



**Universiteit
Leiden**

Master Thesis in Political Science: International Organisation

Filippo Antonioli, S1353772

Supervisor: Dr. Matthew Longo

Second Reader: Dr. Corinna Jentzsch

***Tanzania's Strategy for Refugees
under President Nyerere***

Word Count: 9.592
Submission Date: 11/06/2018

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	3
Theory.....	4
Method.....	11
Case Study.....	13
<i>A brief history of Tanzania under Nyerere.....</i>	<i>13</i>
<i>Tanzania and the refugees.....</i>	<i>15</i>
<i>The Arusha Declaration.....</i>	<i>18</i>
<i>The Refugee (Control) Act.....</i>	<i>21</i>
<i>The Tripartite Agreement.....</i>	<i>22</i>
Analysis.....	23
Conclusion.....	27
Reference List.....	30

Abstract

The purpose of this paper is to provide an understanding of the reasons that brought Tanzania to welcome and open its borders to hundreds of thousands of refugees under the presidency of its first president Julius Nyerere (1964-1985). In order to do this, I will first generally analyse what are the pros and cons of a state accepting refugees. In the second part of the paper, I will present the case study by looking at the history and at the type of policies that were adopted towards the refugees. In the end, an analysis of the case will be provided.

Introduction

According to a report published in 2016 by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), the number of refugees under the agency's mandate was estimated to be 16.1 million at the end of 2015 (UNHCR, 2016). The number of refugees registered peaked at 17.8 million in 1992. If we consider that states have recently begun closing their borders, governments have erected fences, right-wing parties are re-emerging, and refugees are increasingly associated with the terms *burden* and *danger*, it is clear that states (at least most of them) are trying to evade refugee protection obligations. The principle of *non-refoulement* was established in Article 33 of the 1951 Geneva Convention, and it is evolving to become a principle of *Jus Cogens*, which means it is not subject to derogation (Arenilla, 2015). However, there is evidence that states still violate human rights as well as the 1951 Geneva Convention. For instance, it has been claimed and documented that the EU-Turkey deal signed in 2016 violates the Convention and contradicts some of the founding principles of the EU and a number of the directives on asylum issued by the European Commission (Gogou, 2017; Rossi, 2016).

Why do states decide to behave this way? Are we sure that refugees are always a burden for the host country? My study aims to analyse and discover the motivations that lead a country to close its borders and the reasons why a country decides to take refugees in. After analysing these questions in a general fashion, and by making a

distinction between developing and developed countries, I will present my case study: I will analyse through process tracing what the main forces were that drove Tanzania to accept the refugee influx in 1972. In that year, a campaign of violence broke out in Burundi; it was led by the Tutsi-dominated government and was carried on the Hutu ethnicity. 200,000 Burundians were killed in the events of 1972 which triggered the mass exodus of approximately 150,000 refugees to Rwanda, Tanzania, and Zaire (now the Democratic Republic of Congo), with most fleeing to Tanzania (COR Center, 2007). Why did Tanzania decide to take all the refugees in? Why did Tanzania not close its borders? My study will address these questions and will aim to find out what motivated the Tanzanian government to take the decisions it made concerning refugees.

Theory

The specific aim of this paper is to analyse and understand why states take in refugees, and why they do not. Since all states are different from one another, when facing a refugee influx every state will approach the problem differently. This means that a state, depending on its political, social and economic situation, might consider more the benefits of taking refugees in while another state might be more prudent and weigh more heavily the costs of accepting a number of people who are looking for refuge and are in need of assistance. I will start by analysing the theories that are used to understand the refugee policy choices of states when a refugee influx occurs. The focus will be on developing countries as the case study of this paper is Tanzania, specifically during the 1960s and 1970s. The first four hypothesis apply to both developed and developing countries, while the last five look explicitly to developing countries.

H1) The first theory I consider, which refers to developed countries, is based on social and economic benefits: states accept refugees in order to counter specific trends within their borders. An example might be helpful to better understand this theory.

According to Matsangou (2015), Europe has an impending problem on its hands that could have disastrous repercussions – an ageing labour force and a declining birth rate. According to a UN report published in 2016, the average fertility rate in Africa was 4.7 in 2015, meaning that in Africa, on average, every woman was giving birth to 4.7 children. In the same year, the average in Europe was 1.6 (UN, 2016). Refugee influxes from developing countries can therefore be an important source to counter the ageing labour force and the declining birth rate in order to maintain Europe's demographics at levels for sufficient economic growth (Matsangou, 2015). These findings lead to my first hypothesis, namely that states take in refugees in order to counter frightening trends, such as sustaining a state's pension system or countering the declining birth rate.

H2) The second theory suggests that states take refugees in based on morality and ethics, essentially because it is the right thing to do. This theory applies to both developed and developing countries, as morality, international treaties and the protection of human rights make no distinction between poor and rich countries. Behind the legal definition of the term *refugee*, there is a reality that is immensely more complex, which makes a claim not only on our legal minds, but also on our hearts and souls (Durieux, 2013). As Martin puts it, the label *refugee* has become a call to action, a challenge to elicit a humanitarian response, an invitation to roll up one's sleeves and find ways to help, to rally material support and find new homes for this special category of individuals (Martin, 2013). No country was obliged to sign the 1951 Geneva Convention relating to the Status of Refugees nor to sign the 1967 Protocol; and yet, the total number of state parties to the Convention is 145, while the total number of state parties to the Protocol is 146, as of April 2015 (UNHCR, 2015). This shows how states have decided to commit themselves to some moral principles, namely the principle of mutual aid, the priority to save lives, and the duty to rescue people in need or jeopardy. Some countries might decide to help neighbouring countries because of a sense of unity, solidarity and fraternity (as the case

study will show, Pan-Africanism played a big role in the acceptance of the refugees), or because of a tradition of mutual help or due to common culture and religion. As a consequence, my second hypothesis is: developed and developing states take refugees in because they feel somehow morally obliged to do so.

H3) According to some theories, states should not accept refugees. For instance, one theory, which also explains some policies that can be found in developing countries such as Kenya, is linked to national security and terrorism. Since 9/11, international migration, both forced and voluntary, has become a critical point in the security agenda of many countries; indeed, migration and security are viewed through the lens of international terrorism. Lately, migration has increasingly been linked to terrorism, causing the rise of populism as well as the re-emergence of far-right movements across Western countries. Determining which categories of migrants to let in and which to keep out is a key challenge facing developed countries (Adamson, 2006). Migration flows are believed to foment violent conflict in the international system: indeed, they can be a conduit for international terrorism and they may also provide opportunities for networks of organised crime. Although these theories are not always true and have often been disproven (Dearden, 2016), many political actors have unfortunately taken advantage of this wave of fear of migration to obtain consent and in some cases to gain power, the most absurd example being the election of United States President Donald Trump. My third hypothesis is that states do not take refugees in because they fear that these people might be potential terrorists who could harm the country and its citizens.

H4) Welcoming refugees might also have negative impacts, both social and economic. This fourth hypothesis states that a refugee crisis creates an issue of overcrowding in the host nation. This problem has several consequences, which vary depending on the country: a problem of overcrowding in a developing country may see the gathering of hundreds of thousands of people in a concentrated area; in this case,

disease can quickly break out because of a lack of health control or hygiene.

Overcrowding phenomena also cause environmental degradation in both developing and developed countries: the example of the Calais Jungle, which was closed at the end of 2016, demonstrates that the gathering of a huge number of people often leads to a situation where those involved end up living in conditions where their physical and mental health might be jeopardised. If such a situation happened in France, uncontrolled refugee camps in poorer countries might be even worse. However, overcrowded situations can bring up other issues: for instance, welcoming significant numbers of refugees may cause unemployment among locals. In fact, it is a common belief that refugees drain state resources and take jobs away from residents. This is not always true, as Matsangou (2015) made clear, but the perception might create social conflicts between the locals and the refugees. To conclude, this fourth hypothesis states that a country should not take in refugees because of the negative social and economic consequences that they might cause.

I will now narrow my focus specifically to developing countries, as these countries weigh a whole different set of factors when they approach a refugee influx. I will first discuss pro-refugee theories.

H5) The first theory claims that refugees significantly contribute to the state-building of the host country. An influx of refugees means international media attention. As a consequence, international actors such as the UNHCR and non-governmental organisations (NGOs) focus their attention on the crisis. Jacobsen (2001) calls 'refugee resources' all the material, social and political resources that flow into the host country when a refugee crisis occurs. Considering the fact that the UNHCR, in a report published in 2014, recognised that refugee camps should be a last resort rather than a default response, the UNHCR itself and NGOs are trying to fund projects that integrate refugee

policies with local ones (Jacobsen, 2001). She further argues that the same thing should be done with refugee and local services. Refugee resources may help develop some areas of the country, extend the bureaucratic reach of the state, and benefit the local communities through the improvement of transport infrastructures, health clinics, schools, etc. It is a win-win situation, where both the host government and the refugees benefit and profit (Jacobsen, 2002). Moreover, some types of resources, such as buildings, schools and transportation equipment, persist once the refugees repatriate and thus can be turned over to the local community. There are several examples in developing countries where the presence of refugees has brought resources which have improved local services. For instance, refugees from Liberia, Côte D'Ivoire and Sierra Leone fled to Guinea during the 1990s and early 2000s and they were allowed to settle in local villages; the building and rehabilitation of facilities such as latrines, bathrooms and water points was bolstered by international aid (Fielden, 2008). In Uganda, the UNHCR has funded schools and projects and is paying teachers in order to integrate young refugees with the local community (Dryden-Peterson, 2003). As a consequence, another hypothesis is that a developing country takes in refugees in order to take advantage of the flow of resources brought by international actors and invests these resources to develop its facilities.

H6) A second theory claims that the refugees themselves have an economic contribution to the host country and the host community. Not only do refugees cause a flow of resources as mentioned above, but they can be the resource themselves. Indeed, refugees bring assets, such as social capital, new skills and material goods they brought from their home country (Jacobsen, 2002); refugees also bring economic benefits and development potential by expanding consumption of food and commodities, which helps stimulate the growth of the economy (Zetter, 2012). Moreover, refugees interact socially and economically with the host community. For instance, in Uganda, local communities are important customers for settlement-based refugees, and Ugandan businesses rely

heavily on refugees as suppliers, customers, distributors, and employees (Betts, 2014). According to Jacobsen (2002), a key contribution of refugees is their entrepreneurship: there is evidence that refugees have started their own businesses which serve both other refugees and the local community, sometimes with the refugees employing the locals. A new hypothesis can therefore be made, namely that developing countries take in refugees because they can bring notable economic benefits to the host community.

Next, I will present a set of theories that recommend that states do not take refugees in.

H7) The first theory maintains that a refugee influx from one state to another significantly increases the likelihood of militarised interstate disputes (MID) in that dyad (Salehyan, 2008). There is evidence that when a civil war breaks out in a developing country, the refugee-sending country is likely to chase the dissidents into the neighbouring country and violate borders in order to prevent the dissidents from gathering and creating a resistance movement that might attempt to gain power. On the other hand, it has also happened that the refugee-receiving country initiated a MID in order to stop the flow of refugees into its borders as the burden of taking care of them was becoming unbearable. According to Salehyan, there is evidence that refugees significantly increase the probability of international conflict. My hypothesis therefore suggests that a developing country does not take refugees in because this would enhance the probability of a military clash with the refugee-sending country.

H8) The second theory claims that a country does not take refugees in because of the degradation of the environment. Land degradation can also be a cause of conflict (Martin 2005). The establishment of a refugee camp means that from several thousands to hundreds of thousands of people will set up in an area which is usually close to a border. This will have a tremendous effect on the surrounding area and the communities

who live there. Some of the consequences are the quantity of waste produced - which is also a threat to human health - and the considerable stresses placed on natural resources (Martin, 2005). Since refugees cannot entirely rely on international aid, they start converting forests to agricultural land, collect firewood, and start fishing and hunting. This can lead to confrontations with the locals. As a result, environmental impacts lead to social and economic impacts, sometimes causing local populations to suffer as much as, if not more than, refugee populations (Martin, 2005). According to this finding, my hypothesis claims that a developing country does not take refugees in because of the devastating environmental consequences that such an action may cause.

H9) Another possible reason that may push a country to take refugees in is the fear of international punishment. As mentioned above, being a signatory of the 1951 Geneva Convention compels a state not to send or return people to a country where they might be in danger or persecuted. Although there are not many cases where a country has been punished by the international community for not complying with its duty of providing refuge, the international community might take some kind of action against a country which decides to repel refugees back to a place where they are in danger. For instance, the violator might be taken to the International Court of Justice (ICJ) by another state, and if evidence of the violation of the 1951 Convention is provided, the ICJ might deliver a judgement which is final, binding on the parties to the case, and without appeal. Another possible action might be that of imposing financial penalties. For instance, in 2017 the European Commission launched a legal case against Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic for refusing to take in refugees (Wintour, 2017). Complaints were made as some European members were accepting many refugees while others did not accept any. Sanctions might be imposed, although it may take a long time before a European court does so. Accordingly, a country might accept refugees in order to avert legal and financial consequences.

Method

Tanzania is used as a representative case as soon after its independence, it established a reputation for being one of the most hospitable countries in the world. The refugee situation in Africa has gone through different stages since the 1960s. The case study of this paper focuses on migration movements and refugee crises that occurred during the 1960s and the 1970s in and around Tanzania. Before moving into the specifics of the case, it is important to have an idea of the refugee situation in Africa during this period. Refugee movements in Africa started growing slowly in the early 1960s. There are different causes that can be identified for these movements, such as political crises, liberation struggles, political instability in newly independent countries, and other types of crises originating from the rise of several authoritarian regimes. 1960 became known as 'the year of Africa,' since seventeen countries gained independence. As a consequence, Africa during the 1960s witnessed a dramatic upsurge in the number of refugees (Adepoju, 1982). It is estimated that in 1967, the number of refugees on the African continent was only 735,000; by 1980 the number reached about 4 million (Adepoju, 1982). In less than fifteen years, secessionist and civil wars, persecutions, social upheavals, as well as natural disasters such as famines and droughts, made Africa home to more than a third of the world's total refugees, most of whom were in black Africa. As will be shown, Tanzania did not only welcome refugees and migrants from independent countries, but it also accepted and gave refuge to thousands of freedom fighters who were fighting for the independence of their countries from European rule. Furthermore, Tanzania allowed the refugees to earn a living, gave them plots of land to cultivate, and it is one of the few cases where the host state naturalised refugees once they were integrated into the local population. I therefore decided to analyse the case of Tanzania during the 1960s and 1970s in order to see what could be the driving forces that bring a country to accept

refugees and, on the other hand, what type of benefit and burden the refugees themselves could produce.

To examine why Tanzania accepted all the refugees during Nyerere's presidency, I will conduct a single case study and process tracing to understand the motivations of the open door policy. This will allow me to understand what were the driving forces that made it accept the refugee influx. Indeed, Tanzania is a very particular case, for it welcomed both refugees and freedom fighters and allowed them to integrate economically and socially, by providing plots of land and other services with the help of the UNHCR and other international actors. I will adopt a theory-building process tracing design; this allows me to weigh each theory according to how much influence it had in the decision-making process. By using a single case study, I will be able to understand the motivations that led Tanzania to adopt certain policies; on the other hand, building up a theory does not necessarily mean that it can be proved right on other similar cases. As a matter of fact, Tanzania is a rather unique case for its political situation and its role in the fight for African independence. I use Tanzania because its policies and behaviour towards the refugees serve as an example to demonstrate that refugees can be integrated. Moreover, they can benefit the host country as my study will show. As such, Tanzania could be taken as an example for developing countries. My analysis will be largely qualitative rather than quantitative though I use some data in order to see what effect the decision of welcoming the refugees had on the economy of Tanzania. However, I will mostly focus on qualitative analysis of the political background, the influence and role that international organisations had on the decision-making process of accepting the refugees and their settlement.

Case Study

The next section is dedicated to the case study. In the first part, some historical and economical background will be given in order to better understand the reasons that brought the Tanzanian government to accept all the refugees under President Nyerere's mandates. The second part will be dedicated to the analyses and the understanding of the open door policy, by testing the hypotheses made above in order to find out what actually resulted in the development of such refugee policies.

A brief history of Tanzania under Nyerere

Tanganyika gained independence from British rule in 1961. Three years later, it joined with Zanzibar to form the Republic of Tanzania. The new Republic soon established a reputation as one of the most hospitable countries of asylum in Africa, if not in the world (Milner, 2013). Having gained its independence, Tanzania found itself being a very poor country with a very poor agricultural economy. In 1964, the category "agriculture, hunting, forestry and fishing" represented 50% of monetary GDP (Edwards, 2012). What is even more striking is that the agricultural sector absorbed 80% of the Tanzanian labour force. It is necessary to take into account the poor economic situation of Tanzania as it helps to understand most of the economic and social policies adopted by the father of the nation, the first president of Tanzania, Julius Nyerere. Nyerere was the first Tanzanian to study at a British university, the University of Edinburgh, where he developed his own ideas of grafting socialism into his own country (Marshall, 1999). He belonged to the group of young Africans who moved to Europe to have a 'modern' education. Many of them, such as Jomo Kenyatta from Kenya, Kwame Nkrumah from Ghana, and Nyerere himself, were strongly influenced by Fabian Socialist ideas. Once they returned to their respective countries, they all acceded to power and applied what they had learned in Europe, each following a different path and implementing socialism to a different degree. They all

believed in the “planning approach,” even though some implemented it in a soft way, while others implemented a stronger version. President Nyerere belonged to the latter group.

Despite the fact that there were competing views on the appropriate avenue for economic development, Nyerere was inflexible about his plan: his planning perspective was supported by different economists and eventually his idea of socialism was implemented. As will be shown later, the Arusha Declaration was approved in 1967 and with it begun the socialist transformation of Tanzania. Nyerere was strongly influenced by China: in a 1968 visit, he stated that he had “come to China to learn” (Edwards, 2012). For instance, he was very impressed by the collectivisation of agricultural sectors into communes, a policy that he also implemented in his own country during the 1970s (Villagisation Programme). The self-confidence, the commitment and the dedication that Nyerere was showing for the development plan of Tanzania was key for the attraction of enormous amounts of foreign aid. Without the large flows of international aid, the Arusha Declaration would have been just another Third World manifesto. Instead, it became one of the most ambitious political, social and economic experiments in Africa, and one of the most costly (Edwards, 2012).

In the years following the Arusha Declaration, foreign assistance increased at a vertiginous pace. Bilateral donors were extremely important for Tanzania (over 50 bilateral deals were signed); the most generous came from Nordic countries, which provided 30% of all assistance. In the early seventies, after the acceptance of the massive 1972 Burundian influx, Nyerere’s allure skyrocketed. Even the World Bank, initially reluctant and unsure about the Declaration, fell under Tanzania’s spell and concluded a deal with the president for a huge lending program. Although refugees did not play a primary role in this set of foreign aid, they certainly helped: welcoming all the refugees and providing them plots of land, opportunities to integrate and in some cases even naturalising them, were

all factors that increased the flow of funds and attracted international attention. Another strategic move was the mass naturalisation of about 36'000 Rwandese refugees in 1980, although the implementation of this policy took more than a decade and this had negative consequences on the integration of the refugees (Gasarasi, 1990). However, in the end, the socialist experiment turned out to be a miserable failure. In 1979, when the economy of Tanzania was about to collapse, Nyerere expelled an IMF mission saying that he would never allow Washington to run his country. Donors slowly started reducing their financial support and by 1985 almost everyone had withdrawn their support. Finally, in 1985, Nyerere announced that he would not stand for re-election as president, and the year after, Tanzania made an official request for an IMF Stand-by Arrangement. The era of socialism had come to an end and the process of economic liberalisation had begun.

Tanzania and the refugees

Ever since its creation in 1961, Tanzania has never stopped dealing with refugees. Even before independence, while Tanganyika was under British rule, this African region experienced different refugee influxes. The main reason is that during the 1885 Berlin Conference that partitioned Africa, borders were not drafted based on elements such as common language, religion or cultural practices, as logic would suggest; instead, they were drafted on the basis of conquest and legitimisation of occupied lands (Chaulia, 2003). Despite the fact that such decisions utterly concerned native populations and tribes, most of the time, those people were not informed. As a consequence, they would cross borders without even being aware of what they were actually doing: becoming migrants. However, these unwitting refugees were easily and often naturally accorded sanctuary - as they had been for more than a hundred years - eventually integrating into the local setting like fish taking to familiar water as Tanzanians generally welcomed these uprooted people (Chaulia, 2003).

As an independent country, Tanzania experienced its first contact with refugees not even one year after its independence, when it had to deal with an undefined number of refugees from Rwanda who fled into the West Lake Province (Gasarasi, 1984). During Nyerere's presidency, which lasted until 1985, Tanzania hosted a number of refugees resulting from a wide range of situations and countries (Mendel, 1997).

Before analysing the different influxes, I shall highlight a peculiarity of Tanzania. As mentioned above, President Nyerere was a strong advocate of African unity and its total liberation from European imperialism. In a speech on Pan-Africanism held in 1966, Nyerere claimed:

“African unity is essential to the continent as a whole and to every part of it. Politically we have inherited boundaries which are either unclear or such ethnological and geographical non-sense that they are fruitful of disagreements... There is only one way in which Africa can stay outside irrelevant world conflicts and in which she can hope to deal with oppressing economic and social problems which now beset her people. The present boundaries must lose their significance and become merely a demarcation of administrative areas within a larger unit.”

This ideology made Tanzania one of the safest refuges in southern Africa, not only for refugees from independent countries, but also for freedom fighters. Support for liberation movements began in the pre-independence period when its own liberation movement, TANU¹, forged links with other anticolonial groups on the continent (Daley, 1992).

According to Chaulia, Tanzania during the 1970s outdid Ghana, Guinea, the United Arab Republic, and Mali in materially assisting and hosting nationalist rebel movements that were fighting for the overthrow of European rule and minority racialist oppression

¹ The Tanganyika African National Union was a political party formed by Julius Nyerere in 1954. From 1964 the party was called Tanzania African National Union.

(Chaulia, 2003). These freedom fighters are considered refugees in accordance with the broader definition of the term that is stated in the Convention Governing the Specific Aspects of Refugees published in 1969. Freedom fighters were therefore welcomed into Tanzania, although they were not put into settlements built in accordance with the Tripartite Agreement, a document that signed between the UNHCR, Tanzania and a local organisation which will be analysed in the next section. Many of them were allowed to build guerrilla camps where 'refugees' could undergo military training. Tanzania was so committed to the cause of African liberation that in 1968, it built a powerful radio transmitter for external service in Dar el Salaam, back then the capital, to help the freedom fighters propagate their message worldwide (Mwakikagile, 2006). Yet, most of these 'refugees' did not stay for a long time in Tanzania, moving back to their home countries once independence had been achieved.

On the other hand, several refugee influxes coming from independent countries were recorded. The major ones came from Rwanda, Uganda, Burundi, and Mozambique. What is probably the biggest influx registered under Nyerere's presidency, is the one that occurred in 1972. Following a campaign of violence led by the Tutsi-dominated government against the Hutu population in Burundi, the events triggered the flight of approximately 150,000 refugees, with most fleeing to Tanzania (COR Center, 2007). Events in Mozambique generated a wave of 70,000 refugees during the war for independence against Portuguese rule between 1964 and 1974. Following the 1971 putsch of Idi Amin in Uganda, tens of thousands of refugees fled into Tanzania (Mendel, 1997). In all these cases, as well as other less numerous influxes which occurred during this period, Tanzania never rejected a single refugee. Migrants were welcomed and settled in undeveloped areas of the country such as Kagera, Rukwa and Tabora. Sometimes proper settlements were built under the guide of the Tripartite Arrangement, such as Mishamo, Ulyankulu, Pangale, and others. However, it happened that refugees,

especially those from the 1972 caseload and those from Rwanda, settled among locals in villages and quickly integrated socially and economically. In the end, both refugees in official settlements and those who settled with Tanzanians were integrated in the national development plan and in the villagisation programme. Accordingly, refugees were involved in the production of cotton, tobacco and other agricultural crops and increased their export.

I now present my case study from different perspectives which are essential to understand the open door policy developed towards refugees. To begin, I will provide an analysis of three important documents that influenced the refugee policy. Afterwards, I will use process tracing to analyse what drove the decision for the open door policy.

The Arusha Declaration

Nyerere was elected president of Tanzania in 1961, and in 1967 the Arusha Declaration was published; it was a statement that described Nyerere's idea of how to build a socialist state. It is essential to understand the importance of the Arusha Declaration as it explains the aims and targets of the government, how to achieve them and the political ideology that would shape Tanzania in the decades to come. I will present three points of the Declaration that I argue have strongly influenced the refugee policy: the importance of having a socialist structure, the strong influence of Pan-Africanism, and the strategy of self-reliance.

As mentioned, Nyerere wanted to build a socialist state as he believed socialism was the only way for Third World Countries to develop in a world led by capitalism and free markets and therefore the only way to defeat poverty. This is clearly stated in the first part of the Arusha Declaration, as the opening of the Declaration states, "The policy of the TANU is to build a socialist state." The Declaration continues with a list of aims, one of

which maintains that the ruling party will ensure that Tanzania shall be governed by a democratic socialist government of the people (Arusha Declaration, 1967). This shall be achieved by letting the government participate in the economic development of the country, by eliminating the division between workers and those who exploit the workers and by eradicating all elements of capitalism and feudalism. According to the Declaration, all the major means of production and exchange in the nation shall be controlled by the machinery of the government.

Another important point of the Arusha Declaration is the will to co-operate with all African political parties that are engaged in the liberation of their countries. President Nyerere strongly believed in the importance of African unity and its liberation from colonial rule. In his own words:

“The Tanzanian government is convinced that her independence is incomplete before the whole of Africa becomes free. We shall neither give up nor lag behind in supporting the refugees ... We will help those who want to free their countries”.

It is important to note that the term refugee in Africa is slightly differently defined. Indeed, the definition does not only refer to that of Article 1(2) of the 1951 Geneva Convention; in fact, in 1969 the Organisation of African Unity (OAU) published the Convention Governing the Specific Aspects of Refugees, where it added that the term *refugee* “shall also apply to every person who, owing to external aggression, occupation, foreign domination or events seriously disturbing public order in either part or the whole of his country of origin or nationality” (OAU Convention, 1969). With these ideologies, Tanzania became one of the safest places for oppressed people in Africa. Freedom fighters from neighbouring countries such as Namibia, South Africa, Zimbabwe, Mozambique and others found

refugee in Tanzania. All of these refugees were incorporated in the socialist development plan of Tanzania: they were settled into rural refugee settlements that were built in accordance with the Tripartite Agreement, an agreement which will be explained and analysed below.

Self-reliance is the fundamental structure of *Ujamaa*, the social and economic policy developed under Nyerere's presidency. *Ujamaa* means 'brotherhood' or 'extended family' in Swahili, and is based on concepts such as collective agriculture, nationalisation of banks and industries, and increased levels of self-reliance at both an individual and a national level (Boddy-Evans, 2017). President Nyerere unceasingly mentioned the importance of self-reliance in his mandates. For instance, in a speech held in front of the parliament in July 1975, Nyerere highlighted the necessity of achieving self-reliance to counter poverty in the country, saying that it has to be the aim of every Tanzanian. In order to achieve it, Nyerere claimed that the nation had to make a concerted effort to increase production in all sectors, by using the land both more extensively and more intensively and by using the existing resources of men and skills to the utmost (Nyerere, 1975). Therefore, agriculture was identified as the main foundation for Tanzania's future development. The policy of *Ujamaa* was implemented through a 'villagisation' program that aimed at settling people in small communities (Kweka, 2007). The strategy placed great trust in the Tanzanian peasants as initiators of their own progress. Socially, the village would offer a life without exploitation; politically, the life in villages was equated with grass-roots democracy and popular participation (Kjekshus, 1977). Initially, in the period 1967-73, the program was slowly implemented and did not affect many Tanzanians, according to Hyden (1975), only 15% of the population. Indeed, only 23 villages had been created covering some 15 000 acres and involving about 3500 families (Kjekshus, 1977). However, as mentioned before, President Nyerere implemented a strong version of socialism. In fact, in 1973 the government started firmly applying the

policy: peasants were forced to leave their homes and were put into communities (or villages); between 1973 and 1975, the implementation of the villagisation strategy had affected the lives of approximately half of Tanzania's population (Hyden, 1975). By the end of the 1970s, there were over 2500 of these villages (Boddy-Evans, 2017). At the core of the planning view of development was the idea that the accumulation of physical capital was the main source of economic growth, and that the availability of labour was not a constraint to economic expansion (Edwards, 2012).

The Refugee (Control) Act

The second document is the Refugee (Control) Act of 1965. This Act contains the legal regime and specific national legislation governing refugees in Tanzania. Notwithstanding the many critiques it received from different international organisations, including the UNHCR itself, and authors (Chol, 1985), it was only superseded by a new refugee act in 1998. The instability created by the influx of Rwandan refugees in the early 1960s had great repercussions in Tanzania, as the refugees were reluctant to accept the solutions proposed by their host. Their intransigence forced the Tanzanian government to hurriedly enact a refugee law containing several caveats to control refugees' movements and activities (Daley, 1992). The document addresses a wide range of issues relating to refugees, although it does not provide a general definition of a refugee. For instance, it establishes that the responsible minister, the Minister of Home Affairs, may declare any part of Tanganyika to be an area for the reception or residence of any refugees or category thereof. It also allows the responsible Minister to declare any class of person (with some exceptions, such as citizens) to be refugees (section 3) (Mendel, 1997). Referring to refugees crossing the border, the Act states that once a refugee enters Tanganyika, he or she has to surrender any arms or ammunition (section 6); animals brought in shall be kept or slaughtered by the authorities (section 7); authorities may take

possession of any vehicle (section 8). Furthermore, individuals need to obtain permits authorising them to remain in the country, from which they may not depart without permission. These extensive powers dealing with the maintenance of law and order were made in accordance with the idea of building a socialist state through a planning approach.

The Refugee (Control) Act of 1965 grants a significant amount of power to the officials; indeed, it recognises the Settlement Commandant as the government representative responsible for the maintenance of law (Gasarasi, 1984). This document is extremely important because any other agreement concerning refugees has to fit its stipulations into the general spirit of the Act. This is the case of the Tripartite Arrangement, which will be presented in the next section.

The Tripartite Agreement

The last document that I will analyse is the Tripartite Agreement. It is a document signed between three parties, namely the government of the Republic of Tanzania, the UNHCR, and the Tanzanian branch of the Lutheran World Federation (a humanitarian Non-Governmental Organisation) of the Tanganyika Christian Refugee Service (TCRS). The first agreement was signed in 1964, when 3000 Rwandan refugees had to be resettled. It led to the establishment of the Mwese settlement following a division of tasks and duties among the three signatories. The Agreement is a strategy adopted by the government and the UNHCR. The TCRS is an organisation that coordinates all kind of assistance from voluntary agencies other than UN bodies, and that makes sure that the implementation of the Agreement benefits Tanzanians living in the area of the settlement. For instance, it has to make sure that educational or medical services provided for the refugees can also be used by the locals, boosting the level of integration. The Tripartite Agreement can be described as a win-win situation; indeed, the deal is that the government provides free

land (a minimum of ten acres per family) for farming, on the understanding that the refugees have the same rights and terms of use as are given to the nationals (Gasarasi, 1984).

Other government duties have comprised such things as the provision of the services of public administration (public safety, public health, etc.), basic tools, and cooking equipment. As stated in the Refugee (Control) Act of 1965, the government appoints a commandant who has to facilitate the implementation of the resettlement project, arrange the importation of supplies and equipment offered by international organisations or private donors through the TCRS and to take charge of the settlement in general. On the other hand, the UNHCR "only" had to provide funds, arrange the movement of the refugees and provide advice through its staff. In accordance with this strategy, after the Mwese settlement, eight other settlements were set up following this design. Some of them hosted tens of thousands of refugees, such as the Katumba settlement which had an average population of 48,000 during the period from 1973 to 1978, or the Ulyankulu settlement which also provided refuge to some 45,000 refugees over the same period. According to Daley, the government has managed to place an estimated 82% of the region's refugee population in organised settlements.

Analysis

These three documents have all determined to some degree the refugee policy adopted by President Nyerere. Authors debate on what might have been the most significant driving force that led Tanzania to welcome the refugees. I will consider the situation from a general perspective in order to tease out possible explanations and combine them with the hypotheses presented in the first part of this paper.

To begin, it is important to understand what the reasons are that made Tanzania so attractive to refugees. The country, for instance, has always had a culture of hospitality

and humanitarianism (Morel, 2009; Edwards, 2012), which made it very appealing to migrants and refugees from southern Africa. The presence of fallow land is clearly a factor that influenced, on the one hand, the government's open door policy, and on the other hand, the decision of thousands of refugees to settle and start a new life there. According to Morel (2009), another reason is the cultural affinity with other African nations of a common ancestry. Obviously, the fact that Tanzania never experienced a civil war and did not have serious political turmoil in the post-colonial period, depicted it as a safe and secure haven compared to other more dangerous and politically complicated countries in the region, such as Mozambique, Uganda, Rwanda or Burundi. In this context, the Refugee (Control) Act of 1965 shaped the open door policy that was pursued until 1998. So what was the driving force that made Tanzania follow a policy characterised by a general allocation of land, local integration and, in some cases, naturalisation?

According to Van Hoyweghen (2001), after the influx of the Burundian caseload, it was quite clear and evident that the resettlement of refugees in remote areas was a strategy of the Tanzanian government to exploit and develop such areas. Moreover, that move allowed the government to economically integrate the refugees into the national economic development. Nyerere stated at different times that the land should have been the bulk of development: in a speech held in 1975, Nyerere frequently repeats that the aim of the nation is self-reliance and that intensive agriculture is the way to achieve it. This theory finds support in **H6**: accepting refugees because of their human potential might be a reason that leads to the opening of the borders. Having hundreds of thousands of people working on Tanzania's undeveloped areas surely counted as a benefit, especially considering Nyerere's development plan. However, human potential alone cannot arguably be the main reason to open borders. As a matter of fact, there is substantial evidence against this theory if we look at what happened in Tanzania in the early 1990s: following the Rwandan genocide of 1993, around 700,000 refugees fled into

Tanzania. The political situation was completely different at that time, but still the government's decision to close its borders in 1995 and to return many of the refugees shows that the human potential is not a major incentive to welcome refugees. If that were the case, the problem of refugees would probably be solved worldwide.

Another possible explanation is the one supported by Edwards (2012): as explained in **H5**, a refugee crisis causes a flow of different types of resources into the host country. As mentioned, the World Bank and other international actors increased their assistance to Tanzania, especially in the 1970s. This was not only because of the open door policy, but also Tanzania's hospitable behaviour towards the refugees. Not only the UNCHR, but private donors as well as other international organisations rushed to help. It is true that sometimes money is invested in the development of facilities that can be used both by the refugees and the locals, such as schools or hospitals; however, believing that a developing country opens its borders to tens of thousands of refugees and deals with all its consequences just to develop some of its infrastructure sounds dubious. For instance, in Tanzania, especially after the Arusha Declaration, infrastructure development was not a priority (Edwards, 2012). Accordingly, I argue that the flow of resources is not a strong incentive to open the borders. The case of the EU-Turkey Refugee Deal signed in 2016 provides support against my hypothesis; however, first of all, Turkey is not a developing country, and second, the deal was a very specific and unique case. Moreover, arguably almost any country, especially a developing one, would accept 6 billion euros in financial aid to welcome refugees.

It is important not to underestimate the power of an ideology. The Pan-African movement played a critical role in shaping policies in different African countries in the second half of the 20th century. Nyerere has always been consistent in pursuing his commitment to Pan-Africanism. Making Tanzania the first of the front-line states to serve as a base for waging the liberation struggles of southern Africa shows just a part of his

tireless dedication to the unity and freedom of Africa (Legum, 1985). The decision to welcome the refugees might find its first step in the Pan-African movement: the idea of a nation committing itself to the saving of African refugees in need of help because the beloved father of the nation asked for it seems more feasible and plausible than all the alternative hypotheses.

In the end, I argue that there is not one prevailing motivation, as in some cases, reasons were complementary. In fact, the strategy adopted can be seen as an interconnected system. Pan-Africanism might be considered as the starting point: solidarity, morality and the importance of African unity and independence brought Tanzania to welcome all the refugees. In reality, the type of refugees that Pan-Africanism especially led Tanzania to accept were freedom fighters. However, Nyerere might have taken advantage of this and decided to open Tanzania's borders to anyone looking for refuge. In this way, by settling in undeveloped areas those refugees coming from independent countries, such as those of the 1972 Burundian caseload, he noticed that this move could perfectly fit into his socialist development plan and the villagisation programme. Accordingly, having hundreds of thousands more people who increase and expand the use of land would be a blessing. Actually, a double blessing: first of all, the production of crops such as tobacco and cotton increased, and secondly, such a move fostered and enhanced Tanzania's prestige in the international community, bringing different flows of resources. The decision to take in all the refugees, on the surface a risky move for one of the poorest countries in the world, started a process that allowed Tanzania to achieve two goals: first of all, to provide refuge to those in need; secondly, to turn a potentially troublesome situation into a win-win situation, both for the refugees who were given the chance to start over, and for Tanzania which saw undeveloped areas flourish and a flow of resources of all types.

To sum up, and considering the evidence, I argue that ideology is the most powerful driving force. Money and other resources can have, and do have, a big impact on decisions; on the other hand, there is nothing as motivating, as decisive and as influential as an ideology or a creed. In this case, there is strong evidence to support the notion that Pan-Africanism was the starting point of a whole system which made Tanzania accept the refugees. Nyerere held a speech in 1966 on Pan-Africanism in the occasion of the inauguration of the University of Zambia:

In more realistic language—perhaps more appropriate to the task ahead—we must keep in front of us at all times the goal of unity; we must recognize the danger that without positive action we shall be diverted from it; and we must take that positive action at every possible point. For African unity does not have to be a dream; it can be a vision which inspires us.

Nyerere really believed in African unity and fought for African freedom. He managed to send this message to the people of Tanzania, as they provided refuge and help to freedom fighter as well as welcomed and accepted refugees in need of help.

Conclusion

The Tanzanian case provides some important lessons about refugee issues. First and most importantly, refugees are not always a burden. With the right policies and proper integration, the burden can be turned into a benefit. Different authors have provided evidence that local integration is feasible and achievable (Jacobsen, 2001; Fielden, 2008; Crisp, 2004). According to Jacobsen (2001), for instance, it is essential that refugee policies are integrated with local ones. This was the task of the TCRS under the Tripartite Agreement, namely making sure that if a school or a well was constructed for the

refugees, these services were also available for the local population. This is considered crucial for three main reasons: in order not to create a sense of jealousy toward the refugee population; secondly, in order to encourage social integration; and finally, because it can result in the long-term benefit of local access to new infrastructure once the repatriation of the refugees has taken place (Fielden, 2008). Tanzania has also shown that providing land is another fundamental requisite: the possibility for the refugees to cultivate their own food removes an important economic burden from the government as refugees do not have to depend on international organisations to survive. However, what I believe is the most important lesson is that there is no such powerful driving force as an ideology. Pan-Africanism played a crucial role in shaping Tanzania's policies in the post-colonial period. After gaining independence, many African countries were culturally lost. Boundaries were made by drawing lines on a map, without considering factors such as common language or culture. The Pan-African movement was for many people a lifeline in a continent that had to find its way after the terrible experience of colonialism. Pan-Africanism brought together all the black populations of Africa.

To conclude with a reflection: it is unfortunate and somehow paradoxical that when it comes to drafting an agreement about the destiny of a group of people, in this case refugees, they are never a party in the agreement. This is what happened for instance in the case of the 1964 Tripartite Agreement; it is true that refugees were represented by the UNHCR, but no actual refugee has ever attended any meeting. This habit of not consulting refugees in decisions that refer to them is unfortunately quite common. For instance, when setting up a refugee camp, the UNHCR follows specific standards and rules that can be found in the UNHCR Handbook for Emergencies, a model that provides guidance when facing a displacement crisis. The guide never mentions considering refugees' will or preferences. In an interview published on IRIN News, Rukia Ali Rage, chairwoman of the Ifo camp in Kenya, claimed that the biggest challenge is that the

refugees are never involved in the decision-making process of the initial design of the camp (Hujale, 2016). The issue is not to be underestimated because whatever decisions are taken about refugees, they are never involved in the process although they are those who will live the effects of the decisions.

Reference List

Adamson, Fiona B. 2006. Crossing Borders, International Migration and National Security. *International Security*.

Adepoju, Aderanti. 1982. The Dimension of the Refugee Problem in Africa. *African Affairs, volume 81*.

Agier, Michel. 2002. Between war and city; Towards an urban anthropology of refugee camps. *École des hautes études en sciences sociales, Paris, France*.

Arenilla, Shirley Llain. 2015. Violations to the Principle of Non-Refoulement Under the Asylum Policy of the United States. *Anuario Mexicano de Derecho Internacional*.

Betts, Alexander. 2014. Refugee Economies, Rethinking Popular Assumptions. *Refugee Study Centre, Oxford University*.

Boddy-Evans, Alistair. 2017. What was Ujamaa? Nyerere's social and economic policy in Tanzania in the 1960s and 70s. ThoughtCo.com

Chaulia, Sreeram Sundar. 2003. The Politics of Refugee Hosting in Tanzania: From Open Door to Unsustainability, Insecurity and Receding Receptivity. *Journal of Refugee Studies*.

Chol, Ayok. 1985. Refugees: Tanzanian Experience, Law and Practice. *Oxford: Refugees Studies Programme*.

COR, Cultural Orientation Center. 2007. The 1972 Burundians. *COR*.

Crisp, Jeff. 2004. The local integration and local settlement of refugees: a conceptual and historical analysis. *NEW ISSUES IN REFUGEE RESEARCH, research paper no. 102, UNHCR*.

Daley, Patricia. 1992. The Politics of the Refugee Crisis in Tanzania. *Tanzania and the IMF, the Dynamics of Liberalization, Chapter 7*.

Dearden, Lizzie. 2016. UN report finds no evidence migration causes terror attacks and warns anti-refugee laws could worsen risk. independent.co.uk.

- Dryden-Peterson, Sarah and Hovil, Lucy. 2003. Local integration as a durable solution: refugees, host populations and education in Uganda. *NEW ISSUES IN REFUGEE RESEARCH*, research paper no. 93, UNHCR.
- Durieux, Jean-François. 2013. Three Asylum Paradigms. *International Journal on Minority and Group Rights*.
- Edwards, Sebastian. 2012. Is Tanzania a Success Story? A Long Term Analysis. *University of California, Los Angeles & National Bureau of Economic Research*.
- Fielden, Alexandra. 2008. Local integration: an under-reported solution to protracted refugee situations. *NEW ISSUES IN REFUGEE RESEARCH*, research paper no. 158, UNHCR.
- Gasarasi, Charles P. 1984. The Tripartite Approach to the Resettlement and Integration of Rural Refugees in Tanzania. *Scandinavian Institute of African Studies*.
- Gasarasi, Charles P. 1990. The Mass Naturalization and Further Integration of Rwandese Refugees in Tanzania: Process, Problems and Prospects. *Journal of Refugees Studies*.
- Gogou, Kondylia. 2017. E.U.-Turkey Deal Hinges on Fate of Syrian Locked Up on Lesbos: Amnesty. *NewsDeeply, Refugees Deeply*.
- Hujale, Moulid. 2016. The Refugee Camp that Became a City. *IRIN, the inside story on emergencies*.
- Hyden, Goran. 1975. Ujamaa, Villagisation and Rural Development in Tanzania. *Development Policy Review*.
- Jacobsen, Karen. 2001. The forgotten solution: local integration for refugees in developing countries. *NEW ISSUES IN REFUGEE RESEARCH*, research paper no. 45, UNHCR.
- Jacobsen, Karen. 2002. Can refugees benefit the state? Refugee resources and African state-building. *Journal of Modern African Studies*.

Kjekshus, Helge. 1977. The Tanzanian Villagization Policy: Implementational Lessons and Ecological Dimensions. *Canadian Journal of African Studies*.

Kweka, Leo Opportuna. 2007. The impact of structural adjustment program on the refugee policy in Tanzania. *Department of Geography*.

Legum, Colin. 1985. The Pan-Africanist. The Nyerere Years. Some personal impressions by his friends. *Britain - Tanzania Society*.

Marshall, Julian. 1999. Julius Nyerere. *The Guardian*.

Martin, Adrian. 2005. Environmental Conflict Between Refugee and Host Communities. *Journal of Peace Research*.

Martin, D.A. 1988. The New Asylum Seekers: Refugee Law in the 1980s. *Springer*.

Matsangou, Elizabeth. 2015. Refugees are an economic benefit, not burden, to Europe. *World Finance, the Voice of the Market*.

Mendel, Toby D. 1997. Refugee Law and Practice in Tanzania. *International Journal of Refugee Law*.

Morel, Michèle. 2009. The lack of refugee burden-sharing in Tanzania: tragic effects. *Afrika Focus*.

Mwakikagile, Godfrey. 2006. Africa 1960 - 1970: Chronicle and Analysis. *Custom Books Publishing, Scotts Valley, California*.

Nyerere, Julius Kambarage. 1966. The Dilemma of the Pan-Africanist. *Inauguration of the University of Zambia*.

Nyerere, Julius Kambarage. 1966. Freedom and Unity (Uhuru na Umoja). *A Selection from Writings and Speeches 1952-1965. Oxford University Press*.

Nyerere, Julius Kambarage. 1975. President Nyerere's Speech in Parliament, 18th July 1975. *The government printer, Dar es Salaam - Tanzania*.

- OAU Convention. 1969. Convention Governing the Specific Aspects of Refugee Problem in Africa. *Organisation of African Unity*.
- Rossi, Enzo. 2016. The EU Agreement with Turkey: Does it Jeopardise Refugees' Rights? *CMS, Centre for Migration Studies*.
- Salehyan, Idean. 2008. The Externalities of Civil Strife: Refugees as a Source of International Conflict. *American Journal of Political Science*.
- Sanyal, Romola. 2010. Refugees and the City: An Urban Discussion. *Development Planning Unit, University College London*.
- United Nations. 2016. World Fertility Patterns.
- UNHCR. 2016. States Parties to the 1951 Convention relating to the Status of Refugees and the 1967 Protocol. *UNHCR, United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees*.
- UNHCR. 1951. Convention and Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees. *UNHCR, United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees*.
- Van Hoyweghen, Saskia. 2001. Mobility, territoriality and sovereignty in post-colonial Tanzania. *NEW ISSUES IN REFUGEE RESEARCH, research paper no. 49, UNHCR*.
- Wintour, Patrick. 2017. EU takes action against eastern states for refusing to take refugees. *The Guardian*.
- Zetter, Roger. 2012. Are refugees an economic burden or benefit? *Forced Migration Review*.