area was known as Shibanga. The extension was approximately 10km from the administrative centre. Shibanga had 26 villages which brought the number to 56 villages at Mayukwayukwa in 2002 when it hosted the biggest number of refugees.²⁰

Another development that had an effect on Mayukwayukwa was the establishment of Maheba Refugee Settlement in Solwezi District in 1971. The new settlement was created to accommodate 10,000 refugees. This development acted in favour of Mayukwayukwa in that all the excess refugees were transferred to the new settlement the same year. The transfer left only 1,500 refugees at Mayukwayukwa, a figure it was initially planned for.²¹ Encouraging progress was also made with the remaining refugees with regard to communal participation and cooperative schemes. It was believed that these initiatives would prove advantageous to the refugees. At Mayukwayukwa, these were spearheaded by Zambia Christian Refugee Services (ZCRS) in the 1960s.

The cooperatives assisted the refugee communities to be more organised and better placed to acquire farming inputs and effectively participate in crop marketing. Such organisation also prepared them for economic independence and less dependence on handouts from humanitarian organisations. The cooperatives' structures and activities were self sustaining ventures that incorporated the refugee communities into the national development plans. Cooperatives were formed in activities like crop production, poultry, bee keeping, knitting, weaving, handcrafts and later fish farming. The development of cooperatives was in line with government directions for economic, social and cultural purposes. In his second reading speech for the Cooperative Societies Bill of 1970, Mr Kamanga, Minister of Rural Development emphasised that cooperative societies were a means of:

Firstly, improving the economic situation of members;
Secondly, contributing to the economy an increased measure of democratic control of economic activity. This is highly relevant in the light of recent Mulungushi Reforms;
Thirdly, increasing incomes and employment by a fuller utilisation of resources, including the bringing of new land into productive use, the marketing and processing of agricultural and natural products, the development of local industries and the processing of raw materials;
Fourthly, improving social and cultural conditions in housing, health and education;
Lastly, raising the level of general and technical knowledge of members of the societies.²²

Although many challenges were encountered in running of these cooperatives, the refugees at Mayukwayukwa were still actively involved in these activities to the very end of this study.

A change that greatly affected the existence of the settlement was its declaration as a self-reliant agricultural-based refugee settlement. The settlement was declared self-reliant by UNHCR in 1973. This saw the complete hand over of full administrative responsibility of the settlement to the Zambian government as of 1st July of the same year.²³ This was followed by reduced international assistance directed towards the settlement through UNHCR. This meant the end of UNHCR financial assistance and the beginning of full government responsibility for the financial and material needs of the refugees.

Assistance to Mayukwayukwa in terms of food rations from WFP had already drastically reduced in 1972. The reduction was mainly due to the transfer of surplus refugee population to the settlement at Maheba the previous year. Moreover the refugees at Mayukwayukwa had very good crop harvests the previous year despite the unexpected drought in the area.²⁴ The refugees also actively participated in various cooperative ventures that added to their earnings and made them less reliant on the relief food.

From the inception of the refugee settlement, increased attention was paid during initial project planning to ensure that the objective of projects included elements of self-sufficiency even within the care and maintenance programmes.²⁵ After the declaration of self sufficiency, the refugees at Mayukwayukwa were expected to produce their own food from the land like the surrounding local communities. Only the vulnerable refugees continued to receive food rations and occasional supplies like

blankets and soap from UNHCR. These included those with severe disabilities or chronically ill, elderly people without support systems, single headed households, child-headed households, children in foster arrangements, orphans and new arrivals.

The declaration of the settlement as self sustaining coincided with the worsening of Zambia's economic standing in the 1970s. This resulted in the straining of the ease with which the State could render assistance to the refugee problem. Mwanza and Seshamani pointed out that:

For nearly a decade since independence, Zambia was one of the most prosperous countries south of the Sahara. The inflow of a few thousand refugees hardly told [sic] on her economy. However, after the 'dual shock' to which the economy was subjected (the oil shock of 1973 and the copper shock of 1974), a declining trend set in and, by the early 80s, the situation became critical. Despite a number of attempts by the government to set the economic house in order, including an IMF/IBRD suggested programme, the crisis only deepened further and the country is still struggling to extricate itself from it.²⁶

The economic situation led to a decline in people's living conditions in the mid-1970s. This was coupled with declines in per capita incomes, currency devaluation, food price controls and subsidy reductions. The economic situation made it obvious that the refugees at Mayukwayukwa had to sustain themselves because it was apparent that little would come from the State in terms of handouts. The refugees at the settlement underwent the same economic conditions that were affecting the local communities in Zambia during the most of the 1970s, 1980s and 1990s.

The 1970s also saw the increased awareness among the stakeholders that the Angolan refugee problem would not end with the attainment of independence as had earlier

been anticipated. At the inception of Mayukwayukwa, the majority of the refugees were generated as a result of colonial rule and the liberation struggles. It was hoped that the attainment of independence in Angola would bring peace and security that would guarantee the repatriation of the refugees back to their land. However, this was not so, as the independence of Angola was shortly followed by a civil war that lasted up to 2002.

The liberation of Angola was secured in 1974 when the Portuguese African Empire fell. According to the Alvor Agreement, the independence of Angola was supposed to be followed by the formation of a tripartite government consisting of the MPLA, FNLA and UNITA liberation movements.²⁷ The proposed coalition government never took off because the three parties differed on personality, ideological and ethnic matters. The differences led the MPLA to use force to drive the FNLA and UNITA out of the capital, Luanda, where the party remained and declared the Peoples Republic of Angola on 11th November 1975. The two sidelined parties waged a civil war against the MPLA which quickly resulted in the decimation of FNLA in Angola. The UNITA forces survived decimation by retreating into the bush from where they continued to fight using guerrilla tactics of warfare with the support of present day DRC, United States of America and South Africa.²⁸ The MPLA successes during this period were due to the heavy military support by the Cubans and Soviets.²⁹

This development of the spoiled post-independence peace in Angola greatly affected the existence of Mayukwayukwa in that it became apparent that the Angolans would

remain at the settlement as refugees. This was different from the case of the Mozambicans at Nyimba Refugee Settlement who repatriated back to their country after the attainment of independence the same year as the Angolans. As discussed in the previous chapter, repatriations from Nyimba led to the closure of the settlement in 1975. Mayukwayukwa continued to host Angolan refugees because the civil war in Angola continued producing refugees and made it unsuitable for repatriation.

The failure to attain peace after the liberation of Angola led to new influxes of Angolan refugees into western Zambia especially in 1976.³⁰ The continued inflow of Angolans pushed the refugee population at Mayukwayukwa to 4,000, an average figure that remained until 1999.³¹ Most of the Angolan refugees that crossed into Zambia during this period were directed to the bigger Maheba Refugee Settlement. 1999 was a year that witnessed an escalation of fighting in Angola that forced thousands more refugees into Zambia. The refugees fled after the 1999 MPLA offensive against UNITA that led to the eventual fall of the UNITA head quarters in Jamba by 2000.³² This pushed the population at the Mayukwayukwa to rise to 14,000 refugees by the end of the year. The refugee numbers reached 19,215 by June 2001.³³ In 2002 when Zambia hosted its biggest refugee population, Mayukwayukwa was accommodating 24,000 refugees.³⁴ In a core document forming part of the report of State parties submitted to the UN on 13th July 2004, GRZ pegged the number of refugees in Zambia at the end of 2002 at 267,020.³⁵

Although the civil war continued to disrupt peace and security in Angola, attempts were made for the repatriation of refugees back to Angola when the situation calmed. For instance, the situation between the two warring parties in Angola calmed significantly after the signing of two peace agreements in the 1990s and another one in 2002. The belligerent forces both participated in the signing of peace agreements like the Bicesse Accords, the Lusaka Protocol and the Luena Accords.

The Bicesse Accords were signed in May 1991 and included the signing of an interim ceasefire agreement that went into effect on May 15, 1991.³⁶ Also in the accords were the institutionalisation of the democratic system, the establishment of government administration over all of Angola and the formation of a national army.³⁷ There was nearly eighteen months of relative peace that ensued in Angola. The peace was so promising that the country hosted its first ever multiparty presidential and parliamentary elections in September 1992.³⁸ The elections were organised and monitored with the help of the United Nations Angola Verification Mission II (UNAVEM II).³⁹ The election results, confirmed the MPLA in power in Angola. The UNITA leader, Jonas Savimbi, refused to accept that his party received fewer votes than the MPLA under Jose Eduardo dos Santos. Savimbi's rejection of the results of the elections led to the resumption of armed conflict throughout the country between his organisation and the Government of Angola in November 1992.⁴⁰

The other period of calm followed the signing of the Lusaka Protocol in November 1994.⁴¹ The Protocol mandated a flexible demobilisation timeframe, provided for

power sharing and gave the UN sufficient muscle and money to implement the accords.⁴² For four years, the two parties negotiated the demobilisation process and the political participation of UNITA in Angola. However, war resumed in 1998 when the MPLA government refused to continue with the negotiations.⁴³

The peace agreements that finally ended 27 years of civil war and brought lasting calm in Angola were the Luena Accords. These were signed between the MPLA – led Angolan army and UNITA after the death of Jonas Savimbi in February 2002. This was accompanied by the signing of a ceasefire agreement on 4th April the same year. The accords also provided for the implementation of the ceasefire through the demilitarisation, quartering and demobilisation of UNITA forces.⁴⁴

During the signing of the first two peace agreements, some refugees repatriated back to Angola from Mayukwayukwa. These repatriations were organized by the refugees themselves. UNHCR repatriation programmes of Angolan refugees from Mayukwayukwa and Maheba back to their country were only organised from 1996 to 1998.⁴⁵ The operations were suspended in June 1998 because the civil war intensified again. The failure of peace agreements forced refugees to return to the settlement. Some refugees that were found at Mayukwayukwa in December 2013 recounted how refugees, especially those that were settled in the local villages, went back to Angola during the election period.⁴⁶ Most refugees were said to have come back to Zambia because of the resumption of war.⁴⁷ However, very few were said to have left the settlement. A number of refugees had sold personal property and ceased self-

sufficiency activities in preparation for returning home.⁴⁸ It became necessary for UNHCR, Government, and the refugees to shift both the assistance programmes and overall strategy back into the care and maintenance mode.⁴⁹ The repatriations that were successful were those that were organised after the Luena Accords.

After the signing of the Luena Accords ceasefire, some refugees began to repatriate back to Angola in large numbers on their own. These were especially refugees that had crossed into Zambia in the 2001-2002 period when there was a food shortage in the organised refugee areas.⁵⁰ The UNHCR organised voluntary repatriation in Zambia started in 2003 under the tripartite agreement with the governments of Angola and Zambia.⁵¹

The first group of refugees to be repatriated under this programme from Mayukwayukwa consisted of 505 people on 4th October 2003.⁵² The refugees were taken on a four day trip, over 2,000 kilometres, to Cozombo in the Angolan province of Moxico. Thousands more were helped back home. The repatriation of Angolan refugees was so successful that it even led to the closure of Nangweshi Refugee Camp in 2006. This resulted in the transfer of 4,900 refugees from Nangweshi to Mayukwayukwa the same year because they did not wish to repatriate back to Angola.⁵³ These joined other refugees at Mayukwayukwa that were not yet ready to repatriate. The reasons why some refugees refused to repatriate to Angola are discussed in the next chapter.

Some refugees had to be given incentives for them to make the decision to repatriate. For instance, those that repatriated back to Angola were provided with personal basic assistance packages to start a new life. This included cooking equipment, seeds, agricultural and house building tools. On a bigger scale, UNHCR provided major incentives by making the receiving country more conducive for the returnees. This was important considering that the country had gone through decades of war destruction which was not very attractive to the refugees.

Between 2003 and 2006, UNHCR embarked on projects in Angola that saw the establishment of more UNHCR offices and the repair of roads, bridges and airstrips. A complex transport and logistics network for the repatriation programme was quickly formulated. The projects also included the construction and rehabilitation of over 220 wells and water points, 1,750 latrines, 75 health posts, and eight women's Empowerment Centres.⁵⁴ Training was also provided in issues such as malaria, HIV-AIDS, sexual and gender based violence and landmine awareness to the returning refugees. These developments provided Angola's refugees with both an incentive and the confidence to repatriate. Having lived in UNHCR-administered camps for many years, they knew and trusted the organisation and were inspired to return by the knowledge that UNHCR would be waiting for them on the other side of the border.

Under the repatriation programme which ended in 2007, over 74,000 refugees were helped home from the Zambian settlements to Angola.⁵⁵ An additional 2,500 refugees were assisted back to Angola after the cessation of the programme between 2007 and

2010.⁵⁶ From 2010 up to 2013, there was very little in terms of repatriation activities out of Mayukwayukwa and Zambia as a whole.

The cessation of the refugee status for Angolans was another change that concerned the existence of the settlement. Cessation of the refugee status for Angolans meant that the people that had fled that country and remained outside its borders would no longer be regarded as refugees by UNHCR and the host governments. The cessation clause for Angolan refugees entered into force on 30th June 2012.⁵⁷ This was based on the fact that Angola had enjoyed many years of peace and stability since 2002. The decision was made by UNHCR to stop the group determination of Angolans out of that country as refugees. Angolans had to make individual claims as to why they should be regarded as refugees because general peace and security had returned to that country.⁵⁸ The cessation saw the major constituents of Mayukwayukwa Refugee Settlement cease to be regarded as persons of concern. There were 8,061 Angolans out of 10,925 refugees at the settlement in mid 2012.⁵⁹ Most of the remaining Angolans at Mayukwayukwa were not ready to go back to Angola even after the cessation of their refugee status.

At the time of the cessation, Mayukwayukwa was also hosting refugees from the DRC, Somalia, Rwanda and Burundi. This was important to the existence of the settlement in that the fate of the settlement was no longer determined by the outcome of a single refugee nationality. This is in reference to Nyimba Refugee Settlement in Zambia's Eastern Province which was closed down in 1975 because Mozambican

refugees repatriated back to the home country after the attainment of independence from the Portuguese. The presence of considerable numbers of refugees from other countries at Mayukwayukwa meant that even if the Angolans repatriated, the settlement would not close down.

To conclude, it can be reiterated that from 1966 to 2013, Mayukwayukwa Refugee Settlement went through a lot of changes within and outside Zambia. The status of the settlement as the oldest agricultural refugee settlement in Zambia and Africa is hard-earned because the settlement has shown resilience and stamina to adapt to the changes that occurred in the period under discussion. The resilience of the settlement to perform its role was shown when some of the changes proved to be challenging to its existence. Other settlements and camps in Zambia closed down under similar circumstances but Mayukwayukwa continued to render a service to the refugees even after the period under discussion. The perception that refugees were hosted by the first president as a result of his cause to aid in the liberation of territories still under colonial rule were dispelled when the consecutive Presidents of Zambia, namely Frederick. T. J. Chiluba, Levy P. Mwanawasa, Rupiya B. Banda and Micheal C. Sata, continued with the spirit of hosting refugees. The new regimes hosted refugees not for the liberation cause but as acts of humanitarians.

ENDNOTES

-
- 1 UNHCR, **Report of the UNHCR to the General Assembly**, Supplement No. 12 (A/6711), 1st January 1968, para. 163.
 - 2 A. Hansen, 'Once the Running Stops: The Socio-economic Resettlement of Angolan Refugees (1966 – 1972) in Zambian Border Villages', (PhD Thesis, Cornell University, 1977), p.32.
 - 3 Hansen, 'Once the Running Stops', p.32.
 - 4 UNHCR, **Report of the UNHCR to the General Assembly**, Supplement No. 12 (A/7211), 1st January 1969, para. 181.
 - 5 UNHCR, **Report** (A/7211), 1969, para. 179.
 - 6 UNHCR, **Report** (A/7211), 1969, para. 179.
 - 7 A. Hansen, 'Refugee Dynamics: Angolans in Zambia 1966 to 1972', **International Migration Review**, 15, 12 (Spring – Summer, 1981), p. 188.
 - 8 UNHCR, **Report** (A/7211), 1969, para. 179.
 - 9 UNHCR, **Report of the UNHCR to the General Assembly**, Supplement No. 12 (A/7612), 1st January 1970, para. 183.
 - 10 UNHCR, **Report** (A/7612), 1970, para. 183.
 - 11 R. Kleeper, 'Zambian Agricultural Structure and Performance', in Ben Turok (ed), **Development in Zambia: A Reader**, (London: Zed Press, 1989), p. 140.
 - 12 UNHCR, **Report of the UNHCR to the General Assembly**, Supplement No. 12 (A/8012), 1st January 1971, para. 137.
 - 13 UNHCR, **Report** (A/7612), 1970, para. 184.
 - 14 UNHCR, **Report** (A/7612), 1970, para. 184.
 - 15 UNHCR, **Report of the UNHCR to the General Assembly**, Supplement No. 12 (A/9012), 1st January 1973, para. 118.
 - 16 Republic of Zambia, Laws of Zambia, Chapter 120 Section 4(1)
 - 17 Republic of Zambia, Laws of Zambia, Chapter 120 Section 13(2)

-
- 18 O. Bakewell, **Review of the CORD Community Services for the Angolan Refugees in Western Province of Zambia**, (UNHCR Evaluation and Policy Analysis Unit, December 2002), p. 12.
- 19 Bakewell, '**Review of the CORD**', 2002, p. 12.
- 20 Bakewell, '**Review of the CORD**', 2002, p. 12.
- 21 UNHCR, **Report** (A/7612), 1970, para. 162
- 22 Hansard N0. 24, National Assembly of Zambia, 8 – 11th December, 1970, (Lusaka: Government Printers, 1970), p. 60.
- 23 UNHCR, **Report** (A/9012), 1973, para. 119.
- 24 UNHCR, **Report** (A/9012), 1973, para. 118.
- 25 UNHCR, **Report of the UNHCR to the General Assembly**, Supplement No. 12 (A/41/12), 1st January 1986, para. 102
- 26 A. M. Mwanza and V. Seshamani, 'Refugees an Important Aspect of the Human Dimension of Africa's Economic Crisis: Zambia Case Study', (Cambridge: ASAUK Conference, 1988), p.10.
- 27 W. James III, **A Political History of the Civil War in Angola: 1974 – 1990**, (New Jersey: Translation Publishers, 1992), P.7.
- 28 K. Shilington (ed), **Encyclopedia of African History, Vol. 1**, (NY: Taylor and Francis group, 2006), p. 152.
- 29 James III, **A Political History**, P. 7.
- 30 UNHCR, **Report of the UNHCR to the General Assembly**, Supplement No. 12 (A/32/12), 1st January 1977, para. 158.
- 31 UNHCR, **Mid – Year Progress Report**, (2000), p. 115.
- 32 Integrated Regional Information Networks (IRIN), 'Angola – Zambia: Security Fears Among Refugees', **Humanitarian News and Analysis**, 10th August 2001 @ <http://www.irinnews.org/printreport.aspx?reportid=24751> [accessed 28th July 2014]
- 33 UNHCR, **Mid – Year Progress Report**, (2001), p. 128.
- 34 UNHCR, **Mid – Year Progress Report**, (2002), p. 129.

-
- 35 UN International Human Rights Instruments, ‘Core Document Forming Part of the Reports of States Parties: Zambia’, (HRI/CORE/1/Add.22/Rev.2, 21 March 2005), No page numbers @ <http://www.refworld.org/docid/43f307362.html> [Accessed 12/11/14]
- 36 C. Knudsen, A. Mundt and I. W.Zartman, **Peace Agreements: The Case of Angola**, (Report from the African Centre for Constructive Resolution of Disputes, 23rd October 2000), No page numbers @ <http://www.reliefweb.int/report/angola/peace-agreements-case-angola.html> [Accessed 23/12/14].
- 37 Knudsen, et al, **Peace Agreements**.
- 38 D. A. Bekoe, **Implementing Peace Agreements: Lessons from Mozambique, Angola and Liberia**, (Washington D. C., Palgrave Macmillan, 2008) p.61.
- 39 UNHCR, ‘Current Situation in Angola, Eligibility of Angolan Asylum Seekers and Treatment of Returnees’, (20th May 1998), No page numbers @ <http://www.refworld.org/docid/3ae6b31f1c.html> [Accessed 09/11/14].
- 40 UNHCR, ‘Current Situation in Angola’.
- 41 Bekoe, **Implementing Peace**, p. 61.
- 42 Knudsen, et al, **Peace Agreements**.
- 43 Bekoe, **Implementing Peace**, p. 61.
- 44 Human Rights Watch, ‘Angola: Struggling Through Peace: Return and Resettlement in Angola’, (15th August 2003, A1516) No page numbers @ <http://www.refworld.org/docid/3f4f592c2.html> [Accessed 09/02/15]
- 45 UNHCR, **2004 Country Operations Plan: Zambia**, (UNHCR, 2004), p. 1.
- 46 Interview with Joao Costa, Mayukwayukwa Refugee Settlement, 29th December 2014.
- 47 Interview with Gladys Catulo, Mayukwayukwa Refugee Settlement, 29th December 2014.
- 48 Interview with Hadukoma Wanga, Mayukwayukwa Refugee Settlement, 29th December 2014.
- 49 UNHCR, ‘Angolan Refugee Operation at a Glance’, in **UNHCR Global Report 1999**, (UNHCR: Geneva, 1999), p. 178.

-
- 50 UNHCR, **Mid – Year Progress Report**, (2002), p. 128.
- 51 UNHCR, **Zambia: Analysis of the Gaps in Protection of Refugees**, (UNHCR, September 2007), p.47.
- 52 UNHCR, ‘Organised Returns to Angola Reach 35,000, UNHCR Ups Pace Before Rains’, **UNHCR News Stories**, 9th October 2003 @ <http://www.unhcr.org/3f8582f84.html> [Accessed 18/11/14].
- 53 UNHCR, **UNHCR Global Report 2006, Zambia**, (June 2007), p. 307 @ <http://www.refworld.org/docid/466d1a7e2.html> [accessed 18 February 2014]
- 54 J. Crisp, J. Reira and R. Freitas, **Evaluation of UNHCR’s Returnee Reintegration Programme in Angola**, (UNHCR Policy Development and Evaluation Service Report, August 2008), P. 14.
- 55 UNHCR, **Zambia: Analysis of the Gaps**, p.47.
- 56 UNHCR, **Zambia: Analysis of the Gaps**, p.47.
- 57 UNHCR Spokesperson, A. Edwards, ‘End of Refugee Status for Angolan and Liberian Exiles this Weekend’, **Briefing Notes**, 29th June 2012 @ <http://www.unhcr.org/4fed82459.html> [Accessed 11/01/14].
- 58 UNHCR, **Implementation of the Comprehensive Strategy for Angolan Refugee Situation, including UNHCR’s Recommendation on the Applicability of the “Ceased Circumstances” Cessation Clauses**, (Geneva: UNHCR, 15th January 2012), p. 7.
- 59 Interview with Tikambenji Njovu Munkombwe, Program Assistant, UNHCR, Lusaka, 12th January 2015.

CHAPTER FOUR

MAYUKWAYUKWA AND THE ATTEMPTS AT LOCAL INTEGRATION

This chapter discusses the attempts that were made towards the local integration of Angolan refugees in western Zambia in the period between 1966 and 2013. Local integration, an important durable solution to the plight of refugees, was a legal, economic, socio-economic and political process. In some countries, refugees had the opportunity to integrate locally because the host country provided them with access to land or the labour market, while in others they remained confined to camps where they depended on assistance from the international community. Local integration involved the settling of refugees in areas where they were expected to be assimilated by the local host communities that welcomed them.

The refugee problem in Zambia from 1965 called for the employment of different strategies to solve it. Host countries like Zambia worked hand in hand with the UNHCR in finding solutions. UNHCR was mandated to facilitate the pursuit of three solutions: voluntary repatriation of refugees; their integration within their host countries; or their resettlement to third countries.¹ All three solutions were employed at Mayukwayukwa.² Resettlement as a solution was dependant on the willingness of third countries to accept the refugees. This was a burden sharing solution where refugee problem was transferred from one asylum country to another. Moreover, genuine cause had to exist to necessitate the moving of the refugees from the host country to another.³ In the case of the refugee problem at Mayukwayukwa involving

Angolan refugees, the most practical solution was local integration. The most preferred solution for most stakeholders was voluntary repatriation of refugees back to their countries of origin. However, this was dependant on the establishment of a peaceful environment in the refugee generating countries. As discussed in the previous chapter, peace was elusive in Angola from the 1960s up to 2002.

From UNHCR's point of view, the ideal situation with regards to refugee settlements as a form of local integration consisted of three main phases. The first was the land settlement phase which was followed by the second one known as the consolidation phase. The last one was the integration phase. The land settlement phase involved assisting of the refugees to settle on the allocated land and become self-supporting while the consolidation phase aimed at the promotion of a sense of community among the refugees. The integration phase involved the facilitation of the settlement into the larger social, political and economic life of the host countries.⁴ From inception of the refugee settlement at Mayukwayukwa, the government did not pursue this ideal settlement situation to the integration phase.

Like in most African countries, Zambia did not view settlements as vehicles for integration nor integration as a solution for the refugee problem. Settlements were viewed as a temporal solution and that the refugees would soon or later repatriate back to their countries of origin. This was probably because of the fact that the nation was still young, and later, began to face economic difficulties. The country was not ready to shoulder the full responsibility of accommodating the refugees once they

were integrated and naturalised as Zambian citizens. Only countries like Botswana, Tanzania and Burundi employed local integration as a solution to the refugee problem in the early decades of their independence.⁵ In the 1960s and 1970s for instance, Tanzania allowed refugees to self settle themselves in rural areas where they were offered land and integration services.⁶

The hesitancy of the host countries towards integration of settlement refugees stemmed from an unresolved dispute regarding the responsibility for refugees that divided low-income host countries from UNHCR and rich donor countries. These on the other hand viewed settlements as a durable solution which resulted into the local integration of the refugees and the termination of international assistance. In Zambia, this ambiguous situation continued throughout the sixties, seventies, eighties and the nineties. It was only after 2000 that the refugee policy direction began to change.

The change in policy was as a result of a situation at Mayukwayukwa where the surrounding host communities became poorer than the refugees they were hosting. This was because of continued international humanitarian assistance that was targeted at the refugee settlement for decades. This assistance was in terms of things like access to clean water, health services, education, opportunities and community services. Refugees were perceived to have better socio-economic opportunities by the locals. This perception was substantiated by the fact that refugee settlements were stocked with relief supplies like food, equipment, tools, blankets, soap and tents.⁷

Some of these items found themselves on sale on the black market. To the locals, it seemed as if the refugees had so much that they even had surplus for sale.

The refugee settlements also received a lot of infrastructure development spearheaded by international humanitarian agencies. For instance, Kaoma District had the highest number of hospital bed space in Western Province in 2000.⁸ It was second to Mongu in terms of the number of hospitals in the province. To appreciate this better, one has to bear in mind that Kaoma and Mongu had the largest population shares amounting to 21% each of the provincial population.⁹

Although UNHCR declared Mayukwayukwa as a self sustaining settlement in 1973, its presence and assistance was never completely withdrawn.¹⁰ This was because the refugee movement in and out of Mayukwayukwa never stopped. The protracted nature of the refugee problem in Western Province and the fact that the hosts were poorer than the refugees led to the development of the Zambia Initiative (ZI). This was a strategy aimed at developing the refugee-hosting areas to benefit both the hosting locals and the refugees. The major ambition of ZI was poverty reduction in the refugee hosting areas. The programme was initiated in three districts of Western Province of Zambia, namely, Kaoma, Senanga and Shangombo. These districts were chosen for initial implementation of the ZI for a number of reasons. According to Central Statistics Organisation reports, the region was one the poorest parts of Zambia and many refugees lived there.¹¹

The area around Mayukwayukwa was targeted, together with the area around the refugee camp at Nangweshi. In addition to those in organised refugee settlements, many self settled refugees lived in the border areas around these districts. Self settled refugees had been present in the province since the 1960s and earlier. These were invisible to the refugee assistance policies and created an extra burden on the host government's efforts to provide for its people. Lastly, the province had hosted refugees for a long time.

The ZI was based on the concept of development of local communities surrounding refugee hosting areas. It was aimed at alleviating and mitigating the negative impact of hosting refugees and the easing of tensions between the refugee population and the hosting community. It was a strategy to address the immediate needs in the identified districts which included food deficits, poor infrastructure, and limited access to public services and other economic opportunities. The idea was to take development projects in agriculture, education, health and infrastructure.¹² These were aimed at benefiting both the refugees and host communities. What was hoped for was the creation of an improved and conducive situation for the refugees to become productive members of the host communities. The ideal situation was that this would lead to social integration, peace, security and stability in the region. It was hoped that once development projects were implemented to benefit both the host and refugee communities, it would be easier for the local integration of refugees.

The initiative was incorporated into the Zambia's Fifth National Development Plan, the Government's Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP) and the Framework for the United Nations Development Assistance Fund which supported the Common Country Assessment (CCA) for Zambia.¹³ The initiative was also supported by donors like Japan, European Union, Denmark, Sweden, and United States of America (USA).¹⁴ In 2002, GRZ, with the support of UNHCR, invited representatives from these donors to conduct a field mission in Zambia to identify priority areas in which they could assist. The sectors of agriculture, education, health and infrastructure were targeted for donor aid.

Agriculture was the main economic activity of the population in Western Zambia. Focus was on improving the sector so as to improve the main source of income and employment generation. The expected result was poverty reduction in the province. Interventions were made towards improving animal production by tackling of animal health problems. In crop production, measures were taken to improve productivity through improved agriculture extension services and farming methods. Also targeted were input provision, water control and plant protection. Even fish farming was earmarked for support.

The health sector was targeted because the health of the people was a priority if their living standards were to be improved in order to contribute to poverty reduction. The ZI projects focused on improvement and extension of essential services, logistical support to the referral system as well as health infrastructure, equipment and

provision of essential drugs. Both preventive and curative aspects of the sector were targeted.

In the education sector, projects were aimed at improving the quality, access, and equity of services to refugees and host communities. The objective was to promote human development for improved productivity. The projects were aimed at improving education infrastructure, provision of education materials, training of teachers and the provision of a conducive environment. Incentives like housing and access to clean water were given to teachers so that they remained in the rural areas. Vocational training was taken into consideration as part of improving life sustenance skills of both host and refugee communities. The ZI projects also aimed at improving infrastructure like road networks, bridges and even the protection of the environment.

The ZI had the support of many stakeholders in Zambia. The support was pledged when the ZI Donor Field Mission held consultative discussions with the major stakeholders between 18th and 28th March 2002. Discussions were held with the Litunga, the Barotse Royal Establishment and other traditional leaders in the province.¹⁵ Further discussions were held with the government administration at national, provincial and district levels. The government facilitated the Inter-Ministerial Committee (IMC) in Lusaka and sector departments in the province to present situational analyses and proposals to address the problems that were obtaining in the refugee hosting areas.¹⁶ Host and refugee communities and the civil society were also consulted and requested to offer full participation.

Community participation of both the hosts and the refugees was witnessed in the formation of Local Development Committees (LDC). The LDCs were the basic operating unit of the ZI in the field. Each LDC consisted of 8 – 10 villages which made up one constituency.¹⁷ Where possible, LDCs consisted of six elected representatives preferably from both the hosts and the refugee communities. By 2004, there were a total of 22 LDCs in the province. Kaoma had 10 LDCs while Senanga and Shangombo each had 10 LDCs. The LDCs were instrumental in identifying local needs and the recipients of the projects. For instance, their influence helped in the efficiency and return of loans under the ZI. The refinement of the planning and preparatory processes of the ZI intensified in 2002 and continued in 2003 when the programme was implemented. The framework for ZI existed for some years but the actual implementation started in April 2003 when the funding for projects under the same reached the province.¹⁸

The ZI was a model under the Development through Local Integration (DLI) which was part of UNHCR's Convention Plus initiatives.¹⁹ The DLI was a proactive strategy aimed at showing how refugees should play positive roles in broader contexts of local development. Alternative models to the traditional "Care and Maintenance" and local settlement dated back to the 1960s when strategies like the Integrated Zonal Development Approach (IZDA) were pursued.²⁰

The 1980s witnessed the propagation of Refugee Aid and Development (RAD). This was a strategy that stipulated that assistance should, right from the onset, be development oriented, enhance refugee self-reliance and incorporate support to refugee hosting areas. This strategy was applied in both the International Conferences on Assistance to Refugees in Africa (ICARA I and ICARA II) of 1981 and 1984 respectively.²¹ The same approach was also employed by international NGOs in South Africa to integrate Mozambican refugees.²²

Both the IZDA and RAD approaches were later abandoned due to lack of funds and the divergence of objectives between host countries and donors. Donors probably withheld funding when their objectives of local integration were not supported by the host countries. Attention to these strategies was diverted towards repatriation and reintegration as durable solutions especially in the 1990s.²³

In the early 2000s, UNHCR introduced new approaches known as Targeted Development Assistance (TDA). The central characteristic was the focus on the needs of both the refugees and host communities.²⁴ During the same time, DLI and Development Assistance and Refugees (DAR) were conceived. The DLI approach was conceived to promote local integration while DAR promoted self sufficiency. The DLI strategy was based on case study of the ZI which promoted local integration of Angolan refugees in Zambia. The DAR strategy on the other hand was based on the Ugandan Self Reliance Strategy (SRS) model.²⁵ The ZI was not only important

for Zambia's refugee situation, but was also as a pilot programme that informed other protracted refugee situations where DLI was being considered.

At the end of 2003, significant progress was recorded. In the agricultural sector, 120,000 host and refugee farmers benefitted from the credit loans under the programme in the 2003/4 farming season.²⁶ A credit scheme was established that expanded access to seeds, fertilizers, pesticides and agricultural tools in the ZI areas.²⁷ LDCs selected the borrowers and prepared loan contracts guaranteed by local indunas.²⁸ Repayment was in kind to the LDCs who would store the bags of produce until the market price was right. Storage of produce was improved under the ZI through the construction of brick silos in the LDCs. The money realised from the sale of the produce became a revolving fund to benefit other farmers in the next farming season.

The credit facility contributed to the increase in the average cultivated land area per household from 2 hectares to 2.5 hectares.²⁹ As a result of ZI inputs and improved agriculture extension services in 2003, crop productivity doubled from 1.5 to 3.5 metric tons per hectare for the 2003 – 2004 farming season.³⁰ In the same period, the livestock campaign by the provincial and district veterinary services in Western Province was reinforced with the acquisition of 36 motor cycles, 110 bicycles and 36 refrigerators using ZI funds.³¹ These items were used by the veterinary officers in the effort to improve livestock farming in the region.

Under the ZI programme, some health facilities were established. For instance, a health post and a HIV/AIDS drop-in-centre were constructed at Nangweshi.³² The HIV/AIDS centre provided counseling and relevant health information and advice to the communities. The programme also saw the establishment of two Mother and Child Health (MCH) facilities, six tuberculosis laboratories and a reproductive health facility at Shangombo and Senanga.³³ Two ambulances were also secured for the referral hospitals at Kaoma and Senanga Districts.³⁴ In Senanga, an orphan day care centre was also constructed.

In the education sector, ZI projects included the construction of brick classroom blocks and renovation of existing ones. Major construction projects included Mayukwayukwa High School in Kaoma, Senanga School for Orphans, a 1 by 3 classroom block at Senanga Orphan Day Care Centre, a new classroom block and the renovation of teachers' houses at Ngundi Basic School.³⁵ A total of about 11 classrooms were completed by end of 2004 which benefitted about 1,500 pupils.³⁶ Senanga Trades School was also rehabilitated with a new iron roof, including works like water borne ablution blocks.

The ZI was initially a three year programme requiring USD 25 million. A total of USD 14,051,112 in form of contributions and commitments was realised for the 2003 to 2005 projects from donors like Denmark, Japan, United States of America, UNICEF/ECHO, and JICA.³⁷ The donors pledged to put up the rest of the funding once the legal environment in Zambia was conducive for the integration of refugees.

Zambia, as the host, put up in-kind contributions. The major contribution that was expected from the Government of Zambia was the putting up of a legal framework or environment that allowed refugees to qualify for permanent residency and the possibility of citizenship. The initiative received a setback when the Zambian Parliament failed to pass legislation granting citizenship to Angolan refugees who were born in Zambia or had lived there for over ten years.³⁸

At that time, there was no mechanism in place to guarantee the rights of long-term residency or citizenship for refugees in Zambia. Although the Constitution and the Citizenship Act of Zambia required 10 years of ‘ordinary residency’ before an application for citizenship could be considered, refugees in Zambia were not considered as ‘ordinary residents’ and were ineligible to apply. The amended Citizenship Act of 1996 stated that:

4. (1) Every person who immediately before the commencement of this constitution was a citizen of Zambia shall continue to be a citizen of Zambia after the commencement of this Constitution. Citizens of Zambia

(2) A person who was entitled to citizenship of Zambia before the commencement of this Constitution subject to the performance of any conditions following the happening of a future event, shall become a citizen upon the performance of such conditions.

5. A person born in or outside Zambia after the commencement of this Constitution shall become a citizen of Zambia at the date of his birth if on that date at least one of his parents is a citizen of Zambia. Children of citizens of Zambia

6. (1) Any person who-Persons entitled to apply to be registered as citizens

(a) has attained the age of twenty-one years; and

(b) has been ordinarily resident in Zambia for a continuous period of not less than ten years immediately preceding that person's application for registration; shall be entitled to apply to the Citizenship Board, in such manner as may be prescribed by or under an Act of Parliament, to be registered as a citizen of Zambia.³⁹

The refugee guidelines enshrined in the laws of Zambia did not allow for the naturalisation of refugees in Zambia. There was also no political will to facilitate for the inclusion of refugees among the people who were qualified to commence the application procedure for Zambian citizenship.

GRZ failed to come up with legislation or mechanisms that removed the legal restraints on refugees' freedom of movement, and access to the formal labour market. Freedoms of movement, and access to the formal labour market were some of the major tenets of the ZI that were supposed to be guaranteed by the Government. The failure on the part of the Government was a major hindrance to the full implementation of the ZI and the integration of the Angolan refugees.

What had promised to be the first major step towards the integration and naturalisation of refugees in Zambia did not happen with the ZI. Progress in programme stalled because the Government faced challenges in fulfilling its part of the bargain. As a result, funding for the programme became a problem because donors were no longer willing to continue releasing funds when the host government did not provide the conducive legal environment. For instance, in 2006, few projects under the ZI were implemented due to lack of funding.⁴⁰ Many projects that had been started could not be completed.

In December 2012, there was progress towards the naturalisation of refugees in Zambia. The Zambian government allowed the naturalisation of former refugees to become Zambian citizens. This was applied to the Angolans and Rwandese that refused to go back to their countries of origin after the cessation of their refugee status. This development meant that refugees were eligible to apply to become citizens of Zambia.⁴¹

Some Angolan refugees had been at Mayukwayukwa for over four decades without opportunities to become Zambian citizens. Some of the refugees who settled there for long periods led exemplary lives in Zambia where they contributed positively to the Mayukwayukwa refugee community. Although refugees actively participated in various activities in Zambia, they could not be naturalised to become citizens before the change in policy. This was regardless of the fact that a fundamental objective of the UN international protection function was to help refugees cease to be such through naturalisation. This was contained in the 1951 UN Convention that provided that:

The contracting States shall, as far as possible, facilitate the assimilation and naturalisation of refugees and shall in particular, make every effort to expedite naturalisation proceedings. The office continues to encourage national authorities to adopt administrative or legal measures with a view to:

- (a) Enabling refugees to qualify for naturalisation earlier than aliens generally;
- (b) Exempting refugees from the requirements of furnishing proof of release from or loss of their former nationality;
- (c) Exempting needy refugees from payment of fees normally payable for naturalisation proceedings, or reduce such fees.⁴²

Some refugees were even awarded with certificates of excellence for their achievements. For instance, during the commemoration of World Refugee Day at Mayukwayukwa in 2013, UNHCR, in the presence of top government officials, gave awards to refugees who were outstanding at the settlement. Among the awarded refugees was Mary Nsamba, an Angolan woman, who fled into Zambia with her parents in 1966 when she was eight years old. Although she had little formal education, she was involved in many activities within Mayukwayukwa Refugee Settlement. She was a Section leader, also a member of the Camp Council where she was involved in the resolving of community leadership problems.⁴³ After 2012, she was eligible to apply for permanent residency and even Zambian citizenship.

Another recipient of the 2013 awards who was also eligible for citizenship was Mercha Coasta, a male refugee, who had also fled to the settlement in 1966. He had also been involved in various productive activities at Mayukwayukwa. Other than being a farmer who contributed to the national food basket, he was a bricklayer. He had also been camp chairperson and councilor at the settlement.⁴⁴

Not only former refugees with outstanding achievements were eligible to apply for permanent residency and citizenship after 2012. Monde Mweemba, a girl of 18 years and a grade 10 school dropout also qualified to apply.⁴⁵ She was born at Mayukwayukwa Refugee Settlement from an Angolan refugee mother and a Zambian father from a nearby village. She never knew her father well because he never married her mother but someone else. He also lived very far outside the settlement

which meant that she had to get a gate pass in order to see him. She lived all her life in Zambia and had only heard of Angola from her mother and neighbours. Before 2012, she could not apply for citizenship because of the refugee status of her mother. She was granted a permanent residency permit in 2013.

The change in policy began in 2011 when Government pledged to facilitate the local integration of some 10,000 Angolan refugees in Zambia.⁴⁶ This pledge was made at a Ministerial meeting held to commemorate the 60th anniversary of the 1951 UN Convention. Using lessons from the ZI experience, the Government conceived more solid management and oversight mechanisms among the different government entities.⁴⁷ To avoid a situation where there was an imbalance in the socio-economic foundation of the local host communities, the Government requested for financial support for socio-economic projects that would benefit both the refugee and the host communities. This was followed by the implementation of the pledge by the granting of permanent residence permits to the refugees by the Minister of Home Affairs in 2012.⁴⁸

Jose Pinto, a refugee for 33 years, was the first refugee to receive the permanent residence permit. Zambia's Minister of Home Affairs at the time, Edgar Lungu, granted the first three residency permits to Pinto, his wife and their daughter Filipa in a ceremony that was held in the capital, Lusaka, on 18 December 2012.⁴⁹ The hand-over of the documents marked the launch of issuing the local integration permits to up to 10,000 former Angolan refugees who met the criteria under immigration laws. The

hand-over ceremony was witnessed by UNHCR and a delegation from the African Union. The African Union supported the local integration process by donating US\$100,000.⁵⁰



Figure 2: Zambia's Minister of Home Affairs, Edgar Lungu (right), presents a Residency Permit to Filipa Pinto (centre), while her father, Jose Pinto and UNHCR Representative, Joyce Mends-Cole, look on.

[Source: UNHCR News Stories, 31 December 2012](#)

The criteria and procedure for the local integration of the Angolan refugees were premised on existing Zambian legislation, namely, the Constitution of Zambia, the amended by Citizenship Act No. 18 of 1996, already mentioned and the Immigration and Deportation Act No. 18 of 2010. What changed in 2012 was that Government decided to allow former Angolan and Rwandan refugees to apply for permanent residency. The Citizenship Act was complemented by the Immigration and Deportation Act (No. 18 of 2010) which states that:

20. (1) A person shall apply to the Director-General of Immigration for a residence permit in the prescribed manner and form.
- (2) The Director-General of Immigration shall, upon receipt of an application under subsection (1), issue the person with a residence permit if the person—
 - (a) is not an illegal immigrant;

- (b) has an adequate knowledge of any language commonly used by the indigenous inhabitants of Zambia as may be prescribed, or of English;
- (c) intends to remain in Zambia for a period in excess of ten years;
- (d) belongs to a class set out in the First Schedule;
- (e) is a foreigner holding an investor's permit for a period exceeding three years;
- (f) is an established resident;
- (g) is the spouse of a citizen who has held a spouse permit for a period of not less than five years;
- (h) is a child of a citizen, irrespective of the age of that child;
- (i) is a child or dependant under the age of twenty-one years of an established resident or person holding a valid residence permit.⁵¹

The Zambian government came up with a document outlining the criteria and procedures for the local integration of former Angolan refugees in Zambia in July 2012. The policy document was important in that it guaranteed the inclusion of former refugees still resident in Zambia an opportunity to apply for permanent residency and citizenship after 10 years just like ordinary non Zambians.

Six categories were availed to the former refugees under which they could be considered for permanent residency in Zambia. The first was of children born from a refugee and a Zambian citizen. Article 5 of the Constitution of Zambia, Act No. 18 of 1996 made provision for children born in or outside Zambia to become citizens of Zambia if at least, one parent was a citizen of Zambia. A child born from one Zambian parent was eligible to apply for a Zambian national registration card upon attaining the age of 16 years.⁵² This is similar to the case of Monde mentioned above. The second was of persons married to Zambian nationals. All former refugees who fit in this category were eligible to apply according to Section 23 of the Immigration and Deportation Act, No. 18 of 2010. The Act provided for the issuance of a Spouse

Permit by the Director-General of Immigration to a spouse of a citizen or an established resident. Former Angolan refugees married to Zambian spouses were eligible to apply for this permit. The permit was issued initially for a two year period after which, it was subject to renewal for 3 years. After 5 years, a holder of the Spouse Permit qualified to apply for a residence permit in accordance with Section 20 (1) (g) of the Immigration and Deportation Act.⁵³

The third covered former refugees that wanted an Investor Permit. In accordance with Section 29 of the Immigration and Deportation Act, No 18 of 2010, any foreign national could be issued with an Investors Permit by the Director-General of Immigration if they intended to establish a business or invest in Zambia. The source of the funds could be from within Zambia or outside Zambia. All family members aged 18 years and below may be included in the permit. A holder of this type of permit, operating a viable business for a period exceeding 3 years, was eligible to apply for a Residence Permit. After 10 years on a Residence Permit, they qualified to apply for citizenship.⁵⁴

Former Angolan refugees could also acquire permanent residency by applying for an Employment Permit. The legal basis for the criteria was lodged in section 28 of the Immigration and Deportation Act. Refugees who had a professional qualification that met the set standards could be considered for issuance of an employment permit. A holder of an Employment Permit was eligible to apply for a Residence Permit after 10

years.⁵⁵ After another 10 years, one was eligible to apply for citizenship. Family members 18 years and below could be included in the permit.

Others applied for permanent residency based on their long stay or continuous residence in Zambia. Former Angolan refugees, who arrived in Zambia between 1966 and 1986 and continuously lived in Zambia as well as their children, were all eligible to apply for a Residence Permit. This permit was valid for 10 years. A holder of Residence Permit was eligible to apply for citizenship after 10 years. Lastly, there was the category of persons married to refugees of other nationalities. The logic behind the consideration of this group was in support of the principle of family unity.⁵⁶

The issuance of residence permits by the Zambian authorities was on condition that the former refugees presented valid identification in the form of Angolan national registration cards and or passports. This would have normally proved difficult bearing in mind that most refugees did not have proper identification papers. It was common for refugees to enter countries of asylum with no identification at all. Some Angola refugees had outdated identification cards from the colonial period while others were born in Zambia. The common identification documents that the former Angolan refugees at Mayukwayukwa had were the UNHCR refugee cards. These were not valid as they expired after the cessation of the Angola refugee status on 30th June 2012.

The problem of lack of proper identification for the Angolan refugees was quickly rectified by the Government of the Republic of Angola (GRA) which expedited the issuance of NRCs and passports to the refugees. The GRA also bore the full cost of the issuance of the passports. By the end of 2013, a total of 1,500 Angolan identity cards had been issued to former Angolan refugees in Mayukwayukwa.⁵⁷ The cost of the resident permits was split half-way between UNHCR and GRZ. The only cost that the former refugees had to bear was of acquiring of Zambian alien cards that cost ZK 50.10 which was about USD 9.⁵⁸ The alien cards allowed them to remain in Zambia while they waited for the issuance of residence permits.

Table: Former Angolan Refugees Local Integration Statistics as of December 2013

Location	Immigration Applications	Beneficiary Population
Meheba	2,994	4,016
Mayukwayukwa	1,183	1,537
Urban	25	35
Self-Settled	0	0
Totals	4,202	5,588

Source: GRZ, *Strategic Framework*, 2014

According to the statistics provided in Table 1, a total of 1,537 former refugees at Mayukwayukwa benefited from the issuance of permits in 2013. There were 7,934 former Angolan refugees out of the total population of 11,532 persons of concern to UNHCR at Mayukwayukwa.⁵⁹ The recipients of the permits could move wherever they wanted in Zambia without any restriction or need for permission. They could also live anywhere they wanted in Zambia just like Zambian citizens.

In 2013, the Zambian Government was planning for the relocation of former refugees who had been granted with permits from the refugee settlements. The plan was to settle them in agricultural settlement schemes as a way of empowering them with land. Ordinary Zambian citizens were also free to apply for land in the agricultural schemes. Former Angolan refugees that did not qualify for permits were expected to repatriate back to their countries. Both UNHCR and the government had not come up with any decisions concerning former refugee that did not want to repatriate back. However, these former refugees remained in the settlements as persons of concern.⁶⁰

In conclusion, it can be said that it took Zambia almost fifty years to finally decide on employing local integration as a solution to the problem of refugees from Angola. Mayukwayukwa Refugee Settlement was very instrumental in the journey to arrive at this decision to integrate the refugees. Having been established at the inception of refugee settlements in Zambia in 1966 and being the longest operating refugee settlement in 2013, it was used as a test area for the different approaches to the refugee problem. Mayukwayukwa was the only settlement where all the attempts at finding lasting solutions to the refugee problem were made between 1966 and 2013.

ENDNOTES

- ¹ UNHCR, **Update on Solutions**, (6th June 2014, EC/65/5C/CRP.15) no page numbers @ <http://www.refworld.org/docid/542cfe634.html> [Accessed 17/01/15]
- ² Interview with Kelvin Shimo, Pubic Information Associate, UNHCR, Lusaka, 1st December 2014.
- ³ Interview with Maureen Chimbala Namwanyi, Resettlement Associate, UNHCR, Lusaka, 16th December 2014.
- ⁴ B. Stein, 'Refugee Integration and Older Refugee Settlements in Africa', (American Anthropological Association, 28th November 1990), no page numbers @ www.msu.edu/course/pls/461/stein/FINAL.htm [Accessed 22/05/14]
- ⁵ Stein, 'Refugee Integration and Older Refugee Settlements', no page number.
- ⁶ A. Betts, 'Development Assistance and Refugees: Towards a North – South Grand Bargain?', Forced Migration Briefing, (Refugee Studies Centre, University of Oxford, June 2009), p.4.
- ⁷ K. Jacobsen, 'Can Refugees Benefit the State? Refugee Resources and African Statebuilding', **Journal of Modern African Studies**, 40, 4 (2002), p. 577.
- ⁸ Central Statistics Office (CSO), **2000 Census: Western Province, Vol.9**, (Lusaka: Central Statistics Office, 2004) p. xviii.
- ⁹ CSO, **2000 Census: Western Province**, p. xvii
- ¹⁰ UNHCR, **Report of the UNHCR to the General Assmblly**, Supplement No. 12 (A/9012), 1st January 1973, para. 119.
- ¹¹ Central Statistics Office, **Living Conditions Report**, 1993, p. 112.
- ¹² UNHCR, **Zambia Initiative: Refugee-Hosting Community Development Programme**, Donors Mission Report, (18 – 28 March 2002), p. 9.
- ¹³ T. Amara, 'Zambia Initiative: Refugees Are Not a Burden But an Asset', **Conflict Trends**, 3 (2005), p. 35.
- ¹⁴ UNHCR, Donors Mission Report, p. 9.
- ¹⁵ UNHCR, Donors Mission Report, p. 2.
- ¹⁶ UNHCR, Donors Mission Report, p. 3.

-
- 17 J. Brosche and M. Nilsson, 'Zambian Refugee Policy: Security, Reparation and Local Integration', *Minor Field Study*, (Uppsala University, 2004), p. 29.
- 18 Brosche and Nilsson, 'Zambian Refugee Policy', p. 7.
- 19 M. Watabe, 'The Zambia Initiative', **Forced Migration Review**, 24 (November 2005), p. 69.
- 20 UNHCR, **Handbook for Planning and Implementing Development Assistance for Refugees (DAR) Programmes**, (January 2005), p. 1.
- 21 Betts, 'Development Assistance and Refugees', p.1.
- 22 UNHCR, **Handbook for Planning**, p. 1.
- 23 UNHCR, **Handbook for Planning**, p. 1.
- 24 Betts, 'Development Assistance and Refugees', p.8.
- 25 Betts, 'Development Assistance and Refugees', p.6.
- 26 Amara, 'Refugees are Not a Burden', p. 36.
- 27 Watabe, 'The Zambia Initiative', p. 69.
- 28 UNHCR, **The Zambia Initiative: In Pursuit of Sustainable Solutions for Refugees in Zambia**, Update as at May 2004, p. 13.
- 29 Watabe, 'The Zambia Initiative', p. 69.
- 30 Watabe, 'The Zambia Initiative', p. 69.
- 31 UNHCR, **UNHCR Global Report 2003, Zambia**, p. 287 @ <http://www.unhcr.org/40c6d7770.html> [accessed 11/01/15]
- 32 UNHCR, **UNHCR Global Report 2004, Zambia**, p. 305 @ <http://www.unhcr.org/42ad4dbf0.html> [accessed 13/11/14]
- 33 Amara, 'Refugees are Not a Burden', p. 37.
- 34 Amara, 'Refugees are Not a Burden', p. 37.
- 35 UNHCR, **The Zambia Initiative: In Pursuit**, p. 17-23.

-
- 36 Amara, ‘Refugees are Not a Burden’, p. 37.
- 37 UNHCR, **The Zambia Initiative: In Pursuit**, p. 3.
- 38 United States Committee for Refugees and Immigration, **US Committee for Refugees World Refugee Survey 2004 – Zambia**, 25th May 2004, No page numbers, @ <http://www.refworld.org/docid/40b4594b10.html>.
- 39 Republic of Zambia, Laws of Zambia, (As amended by Act No. 18 of 1996), Chapter 124, Part II, Articles 4 – 6.
- 40 UNHCR, **UNHCR Global Report 2006, Zambia**, (June 2007), p. 311 @ <http://www.refworld.org/docid/466d1a7e2.html>. [accessed 18 February 2014]
- 41 GRZ, Ministry of Home Affairs, **Strategic Framework for the Local Integration of Former Refugees in Zambia**, (UNHCR, 2014), p. 11.
- 42 UNHCR, Report (A/3212), 1977, para. 61.
- 43 UNHCR, ‘Zambians and Refugees Awarded’, p. 14.
- 44 UNHCR, ‘Zambians and Refugees Awarded’, p. 14.
- 45 Interview with Monde Mweemba, Mayukwayukwa Refugee Settlement, 27th December 2014.
- 46 GRZ, **Strategic Framework**, p. 8.
- 47 GRZ, **Strategic Framework**, p. 8.
- 48 UNHCR, ‘Zambia Begins Granting Angolan Refugees Permanent Residency’, **UNHCR News Stories**, 31 December 2012 @ <http://www.unhcr.org/50e162899.html> [Accessed on 30/04/13]
- 49 UNHCR, ‘Zambia Begins Granting’, **News Stories**.
- 50 UNHCR, ‘Zambia Begins Granting’, **News Stories**.
- 51 Republic of Zambia, Laws of Zambia, (As amended by Act No. 18 of 2010) Chapter 123 Section 20 (1 - 2).
- 52 GRZ, Ministry of Home Affairs, Office of the Commissioner for Refugees, **Criteria and Procedures for the Local Integration of Former Angolan Refugees**, July 2012, p. 2.

-
- 53 GRZ, **Strategic Framework**, p. 12.
- 54 GRZ, **Criteria and Procedures**, p. 4.
- 55 GRZ, **Criteria and Procedures**, p. 5.
- 56 UNHCR, **Handbook and Guidelines on Procedures and Criteria for Determining Refugee Status**, (Geneva: UNHCR, 2011), p. 36.
- 57 UNHCR, **UNHCR Operations in Zambia: Factsheet**, 1st March 2014, p. 2.
- 58 GRZ, **Strategic Framework**, p. 13.
- 59 UNHCR, **UNHCR Operations in Zambia**, p.1.
- 60 Interview with Katele Kalumba, Senior Legal Advisor, Office of the Commissioner for Refugees, Lusaka, 12th August 2014.

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSION

The study has demonstrated how Mayukwayukwa Refugee Settlement performed its role and function of hosting refugees in the period between 1966 and 2013. It has shown how the settlement hosted refugees, initially from Angola, and later from other African countries such as Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), Namibia, Rwanda and Burundi. The establishment of the settlement in 1966 was as a result of many contributing factors. This study has shown that the establishment of the refugee settlement at Mayukwayukwa, as a form of the encampment, was a policy not dictated by international instruments or UNHCR but was a decision by Zambian government which had the final say on what kind of policy to pursue.

What has also been demonstrated in the study is that although the existence of Mayukwayukwa had a history of its own, it was not an isolated case. Other refugee settlements and camps were established in Zambia at Nyimba, Lwatembo, Maheba, Ukwimi, Kala, Mwange and Nangweshi. In view of the fact that Mayukwayukwa existed longer than any of these, it must be appreciated that the experiences at these settlements lent important lessons to the execution of the handling of refugees at the settlement. Moreover, since Mayukwayukwa and Maheba remained the only surviving refugee settlements in 2013, it could be said that they were the products of Zambia's combined experiences in refugee hosting.

The study has further shown that Mayukwayukwa existed in changing times in which the political, economic and ideological environment was evolving within and outside Zambia. These included the change from communal land use to individual family plots, the enactment of the Refugee Control Act, the independence of Angola and the failure of repatriation. The changes that took place necessitated the introduction of new guidelines and practices by the stakeholders at Mayukwayukwa as a means of adapting. The changes at the settlement made it possible for it to survive up to 2013 and after. This ability to adapt demonstrated its resilience towards its role and function..

What has been shown is how and why Zambia, as a country faced with an influx of Angolan refugees shortly after independence, established a temporal settlement at Mayukwayukwa. The settlement in turn, began executing its role and function using guidelines that were mostly conceived by the government to tackle problems and situations as they arose. When Zambia finally came up with the Refugee Control Act in 1970, it was evident that the legislation borrowed greatly from the guidelines that had been pursued by the government until then. The experiences from Mayukwayukwa and other refugee settlements that had existed since 1966 greatly contributed to the need to enact the new legislation. What had been used as guidelines at the settlement became enshrined in the laws of Zambia as part of the new refugee policy. In view of this, Mayukwayukwa can be said to have influenced to the establishment of Zambia's refugee policy in 1970.

What can also be deduced from the study is that the repatriation of refugees from Mayukwayukwa was for the most part of the period under discussion the most sought after solution by the government. This was because it was the most practical solution if one considered resettlement to other countries and local integration as the alternatives. Resettlement for instance, was a solution that the host nation could not initiate because it depended more on the second countries of asylum's willingness to share the burden by accepting refugees. If no country (mostly donors) was willing to open its doors to resettle some refugees that year, it meant that the refugees were stuck in first countries of asylum like Zambia. Local integration as a solution only became possible in December 2012.

Repatriation was the most preferred by the Zambian government because of the above-mentioned challenges with the other two solutions. However, it has been shown that earlier attempts to repatriate Angolan refugees back to their country were not successful because Angolan independence didn't bring peace but a civil war in that country which lasted for close to three decades. Attempts to repatriate Angolan refugees during that time failed. Repatriation was only successful after a cease-fire was signed following the death of Jonas Savimbi in 2002. The repatriation programme after 2002 ran alongside attempts at the local integration of refugees in Zambia.

The study has demonstrated that the attempts to change policy to begin allowing the local integration of refugees in Zambia were piloted at Mayukwayukwa. The Zambia

Initiative, which was the first significant attempt at this which required government to grant more freedoms to refugees like movement and access to the labour markets, was focused in the area around Mayukwayukwa. Even though the ZI failed to compel the Zambian government to change legislation at the time, it was used as a learning experience towards the pursuit of local integration. It also showed that the settlement was instrumental in the attempts to arrive at lasting solutions for the refugee problem in Zambia.

It has been shown that in 2012 when the Zambian government finally changed the refugee policy and began allowing the local integration, refugees in Mayukwayukwa were targeted. This was because the settlement had thousands of refugees that qualified to apply for residence permits in Zambia but could not do so earlier because the law did not permit. This showed that the settlement continued to be instrumental in the implementation of refugee policies in Zambia. The inclusion of refugees among the foreigners that could apply for residence permits was a shift of political will on the part of the Zambian authorities. It must be noted that the inclusion of refugees did not require new laws but was based on the use of existing ones.

Finally the study has demonstrated how what started as a temporal role of hosting Angolan refugees at Mayukwayukwa in 1966 turned out to be a protracted one which left the settlement as Africa's longest operating agricultural refugee settlement in 2013. The continuous hosting of refugees at Mayukwayukwa must be appreciated in that it was not mandatory but a choice made by the host country, Zambia. Contrary to

Karen Jacobsen's findings already mentioned in the first chapter that 'the longer the refugee situation persists, the more likely it is that the overall budget for the programme shrinks, assistance reduces and the refugees become invisible to the public eye', Mayukwayukwa continued to attract significant attention after 47 years. It shows that it was the nature of Zambians to be receptive to refugees. An important role of the settlement was to show the receptive nature of Zambians to outsiders.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Primary Source

(i) Interviews

Catulo, Gladys, Mayukwayukwa Refugee Settlement, interviewed on 26th December 2014.

Costa, Joao, Mayukwayukwa Refugee Settlement, interviewed on 29th December 2014.

Kalumba, Katele, Senior Legal Officer, Office of the Commissioner for Refugees, Ministry of Home Affairs, on 12th August 2014.

Munkombwe, Tikambenji Njovu, Program Assistant, UNHCR, Lusaka, on 2th January 2015.

Mweemba, Monde, Mayukwayukwa Refugee Settlement, interviewed on 27th December 2014.

Namwanyi, Maureen Chimbala, Resettlement Associate, UNHCR, Lusaka, on 16th December 2014.

Shimo, Kelvin, Public Information Associate, UNHCR, Lusaka, on 1st December 2014.

Wanga, Hadukoma, Mayukwayukwa Refugee Settlement, interviewed on 29th December 2014.

(ii) National Archives of Zambia

Hansard N0. 24, National Assembly of Zambia, 8 – 11th December, 1970, Lusaka: Government Printers, 1970

NAZ/EP 4/20/82, Frelimo File, Lubinda, H. S. District Secretary, Petauke, to the Commissioner for Refugees, Lusaka, 5th March 1972

NAZ/EP 4/20/82, Frelimo File, Mbita, E. C., District Secretary, Katete, to Chief Immigration Officer, Lusaka, 22nd September 1971.

NAZ/EP 4/20/82, Frelimo File, Moonga, V. M. Immigration Officer in Charge, Petauke, to Chief immigration Officer, Lusaka, 8th October 1973.

(iii) United Nations Reports

UN International Human Rights Instruments, 'Core Document Forming Part of the Reports of States Parties: Zambia', HRI/CORE/1/Add.22/Rev.2, 21 March 2005, @ <http://www.refworld.org/docid/43f307362.html> [Accessed 12/11/14]

UN, 'UNHCR Activities Financed by Voluntary Funds: Report for 1993 – 1994 and Proposed Programmes and Budget for 1995', 19th August 1994, A/AC.96/825/part1/23.

UN, 'UNHCR Activities Financed by Voluntary Funds: Report for 1994 – 1995 and Proposed Programmes and Budget for 1996', 12th July 1995, (A/AC.96/846/part1/23),

UNHCR, Mid – Year Progress Report, Geneva: UNHCR, 2000

UNHCR, Mid – Year Progress Report, Geneva: UNHCR, 2001

UNHCR, Mid – Year Progress Report, Geneva: UNHCR, 2002

UNHCR, Report of the UNHCR to the General Assembly, Supplement No. 12 (A/5511Rev.1), 1st January 1964.

UNHCR, Report of the UNHCR to the General Assembly, Supplement No. 11 (A/6311/Rev.1), 1st January 1966.

UNHCR, Report of the UNHCR to the General Assembly, Supplement No. 12 (A/6711), 1st January 1968

UNHCR, Report of the UNHCR to the General Assembly, Supplement No. 12 (A/7211), 1st January 1969

UNHCR, Report of the UNHCR to the General Assembly, Supplement No. 12 (A/7612), 1st January 1970.

UNHCR, Report of the UNHCR to the General Assembly, Supplement No. 12 (A/8012), 1st January 1971.

UNHCR, Report of the UNHCR to the General Assembly, Supplement No. 12 (A/8412), 1st January 1972.

UNHCR, Report of the UNHCR to the General Assembly, Supplement No. 12 (A/9012), 1st January 1973

UNHCR, Report of the UNHCR to the General Assembly, Supplement No. 12 (A/9612), 1st January 1975.

- UNHCR, **Report of the UNHCR to the General Assembly**, Supplement No. 12 (A/31/12), 1st January 1976
- UNHCR, **Report of the UNHCR to the General Assembly**, Supplement No. 12 (A/32/12), 2nd September 1977
- UNHCR, **Report of the UNHCR to the General Assembly**, Supplement No. 12 (A/33/12), 12th September 1978
- UNHCR, **Report of the UNHCR to the General Assembly**, Supplement No. 12 (A/38/12), 1st January 1983
- UNHCR, **Report of the UNHCR to the General Assembly**, Supplement No. 12 (A/41/12), 1st January 1986
- UNHCR, **UNHCR Global Report 1999, Zambia**, Geneva: UNHCR, 1999.
- UNHCR, **UNHCR Global Report 2003, Zambia**, Geneva: UNHCR, 2003.
- UNHCR, **UNHCR Global Report 2004, Zambia**, Geneva: UNHCR, 2004 @ <http://www.unhcr.org/42ad4dbf0.html> [accessed 13/11/14]
- UNHCR, **UNHCR Global Report 2006**, Geneva: UNHCR, 2007, @ <http://www.refworld.org/docid/466d1a7e2.html> [accessed 18 February 2014]
- UNHCR, **UNHCR Global Report 2007**, Geneva: UNHCR, 2007.
- UNHCR, **Zambia Initiative: Refugee-Hosting Community Development Programme**, Donors Mission Report, 18 – 28 March 2002.

B. Secondary Sources

(i) Articles

- Amara, A. 'Zambia Initiative: Refugees Are Not a Burden But an Asset', **Conflict Trends**, 3 (2005), 35 – 37.
- Armstrong, A. 'Refugee Wellbeing in Settlement Schemes', **Journal of Refugee Studies**, 1, 1 (1988), pp. 57 – 73.
- Black, R. 'Putting Refugees in Camps' in **Forced Migration Review**, 2 (August 1998), pp. 4 – 7.

- Crisp, J. and Jacobsen, k. 'Refugee Camps Reconsidered' in **Forced Migration Review**, 3 (December 1998), pp. 27 – 30.
- Dick, S. 'Changing the Equation: Refugees as Valuable Sources Rather than Helpless Victims', **The Fletcher Journal of International Development**, 18, (2003), pp. 19 – 30.
- Fleisch, A. 'Language History in S. E. Angola: The Ngangela – Nyembu Dialect Cluster', **Sprache und Geschichte in Afrik**, 20, (2009), pp. 97 – 111.
- Hansen, A. 'Refugee Dynamics: Angolans in Zambia 1966 to 1972', **International Migration Review**, 15, 12, (Spring – Summer, 1981), pp. 175 – 194.
- Lassiailly-Jacob, V. 'Refugee – Host Interactions: A Field Report from Ukwimi Mozambican Refugee Settlement, Zambia', **Refuge**, 13, 6 (October 1993), pp. 23 – 26.
- Jacobsen, A. 'Can Refugees Benefit the State? Refugee Resources and African Statebuilding', **Journal of Modern African Studies**, 40, 4 (2002), pp. 577 – 596.
- Kaiser, T. 'Between a Camp and a Hard Place: Rights, Livelihood and Experiences of the Local Settlement System for Long-Term Refugees in Uganda,' **Journal of Modern African Studies**, 44, 4 (2006), pp. 597–621.
- Musambachime, M. C. 'Escape From Tyranny: Flight Across the Rhodesia – Congo Boundary 1900 – 1930', **Trans-African Journal of History**, 1, 18 (1989), pp. 147 – 159.
- Olivier, B. J. 'Kaundas Zambia', **Africa Insight**, 11, 1 (1981), pp. 33 – 39.
- Watabe, M. 'The Zambia Initiative', **Forced Migration Review**, 24, (November 2005), p. 69 – 69

(ii) Books

- Agier, M. **Managing Undesirables: Refugee Camps and Humanitarian Governments**, Cambridge: Policy Press, 2011.
- Anderson, M. A. **Ukwimi Refugee Settlement: A Gender Case Study**, Geneva: UNHCR, 1991.
- Bakewell, O. **Review of the CORD Community Services for the Angolan Refugees in Western Province of Zambia**, EPAU/2002/14, Geneva: UNHCR, 2002.
- Bekoe, D. A. **Implementing Peace Agreements: Lessons from Mozambique, Angola**

- and Liberia**, Washington D. C., Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.
- Betts, A. Loescher, G. and Liner, J. **The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR): The Politics and Practice of Refugee Protection**, New York: Routledge, 2008.
- Briggs, P. **Mozambique**, Guilford: The Globe Pequot Press, 1997.
- Central Statistics Office (CSO), **2000 Census: Western Province, Vol.9**, Lusaka: Central Statistics Office, 2004.
- Central Statistics Office, **Living Conditions Report**, Lusaka: Central Statistics Office 1993.
- Cheke Cha Mbunda Cultural Writers Association, **The History and Cultural Life of the Mbunda Speaking Peoples**, Lusaka: University of Zambia, 1994.
- Colombey, J. (ed), **Collection of International Instruments and Other Legal Texts Concerning Refugees and Displaced Persons, 2 vols.**, Geneva: UNHCR, 1995.
- Colson, E. 'The Plateau Tonga of Northern Rhodesia', in E. Colson and M. Gluckman, **Seven Tribes of British Central Africa**, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1959, pp. 94 - 102.
- Gann, L. H. **The Birth of a Plural Society: The Development of Northern Rhodesia Under Colonial Rule**, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1958.
- Hansen, A. and Oliver, A. **Involuntary Migration and Resettlement: The Problems and Responses of Dislocated People**, Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1982.
- Holborn, L., Chartrand, P. and Chartrand, R. **Refugees – A Problem of Our Time: The Work of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees 1951 – 1972, 2 vols.**, Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1975.
- Jacobsen, K. **The Economic Survival in Refugee Camps**, Bloomfield: Kumarian Press, 2005.
- James III, W. **A Political History of the Civil War in Angola: 1974 – 1990**, New Jersey: Translation Publishers, 1992.
- Jansen, S. and Lofving, S. (eds), **Struggles for Home: Violence, Hope and the Movement of People**, London: Berghahn Books, 2009.
- Kaunda, K. D. **Humanism in Zambia: and a Guide to its Implementation, Part 1**, Lusaka: Zambia Information Services, [No publication year].

- Klepper, K. 'Zambian Agricultural Structure and Performance', in Ben Turok (ed), **Development in Zambia: A Reader**, London: Zed Press, 1989, pp. 137 – 148.
- Lamont, C. **The Philosophy of Humanism**, New York: Humanist Press, 1997
- Mainga, M. **Bulozi Under the Luyana Kings: Political Evolution and State Formation in Pre-colonial Zambia**, Lusaka: Longman, 2010.
- Marcum, J. A. **The Angolan Revolution: Exile Politics and Guerrilla Warfare (1962 – 1976)**, vol. 2, Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1978.
- Papstein, R. 'From Ethnic Identity to Tribalism: The Upper Zambezi Region of Zambia, 1830 – 1981', in L. Vail, (ed), **The Creation of Tribalism in Southern Africa**, Oxford: University of California Press, 1989, pp. 372 - 394.
- Shilington, K. (ed), **Encyclopedia of African History, Vol. 1**, New York: Taylor and Francis group, 2006.
- Starkey, P. and Simalenga, T. (eds) **Animal Power for Weed Control: A Handbook**, Wageningen: Technical Control for Agricultural and Rural Cooperation, 2000.
- UN, **Activities of the United Nations and its Family of Agencies in Zambia**, Lusaka: United Nations Development Programme, 1967.
- UNHCR, **Handbook and Guidelines on Procedures and Criteria for Determining Refugee Status**, Geneva: UNHCR, 2011.
- UNHCR, **Handbook for Planning and Implementing Development Assistance for Refugees (DAR) Programmes**, Geneva: UNHCR, 2005.
- UNHCR, **Handbook for the Repatriation and Reintegration Activities**, Geneva: UNHCR, 2004.
- UNHCR, **Implementation of the Comprehensive Strategy for Angolan Refugee Situation, including UNHCR's Recommendation on the Applicability of the "Ceased Circumstances" Cessation Clauses**, Geneva: UNHCR, 2012.

(iii) Dissertations and Theses

- Bakewell, O. 'Repatriation: Angolan Refugees or Migrating Villagers?', PhD Thesis, University of Barth, 1999.
- Hansen, A. 'Once the Running Stops: The Socio-economic Resettlement of Angolan Refugees (1966 – 1972) in Zambian Border Villages', PhD Thesis, Cornell

University, 1977.

Gray, A. M. 'Emplacing Displacement: Cultural Landscapes of Refugee – hosting in Ukwimi, Zambia', PhD Thesis, University of Kansas, 2009.

Sapao, W. 'A Social and Economic History of Displaced People: The Maheba Refugee Settlement Experience, 1971 – 1994', M.A. Dissertation, University of Zambia, 1996.

(iv) Published and Unpublished Papers and Reports

Berrett, M. 'Social Landscapes and Moving People: The Mysterious Meaning of Migration in Western Zambia', *New Issues in Refugee Studies*, Working Paper No. 78, 2003.

Betts, A. 'Development Assistance and Refugees: Towards a North – South Grand Bargain?' **Forced Migration Briefing 2**, Refugee Studies Centre, University of Oxford, June 2009

Black, R. Mabwe, T. Shumba F. and Wilson, K. 'Ukwimi Refugee Settlement: Livelihood and Settlement Planning for Mozambicans in Zambia', unpublished report, Oxford Refugee Studies Programme, 1990.

Brosche, J. and M. Nilsson, 'Zambian Refugee Policy: Security, Reparation and Local Integration', Minor Field Study, Uppsala University, 2004.

Crisp, J. Reira, J. and Freitas, R. **Evaluation of UNHCR's Returnee Reintegration Programme in Angola**, UNHCR Policy Development and Evaluation Service Report, August 2008.

GRZ, Ministry of Development Planning and National Guidance, 'Hand-Outs on Humanism', Lusaka: November 1972.

GRZ, Ministry of Home Affairs, Office of the Commissioner for Refugees, **Criteria and Procedures for the Local Integration of Former Angolan Refugees**, July 2012

GRZ, Ministry of Home Affairs, **Strategic Framework for the Local Integration of Former Refugees in Zambia**, UNHCR, 2014.

Human Rights Watch, 'Angola: Struggling Through Peace: Return and Resettlement in Angola', 15th August 2003, A1516 @ <http://www.refworld.org/docid/3f4f592c2.html> [Accessed 09/02/15]

Integrated Regional Information Networks (IRIN), 'Angola – Zambia: Security Fears Among Refugees', **Humanitarian News and Analysis**, 10th August 2001 @

<http://www.irinnews.org/printreport.aspx?reportid=24751> [Accessed 28th July 2014]

Knudsen, C. Mundt, A and Zartman, I. W. **Peace Agreements: The Case of Angola**, Report from the African Centre for Constructive Resolution of Disputes, 23rd October 2000, @ <http://www.reliefweb.int/report/angola/peace-agreements-case-angola.html> [Accessed 23/12/14].

Mwanza, A. M. and Seshamani, V. 'Refugees an Important Aspect of the Human Dimension of Africa's Economic Crisis: Zambia Case Study', Working Paper for the 25th ASAUK Conference on 'The Refugee Situation in Africa', Cambridge, 14th - 15th September 1988.

Reuters, 'Zambia: Refugees from Mozambique Flee to Zambia. Being Rehoused by Government', 5th January 1966 @ <http://www.itnsource.com/en/shotlist/RTV/1966/01/05BGY506020337/?5> [Accessed 12/03/14]

UNHCR, **Zambia: Analysis of the Gaps in Protection of Refugees**, September 2007.

United States Committee for Refugees and Immigration, **US Committee for Refugees World Refugee Survey 2004 – Zambia**, 25th May 2004, No page numbers, @ <http://www.refworld.org/docid/40b4594b10.html>.

(v) United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees Documents

UNHCR, 'Organised Returns to Angola Reach 35,000, UNHCR Ups Pace Before Rains', **UNHCR News Stories**, 9th October 2003 @ <http://www.unhcr.org/3f8582f84.html> [Accessed 18/11/14].

UNHCR, 'Zambia's Nangweshi Camp Closes After Last Group of Angolans Move Out', **News Stories**, 20th November 2006 @ <http://www.unhcr.org/4561d52b2html> [Accessed 2nd March 2014]

UNHCR, 'Zambia Begins Granting Angolan Refugees Permanent Residency', **UNHCR News Stories**, 31 December 2012 @ <http://www.unhcr.org/50e162899.html> [Accessed on 30/04/13]

UNHCR, **The Zambia Initiative: In Pursuit of Sustainable Solutions for Refugees in Zambia**, Update as at May 2004

UNHCR, **2004 Country Operations Plan: Zambia**, UNHCR, 2004

UNHCR, 'Curtains Close on Mwange and Kala Refugee Camps', **UNHCR Zambia Newsletter**, 2010.

UNHCR, 'Thousands of Angolan Refugees in Zambia Wait for Resettlement as Camps Reach Capacity', **UNHCR News Stories**, 28th January 2002.

UNHCR Spokesperson, A. Edwards, 'End of Refugee Status for Angolan and Liberian Exiles this Weekend', Briefing Notes, 29th June 2012 @ <http://www.unhcr.org/4fed82459.html> [Accessed 11/01/14].

UNHCR, **UNHCR Zambia Newsletter**, UNHCR, 2013.

UNHCR, **Update on Solutions**, 6th June 2014, EC/65/5C/CRP.15 @ <http://www.refworld.org/docid/542cfe634.html> [Accessed 17/01/15]

UNHCR, **UNHCR Operations in Zambia: Factsheet**, 1st March 2014

UNHCR, 'Current Situation in Angola, Eligibility of Angolan Asylum Seekers and Treatment of Returnees', 20th May 1998, @ <http://www.refworld.org/docid/3ae6b31f1c.html> [Accessed 09/11/14].