

# **NEW ISSUES IN REFUGEE RESEARCH**

**Working Paper No. 105**

## **REFUGEE LIVELIHOODS** **Confronting uncertainty and responding to adversity:** **Mozambican war refugees in Limpopo Province,** **South Africa.**

Frederick Golooba-Mutebi

Agincourt Health and Population Unit  
School of Public Health  
University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa

Email: [mutebi@soft.co.za](mailto:mutebi@soft.co.za)

June 2004



**Evaluation and Policy Analysis Unit**

**Evaluation and Policy Analysis Unit  
United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees  
CP 2500, 1211 Geneva 2  
Switzerland**

**E-mail: [hqep00@unhcr.org](mailto:hqep00@unhcr.org)  
Web Site: [www.unhcr.org](http://www.unhcr.org)**

These working papers provide a means for UNHCR staff, consultants, interns and associates to publish the preliminary results of their research on refugee-related issues. The papers do not represent the official views of UNHCR. They are also available online under 'publications' at <[www.unhcr.org](http://www.unhcr.org)>.

ISSN 1020-7473

This document is part of a series of Refugee Livelihood Studies commissioned as a component of EPAU's Refugee Livelihoods Project.

The Refugee Livelihoods Project, a follow-up project to the Global Review on Protracted Refugee Situations, examines refugee livelihoods strategies and the potential for UNHCR and other actors to promote sustainable livelihoods in those situations where refugees have been dependent on humanitarian assistance for longer periods.

EPAU's goal in publishing these studies is to widely communicate the knowledge developed to date about supporting refugee livelihoods and to stimulate a better understanding of the ways in which refugees can be helped rather than hindered in efforts towards improving their livelihoods.

.

*“For them the country’s borders were just fences  
and laws and regulations nothing more than words”.<sup>1</sup>*

## **Introduction**

During the 1980s, as a result of civil war in Mozambique, many people fled areas plagued by violence and headed for the relative safety of those that were still peaceful. Others headed for neighbouring countries where they hoped to find refuge. Of the latter, some opted for the Republic of South Africa, eventually self-settling in the Ka-Ngwane and Gazankulu Homelands<sup>2</sup> among communities of fellow Shangaans. Self-settlement was facilitated by the Apartheid government’s refusal to recognise them as refugees and accord them their due rights under international law, the UNHCR’s consequent inability to intervene, the Homeland government’s lack of capacity to encamp and look after them, and the availability of land for the purpose. Following the 1992 peace accord that ended the civil war, the UNHCR mounted a voluntary repatriation programme in 1994/95, under which those wishing to return to Mozambique were assisted to do so. The programme repatriated approximately 31,000 refugees, less than 10 per cent of the estimated total (Johnston, 1997). In 1996 the post-Apartheid government declared a limited amnesty for SADC<sup>3</sup> citizens who had lived in the country continuously since at least July 1991, had no criminal record, and were either economically active or married to South Africans or had dependent children born and lawfully resident in the country [HRW, 1998]. The amnesty effectively ended the refugee status of the war-displaced. Many subsequently applied for and acquired South African citizenship and permanent resident status.

This paper is about a small group of the war-displaced.<sup>4</sup> They live in an exclusive settlement, Maputo-sikomu, on the fringes of a remote village, Tiko<sup>5</sup>, in Ward 5 of Bohlabele District in the semi-arid lowveld sub-region of Limpopo Province. As of June 2001, the village had 3842 residents, of whom 2881 were locally born South Africans and 961 Mozambican immigrants.<sup>6</sup> The immigrants include the war-displaced and labour migrants who left Mozambique before the war. Among the latter some had long settled in Tiko by the time the war-displaced arrived, and had no intention of returning to Mozambique. Others claimed to have intended to return but failed to do so because of the insecurity and the disruption caused by the war. Following retirement or retrenchment from their jobs, they had left the urban areas where they had spent their working lives and settled among the war-displaced in Maputo-sikomu. At the time of the fieldwork, the amnesty notwithstanding, many war-displaced were without legal status and, consequently, remained *de jure* illegal immigrants, though by virtue of having lived in the country for so long, had become

---

<sup>1</sup> Pauw, J., 1991, *In the Heart of the Whore: The Story of Apartheid’s Death Squads*. Halfway House, SA: Southern Book Publishers (Pty) Ltd.

<sup>2</sup> To facilitate its policy of ‘separate development’ the Apartheid government established semi-independent ‘homelands’ for people from the main black language groups and forcibly re-settled millions there from the hitherto scattered settlements and urban centres.

<sup>3</sup> Southern Africa Development Community.

<sup>4</sup> An earlier version was presented at the Graduate Seminar, Graduate School for the Humanities and Social Sciences [Forced Migration Studies], Faculty of Humanities, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, 8 August 2002.

<sup>5</sup> For reasons of confidentiality, many names of places have been changed.

<sup>6</sup> Agincourt Health and Population Unit, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, Annual Census.

*de facto* South Africans. Among them were those who, following declaration of the amnesty, had applied for permanent residence but had, for a variety of reasons, still not got the required documents. The paper describes the refugees' response to the uncertainty created by the civil war and the brutality that accompanied it, their flight and settlement as new arrivals in South Africa, and the adversity they have faced and continue to face in efforts to rebuild their lives. The detailed background provides the context, important for understanding the process of decision-making prior to departure and the evolution of their situation over the last 15 or so years since they settled in Tiko. It shows the resourcefulness with which they have confronted both uncertainty and adversity and demonstrates the important role played by the social connections and networks they had in South Africa prior to their arrival. In line with research conducted elsewhere (Dick, 2002; Kibreab, 1993), it challenges the stereotypical view of refugees as dependent and parasitic on their host communities and contributes to the emerging discussion around the 'development through local integration' (DLI) and 'relief versus development' debates.

A word on terminology. There is much debate and discussion around who a refugee is and is not (Dick, 2002; Andrews, 2003; Zetter, 1991). Since the end of the conflict in Mozambique, the issue of whether those who fled the war or got stranded because of it are really still refugees, invites much discussion from commentators. The definition of a refugee by voluntary and other organisations including the UNHCR, is straightforward<sup>7</sup> and understandable, given their concerns involving, among other things, humanitarian action. As Andrews (2003:1) points out, however, for purposes of analysis, given the complexity of the situations forced migrants face, the label as officially used can obscure more than it reveals. Here I use it to refer to the immigrants whose failure to remain in or return to Mozambique and whose decision to settle in Tiko was precipitated by war and associated disruption. Many, irrespective of legal status and whatever other changes might have occurred in their circumstances, perceive themselves as such<sup>8</sup> and still live in the settlement designated for them after they arrived, despite efforts to move them into the main village where the host community lives.<sup>9</sup> Whilst I am mindful not to "over-produce refugees conceptually, nor preserve them as dedicated refugees after they have, in effect moved on" (Loizos, 1999:245), I also concur with the contention that one can continue to be a refugee "even after one receives asylum in a new place among new people" (Daniel & Chr. Knudsen, 1995:1). And, as Bakewell (2001:6) argues, "the refugee label is a bureaucratic one and does not necessarily coincide with people's self-description".

## **Methodology**

The paper is based on ethnographic research conducted over a period of 18 months.<sup>10</sup> Formal, direct and in-depth interviews in XiShangaan (Xitsonga)<sup>11</sup> facilitated by a

---

<sup>7</sup> UNHCR, 1951.

<sup>8</sup> See, for example, Dick, 2002.

<sup>9</sup> See, Golooba-Mutebi, 2003.

<sup>10</sup>The entire research, conducted from April 2001 to May 2002 and from February to September 2003 and focusing on household structure and general wellbeing of Mozambican immigrants (broadly defined) and their South African hosts, was funded by the Andrew Mellon Foundation. I thank Professor S.M. Tollman of the Agincourt Health and Population Unit, University of the Witwatersrand Johannesburg, and Dr. David Turton, formerly of the Refugee Studies Centre, University of Oxford for according me the opportunity to conduct the fieldwork and for their overall intellectual guidance and

research assistant and interpreter from another village in the area<sup>12</sup> supplemented the usual tools of participant and non-participant observation and informal exchanges. We interviewed 86 respondents, each representing a household and selected on the basis of voluntary availability. The demands of labour migration involving the absence of able-bodied men for long periods of time led to the majority of respondents being women and jobless or retired men, some with pre-war experience of life in South Africa as migrant labourers.

### **Confronting uncertainty**

Most of the refugees hail from the southern, predominantly Shangaan provinces of Maputo (Magude) and Gaza (Chokwe), and therefore share cultural and linguistic attributes with their host community, also Shangaans. The particular circumstances leading to the decision by individuals and their families to flee varied. Some fled following attacks on their villages by Renamo as part of its terror campaign. During the attacks many lost their kin and neighbours through death or abduction.<sup>13</sup> Some left after periods of hiding in the bush following the destruction of their villages and their property.<sup>14</sup> Others did not wait for their villages to be attacked, or even witness the fighting. They fled well in advance, in reaction to the exodus from affected villages.

On the whole people fled in reaction to deteriorating environmental and economic conditions: destruction of property, loss of kin and livestock, departure of neighbours, and the generally deteriorating security situation. Added to these conditions was the uncertainty created by the random violence on non-combatants mostly by Renamo guerrillas.<sup>15</sup> People responded by fleeing to where they expected to find safety. For some, the presence of relatives in South Africa was critical in influencing their decision to leave. For others it was past experience and knowledge of the country, having lived there in the past as temporary migrant labourers. De Haan's observation (1999:14) that population mobility tends to build on earlier migrations is born out here.<sup>16</sup>

### *The road to South Africa*

Prior to fleeing and in the course of flight, it was never certain that they would make it safely to the other side, given the dangers they had to face on the way. Among them

---

support; Christina Qhibi for her able research assistance, and the villagers of Tiko for their hospitality and time.

<sup>11</sup> The language spoken by both the immigrants and the host community.

<sup>12</sup> The decision to recruit an outsider sought to assure the refugees (and their hosts for purposes of other aspects of the larger project) of confidentiality and ensure they expressed their views freely.

<sup>13</sup> The settlement has a fair number of women whose husbands were abducted and not heard of again, as well as women, who later escaped, only to be rejected by their husbands when they came to join them in South Africa.

<sup>14</sup> For details of Renamo's tactics and about the civil war and its effects, see Hall & Young, 1997; Hanlon, 1991, Part I; Finnegan, 1992; Minter, 1994; Urdang, 1989; Nordstrom, 1997.

<sup>15</sup> While both sides in the civil war committed atrocities against civilians [see Human Rights Watch, 1998, for example], refugees generally attributed the violence in their areas of origin to RENAMO. Also, some analysts [see for example Minter, 1994], attribute RENAMO atrocities in the South to support, perceived or real, for FRELIMO among Shangaan communities.

<sup>16</sup> See, also, Laguerre, 1984.

were wild animals, hunger, the possibility of attack by insurgents, or arrest and deportation by South African security forces. The threat from agents of the South African state confirms the contention that for refugees, the authorities in the country of asylum may constitute the next threat (Bakewell, 2001). The majority were aware of these dangers. However, they chose to face them anyway. As they routinely pointed out during interviews, for them risking the dangers on the way was preferable to the near certainty of being killed by the insurgents were they to choose to stay in what was effectively a war zone.

The eating by wild animals, especially lions, of Mozambican refugees trying to cross into South Africa through the Kruger National Park, has become part of local folklore in the Bushbuckridge region. Stories of lions waiting for and ambushing and eating refugees create the impression that the park was the single route through which they crossed into the country. However, the real story is more complicated. It is true that generally the park provided the most readily available option, as it was just over the fence. Also, since all it took was to “just walk until you reached South Africa”<sup>17</sup>, it was cost effective as compared to, for example, travelling by vehicle. Moreover, the park had the added advantage of being used by people smugglers hired by Mozambicans already working and living in South Africa, to smuggle their kin across the border. Therefore one might chance upon guided parties making their way and join them. In that way chances of getting lost, dying of hunger or thirst, or even being eaten by animals were minimised.

Nonetheless, the journey usually lasted many days during which friends and family were killed by electric shock from the electrified border fence, hunger, exhaustion, disease or wild animals. In some cases the infirm and the exhausted were abandoned and not heard of again. Some were caught and deported, while others were picked up by sympathetic park employees and taken to refugee collection points where they were fed and provided with shelter and medical attention. However, while some trespassed through the park, others travelled by vehicle all the way from their villages to South Africa via Maputo. These fell into at least two categories: those whose kin in South Africa had paid truck drivers to smuggle them into the country, and those who made their own arrangements. Some travelled by vehicle up to border towns inside Mozambique and then trespassed through the electric fence separating the two countries. Others first crossed into Swaziland and then into South Africa via secret routes known to paid agents. As in other contexts (see for example, Mavris, 2002), here, too, stringent border controls allowed smugglers to take advantage of the situation for a quick buck.

### *Starting all over again*

Traditionally, South Africa has lured Mozambicans looking for a better life. The success of miners who always left poor and returned with cash and goods strengthened the image of South Africa as a country of plenty. Therefore the refugees, some of whom already had relatives there, generally believed that better material circumstances awaited them on the other side of the border. More uncertainty, however, awaited them upon arrival in South Africa, especially since the Apartheid regime did not recognise them as refugees, was therefore under no obligation to look

---

<sup>17</sup> Interview with a refugee woman, April 2002.

after them as required by international law, even facilitate access to them by the UNHCR. All these factors meant that no “flood of relief aid” (Dick, 2002:1) would descend on them. In addition, with formal recognition withheld, there was nothing to prevent the security forces from deporting them once caught, as indeed many were. Nonetheless, those not caught at the point of crossing or before reaching their destinations, were eventually dumped in the Homelands on whose governments it became incumbent to take responsibility for their welfare and safety.

The unfavourable legal and policy regimes in which they found themselves meant that they had to adjust quickly to their new environment if they were to survive. While some stayed in rural areas, others headed for towns and cities where their kin lived and worked. Some with long-lost kin they knew to live in the Homeland traced them and moved in with them. In a number of cases such kin would have left Mozambique generations ago, or even been born in South Africa to immigrant parents. Those without kin or who did not know how to find them, were taken or directed to ‘collection points’ set up in different villages, among them Tiko, where this study was conducted. As in the case of self-settled refugees elsewhere (van Damme, 1995; Bakewell, *ibid.*), they were allocated land on which to build houses by local leaders and given various forms of assistance by sympathetic locals, the Homeland Government, and various charitable organisations including churches.<sup>18</sup> During interviews, refugees in Tiko were generally complimentary about the welcome and assistance – clothes, cooking utensils and beddings – they had received from local villagers.

With time charitable assistance ran out, however, as resources dwindled and the host communities exhausted their capacity for philanthropy. Increasing resentment from poor locals who saw themselves as equally if not more entitled to assistance than the refugees, eventually forced the Homeland government, already short of resources, to phase out its assistance. As part of their efforts to establish themselves in the new environment, many refugees left the areas where they had originally been assembled and dispersed in various directions in search of places to settle on a more permanent basis. Some did so in response to what they perceived to be anti-refugee sentiment in the villages where they had initially settled, moving instead to areas they knew to be more welcoming, thanks to the networks and contacts they had built up. Some joined fellow refugee friends and kin in other settlements. Some moved at the prompting of newly discovered South African kin who urged them to go and live with or near them. Of critical importance here was the decision, albeit forced by circumstances, by the Gazankulu government to deviate from the standard practice of confining refugees to camps and restricting their movement. It allowed them the freedom to use their ingenuity in pursuit of opportunities to rebuild their lives.

Local churches of which there are many, were also active in recruiting refugees into their congregations. In some cases pastors facilitated their movement from one village to another, sometimes providing them with accommodation in their homes until they found a place to build. Some moved several times, often over long distances, before finally settling down in one village. For large families usually involving polygamous arrangements, some split, leaving one section in one place, while the other went

---

<sup>18</sup> See de Jongh, 1994.



elsewhere.<sup>19</sup> Remarkably, even those who had first headed for urban areas eventually returned. Other Mozambicans who had originally come to South Africa as migrant labourers but could not return to their villages in Mozambique due to the war also joined in, as we have already seen.

Whilst the combined efforts of the Gazankulu Government, churches and other charitable organisations and local villagers enabled the refugees to survive hunger and destitution following their arrival, with time assistance from all these sources dwindled. They therefore had to find ways of sustaining themselves. Over time they built up a variety of means through which they have been able both to secure livelihoods and survive. Some have even gone on to prosper in one of the more deprived environments in South Africa, located in a Province officially designated a 'poverty node' by the current government.<sup>20</sup> Their strategies have sought both to reduce their vulnerability to hunger and impoverishment and to ensure the sustainability of their livelihoods in the long term.

### **Survival in a marginal environment**

Much has been written about the multiple-livelihood strategies rural people adopt to diversify their income-generating activities. Using these strategies they successfully buffer themselves against risks inherent in the uncertain political, agrarian and socio-economic environments in which many find themselves (May, 1997; Scoones et al, 1996). Income diversification lessens their dependence on an often-unreliable agrarian resource base (Ainslie, 1999).

The actions individuals or groups take to counter and respond to food shortage and other material deprivations are often described by a variety of terms. Most commonly used are 'coping mechanisms' or 'survival mechanisms'. For purposes of this study we borrow a leaf from Corbett (1988) and use 'strategy' rather than 'mechanism'. The term 'strategy' more accurately captures the manner in which the refugees have devised and still devise ways to construct and maintain their livelihoods.

Studies of survival and coping strategies<sup>21</sup> show that people adopt a variety of means to construct and maintain their livelihoods in the long term. The same means are used in response to threats to livelihoods by forced displacement, drought-related crop failure, famine and other phenomena. They variously include:

---

<sup>19</sup> One man with seven wives left one wife in Komatipoort near the South Africa-Mozambique border and moved with the other six to Bushbuckridge. Once there, one wife moved to Tiko, while the remaining five settled in one village, on neighbouring residential plots. The children of all the seven wives did not necessarily live with their own mothers. The wife we interviewed, a pensioner, used to send part of her pension to where her husband, her 5 co-wives and some of her own children lived and went to school. Another man with two wives left the senior wife in Malelane, also near the border, where she practices as a herbalist and came with the junior one and most of the children to Bushbuckridge. He and the senior wife, both pensioners, divide their pension money (about which more is written below) between the two sites.

<sup>20</sup> Others are the Eastern Cape and KaZulu-Natal Provinces.

<sup>21</sup> Cekan, 1992; Pyle, 1992; Hamid, 1992; Corbett, 1988.; Toulmin, 1986; Jiggins, 1986; White, 1986; Longhurst, 1986; Dirks, 1980.

- Migration<sup>22</sup>
- Collection of wild foods
- Social security
- Begging and vagrancy
- Curtailed, reduced or altered food intake
- Prostitution
- Child placement<sup>23</sup>
- Petty thieving
- Inter-house transfers and loans<sup>24</sup>
- Credit from merchants and moneylenders
- Sale of assets
- Relief programmes
- Petty trading.

A common feature of studies of coping strategies is their focus on responses to food shortages caused by seasonality, famine and, often, forced displacement due to war and other calamities. Close scrutiny of the literature shows similarities in the way people caught up in situations of deprivation respond to them. What emerges is a picture of resilience, resourcefulness, ingenuity, and flexibility of response. This paper is concerned not with responses to famine or seasonality, but day-to-day problems of survival following forced displacement. It therefore covers a much wider scope than, for example, a study of coping strategies in response to adverse weather conditions such as drought would do.

Since their arrival in South Africa, the refugees have also constructed and maintained their livelihoods through a combination of multi-faceted strategies. Some mirror those observed elsewhere and listed above, while others do not. As already noted, in the early days they depended almost entirely on relief from the government and charity from local residents and church groups. With time, especially following the end of external support, they took to supporting themselves. I am not suggesting that there was a sequential or natural progression from relief to self-reliance. As indicated earlier, some refugees had long had kin living and working in South Africa. Taking advantage of these links, some were able to broaden their survival and livelihood strategies much earlier than those without social networks pre-dating their exodus from Mozambique. Nonetheless, over time they have, on the whole, responded with

---

<sup>22</sup> Migration can be short or long term, circular or permanent, in search of employment.

<sup>23</sup> In better-off households.

<sup>24</sup> This refers to the development of systems of reciprocal obligation among households that ensure flows of food and other resources during crisis periods.

great dexterity and ingenuity to social and material insecurity as the proceeding discussion demonstrates. The means they have used include subsistence agriculture, formal and informal employment, petty trading, mutual aid, remittances and state-provided safety nets.

### *Agriculture*

From early on they took to subsistence farming, the mainstay of their pre-war existence in Mozambique, which they sought to re-enact within a context of limited access to farmland. At the beginning the extent to which they could farm was constrained by the small, 22 by 22 meter portions of land they were allocated for house construction. However, gradually some overcame this obstacle through applying for and securing other plots within the vicinity of their settlement and in other parts of the village. At the time of the fieldwork some had more than one field. In addition to the fields secured from local authorities over the years, some had gradually encroached on land formerly reserved for grazing and turned it into maize fields, to the displeasure of some members of the host community who expressed concern about the way 'the Mozambicans' were 'finishing our land'. The concerns, however, remained at the level of grumbling by a few.

Farming is entirely rain-fed and dependent on the amount of rain received during the short wet season. Farmwork is a collective enterprise. All members of a household who are resident in the village, women, men and young people, take part. Although there are no work parties of the kind observed elsewhere (Cousins, 1996; Crehan, 1992; Mamdani, 1992; Morris, 1998) people help each other with various tasks, including ploughing and weeding. As one might expect in a deprived environment, production technology is rudimentary. The simple hoe is the principal instrument. There are neither extension services nor use of pesticides or fertilisers. Seeds for the next season's planting are saved from each harvest.

Several types of crops are grown, the major one being maize. Others, usually intercropped with maize, include peanuts, groundnuts, sweet potatoes, cassava, beans, pumpkins and several varieties of vegetables. All production is for home consumption, as there is virtually no surplus that could be sold. The harshness of the environment characterised by a short rainy season and a long dry one and low soil fertility does not allow for more than modest harvests. Depending on the amount of rain received in a season, however, a number of households get reasonable yields of maize especially, that enable them to cut down on food-related expenditure for a few months each year. In this way cash that would otherwise be spent on food is saved for other purposes. For the refugees as for villagers elsewhere in rural Africa (Bryceson, 2000), therefore, subsistence farming is a vital safety net, as it provides a degree of food security.

Indeed, many refugees who settled in the village after a short stint in urban areas were influenced as much by the availability of opportunities for farming and cutting down on the cost of living as by the prospect of securing a place where they could plan for their lives in the long-term, an opportunity their meagre incomes could not provide in cities and towns. These motivations were emphasised by urban-based male respondents who returned to the village for occasional breaks from work. Other factors included harassment and extortion by the police who often threatened to have

them deported, dangers from which they are relatively safe in rural areas.<sup>25</sup> Evacuating families to rural areas and setting up a rural base to which one could withdraw whenever necessary was, therefore, a logical and necessary choice. This finding supports the contention that for many people rural areas represent “security in the form of self-provisioned food, family exchange relationships, and relative physical tranquillity”, while urban areas represent “high risk; ‘cash and cares’” that many “would prefer to avoid” [Bryceson, *ibid.*].

In general, farming as a livelihood strategy is more important in the lives of the refugees than those of the host community, not least because back in Mozambique it formed the backbone of their existence. All they did once they settled in South Africa and secured land to farm, was re-enact it. It represents resort to a familiar strategy, part of the peasant life they led back in Mozambique, in which, as many pointed out, money was needed mainly for paying bride price, buying blankets, mattresses, cattle, and building materials. Indeed, informants generally complained about land scarcity which prevented them from farming as much as they used to do ‘back home’.

One effect of the Mozambican’s farming activities has been the revival and increase in importance of arable subsistence agriculture as a livelihood strategy for members of the host community. At the time they arrived in the area, agriculture as a source of livelihood had undergone considerable decline. The locals mostly looked to employment in the formal and informal sectors for sustenance. The arrival of the Mozambicans brought about a resuscitation of arable farming in two ways. First, their conversion of land that had laid fallow for a long time into productive fields awakened their hosts, many of whose experience with farming was limited to work on commercial farms, to the capacity for agriculture directly to boost their livelihoods rendered precarious by limited employment opportunities. Secondly, by taking up hitherto fallow land and converting it into crop fields, they alarmed some in the host community who saw in it a threat to their rights in land. To safeguard their rights, they took to farming it, some using refugees as hired labour, and in the process diversifying further their sources of livelihood. Although some refugees told stories about being thrown off land that South Africans claimed as theirs, no major conflicts concerning land use or ownership were reported.

### *Animal husbandry*

Besides a small number of goats owned by a few households, the refugees do not keep any other type of livestock. Almost every household, however, has chickens. As with goats, few households keep ducks or other types of poultry. Given the abundance of pastureland and the ownership of cattle by some South African households, it seems odd that the refugees do not own any, especially since they claim to have done so back in Mozambique. Indeed, investing in cattle – not buying food as they do in South Africa – was one of the main reasons people needed cash back then and sought employment opportunities in South Africa. Lack of money is therefore what bars them from owning cattle at the moment.

---

<sup>25</sup> For Mozambican refugees and immigrants generally, possession of documents certifying permanent residence or citizenship is no guarantee against arrest and deportation by overzealous immigration officers and members of the security forces [see, for example, Human Rights Watch, 1998].

As with their hosts, refugees do not ordinarily sell their goats, slaughter them for meat, or even milk them, a curious oddity to a casual observer. However, besides being a store of value to be sold during acute need for cash, goats are used for ritual purposes and as a source of meat for the odd celebration. Chickens and other types of poultry are kept mainly for home consumption. Only exotic breeds bought by a few households from large-scale farmers and wholesalers are [re]sold.

Besides farming for themselves, refugees work for their hosts and residents of neighbouring villages in their fields for cash or in-kind payment. As already pointed out, prior to their arrival subsistence farming as a livelihood strategy for the locals had declined considerably. The enthusiasm with which they took to farming, however, spurred the host community into renewing and strengthening their ties to the land. Consequently, farming as a livelihood strategy for the host community has been on the ascendance in the last 15 or so years, as one informant pointed out:

One of the things we have learnt from the Mozambicans is farming. We did not know that one could plough a large piece of land with his bare hands. We thought it could only be done by hired tractor or plough teams. But when the Mozambicans came, we saw that it could actually be done. Now we are also seriously farming, following their example.

For the host community the revival in subsistence farming has coincided with and partly been necessitated by a rise in unemployment and the consequent lack of opportunities for earning cash, which has rendered food self-provisioning more and more important. The increased importance of agriculture as a livelihood strategy within the host community has not been without benefit to the refugees. In many cases they are hired to do most if not all of the farm work, which affords them opportunities for earning extra cash. Remuneration is modest, and has in the past been the subject of much research and debate about relations between the refugees and the host community, amidst charges of exploitation of the former by the latter.<sup>26</sup> Meagre though it is, however, the money earned makes a lot of difference to individuals and households with few other opportunities for earning cash but whose need for it is no less significant than that of the host community.

It is not only to local South Africans that the refugees supply cheap farm labour. They have also carved out something of a niche in the large commercial agricultural sectors of Limpopo province and neighbouring Mpumalanga. Their ability to penetrate the agricultural labour market derives from their willingness to accept lower remuneration than South Africans are prepared to accept. Indeed, in many parts of the Bushbuckridge region Mozambican immigrants probably constitute the largest number of casual commercial farm workers. While some of the work is on a more permanent basis, some of it is seasonal and affords them only a few weeks of employment per year.

Seasonal work usually involves young and older women, with men more represented in more permanent employment. It consists mainly of fruit picking and other harvesting work, and lasts only a few weeks or months. Given the wide variety of sources they have for modest sums of money, it all adds up to cash incomes that help keep their families afloat. Nonetheless, the increasingly high levels of unemployment

---

<sup>26</sup> See, for instance, Dolan & Nkuna, nd.

in the area have reduced opportunities for getting hired so much so that individuals who in the past found work easily are now experiencing increasing difficulty doing so. Only those with the necessary contacts already employed on farms and on whose influence they can capitalise stand good chances of securing employment. More recently though, with the increasing crackdown by the government on the exploitation of farm workers by unscrupulous commercial farmers, the latter have become less willing to hire workers without proper documentation. This has somewhat dented the chances of individuals who are without the necessary paperwork, and in the process increased their vulnerability.

### *Non-agricultural activities*

Bryceson (ibid:3) defines non-agricultural activities as “any work that does not directly involve plant or animal husbandry”. Writing about livelihood strategies in rural Africa in general, she points out that “the vast majority of households have one or more non-agricultural income sources, be it active participation in trade, service provisioning or craft work, or more passive receipt of a transfer payment in the form of a state pension or remittances from relatives”. Moreover, “households are often pursuing more than one, sometimes several, different non-agricultural activities simultaneously or at different points throughout the year. Most of the activities are highly opportunistic in nature, involving quick responses to market demand and supply”. Further, “more and more household members are entering non-agricultural production. Women are assuming an increasingly important position as contributors to the household cash income” (see also Francis, 2000). This picture is not one that applies to only non-refugee communities, let alone rural communities in Africa. Evidence from refugee situations elsewhere (Malkki, 1995; Dick, ibid) and outside Africa (Kobaladze, 2002) shows that rural-based refugees and rural peasant communities in general depend on a wide range of strategies for a living. So does the refugee community of Tiko.

### *Formal employment*

Besides commercial agriculture, employment in the formal sector comprises five main options. The ability by the refugees to secure jobs in the formal sector within a fiercely competitive environment even for South Africans has been the outcome of pre-existing contacts and networks of Mozambican migrants working in the country prior to the refugee influx. As we saw earlier, during the war many migrant workers evacuated their families from Mozambique and also became *de facto* refugees. Adding to the networks of migrant labourers were South Africans of Mozambican extraction who, despite having virtually severed links with their country of origin, were joined by relatives fleeing the war. These networks have been crucial to the success of refugee men and women, some masquerading as South African nationals, at securing formal sector employment in a wide range of fields.

### Tourism

Besides agriculture, the tourism and hospitality industry comprising Kruger National Park and associated private game lodges within both Limpopo and Mpumalanga

Provinces, is an important formal sector employer. A small minority of refugee men and women have managed to find employment in the hospitality industry alongside their South African hosts. Men feature as game trackers, security guards, gardeners, and handy men of various kinds. Women on the other hand feature as cleaners and laundry ladies.

### Mining

The mining industry is one of the biggest employers of male long-distance migrant labourers, indigenous South Africans and immigrants. Most people employed in mining are on permanent renewable contract terms. However, in recent years restructuring in the industry has led to the retrenchment of many mine workers. Some, especially middle-aged and older men, have found their way back into the village. While some continue to look out for employment opportunities, others have been forced into early retirement by the difficulty of securing work. Many of the latter have shifted their attention to livelihood and survival options available on the local scene.

### Construction

The construction industry, thanks to its almost insatiable demand for cheap unskilled and semi-skilled labour, is another important employer for refugee men. As with the mining industry, employment in construction is mostly away from home. Men go in search of work elsewhere in the province and in major cities. Occasionally work takes them into the neighbouring countries of Mozambique, Swaziland, Lesotho and Namibia, where major South African construction firms usually win contracts to implement specific infrastructure projects.

### Business and trading

With the exception of the single grocery shop owned by a refugee who lives in a settlement in a neighbouring village, refugees are not represented in formal trading. The grocery owner is also one of two refugees that own commuter taxis, the other part of the formal business sector from which they are largely excluded by lack of financial resources. However, non-ownership of businesses has not barred them from participation in the sector as wage earners. Taxis owned by refugees from other villages and in the wider sub-region offer excellent opportunities for them to work as drivers and fare collectors, the latter mostly young men aspiring to become taxi drivers. Fare collecting offers opportunities for training on-the-job as drivers and to earn some money as well. Although they are often still living with their parents, some of the young fare collectors have wives and children of their own. The money they earn is therefore a welcome addition to the extended families' aggregate incomes.

## *Informal non-agricultural activities*

### Collection of wild foods

As with elsewhere in rural South Africa (Cousins, 1999) and on the continent (Morris, 1998; Toulmin, 1986; White, 1986), wild fruits, vegetables and herbs are an important source of food for the refugees and the host community. Herbs, besides being a source of food, are an important source of income for practitioners of traditional medicine. During the rainy season there is a great deal of collecting and processing of wild products for food and other purposes. Another local delicacy harvested during this time are caterpillars (mopani worms). Also, it is during this time that fruits of the amarula tree are harvested and used for brewing beer. While the beer is mostly drunk at home with friends and kin free of charge, some people sell it in nearby towns. In addition to beer brewing, marula fruits are a source of nuts that are roasted and eaten or used as a food ingredient.

### Petty trading

Petty trading by women, in some cases using capital provided by their husbands and other employed members of their households, is another source of livelihood. A number of households run micro businesses from home. They sell a variety of prepared and purchased snacks, liquor, soft drinks, sweets, chickens, frozen foodstuffs, vegetables and fruit, and used clothes. Many women generally attributed their engagement in petty trading to a desire to 'help' their husbands. Some households sell only one type of merchandise, while others sell a wide variety. Petty trading also includes the harvesting and sale of firewood and thatching grass, mostly by men, both within the village and outside it. It is for this reason that the refugees are blamed by some in the host community of causing environmental damage. Firewood and thatching grass are marketed through informal networks, usually in response to requests or orders. Selling is mostly by poorer households to those that are better off. Payment is in cash or in kind, and may involve direct reciprocal exchange, as in when a truck owner ferries loads of firewood to customers on behalf of a seller in return for firewood.

### Therapeutic services

A small number of refugees are local healers and draw part of their livelihood from this source. In one particular case during the fieldwork, the wife was the healer while the husband had been unemployed for a long time. The wife had therefore become the main breadwinner thanks to her practice. In at least two cases the healers, both women, practiced locally and in unspecified urban locations. One healer, also doubling as a trainer of aspiring healers, had a residential service for patients in need of long-term observation. He had taken to full-time practice after retiring from his previous occupation as a security guard at Kruger National Park. By virtue of his possession of the necessary documentation, he was able to supplement his income from healing with a pension from the government. Mozambican traditional healers are highly reputed in the village and the Bushbuckridge sub-region. In communities where traditional medicine features prominently in health-seeking behaviour (see



Golooba-Mutebi & Tollman, 2004), they are widely sought after and therefore play an important socio-cultural role.

### Domestic services

In return for a monthly wage, refugee women provide most of the domestic labour in the village, involving the performance of a range of tasks in other people's households. Some do similar work in neighbouring villages. Although remuneration – ranging between 100 and 300 rand<sup>27</sup> per month - is poor and in some cases not always paid on time, it is a useful supplement to income from other sources. By virtue of the refugees' willingness to work for low wages and of the unwillingness by members of the host community to work as 'domestics' for their co-villagers, refugee women have been able to carve out a niche for themselves, adding yet more to the aggregate incomes of their households. Whilst it was not uncommon for Mozambican men to complain about the exploitation of their wives and daughters by South Africans during interviews, the important role the incomes they earn play in supplementing general household income confines dissatisfaction to the level of grumbling. At the same time, male respondents were generally appreciative of their wives' efforts, given that their wages could at least buy '*saka ra mpupu*' (sack of mealie meal) or pay '*xikolofisi xa vana*' (the children's school fees).

### Other casual work

Other casual work includes house construction and excavation of latrine pits for those who need them both in and outside the village. The village boasts a number of skilled builders, both refugees and members of the host community, without regular employment. Locals and people from neighbouring villages occasionally hire them to perform specific tasks. Sometimes they find temporary employment in neighbouring towns to which they relocate until the work is completed. Many young men, both refugees and South Africans, often find work in this way, serving as apprentices of experienced builders. An activity within the construction industry that is exclusively reserved for the refugees is excavation, loading onto lorries and offloading of building sand. In some cases all the male members of particular households earned most of their income in this way. Also, some refugee men work as herdsmen for members of the host community.

### Social security and other transfers

As is the case with other rural areas in the country, here, too, there is a significant inflow of resources in the form of cash, mostly state-provided social security payments, and remittances by individuals working away from home.

Remittances supplement income earned locally. As already noted, prior to their arrival, some refugees had relatives living and working in South Africa. The latter and the refugees that went on to find employment in different parts of the country are the source of the remittances. For households with few other sources of cash such as where women with young children are unable to work, remittances constitute the only

---

<sup>27</sup> US\$1 = 6 -7 rand at current rates.

regular source of cash. There are some, however, where they come only intermittently, as is the case elsewhere in South Africa<sup>28</sup> and other parts of the developing world.<sup>29</sup>

Here, as elsewhere, a number of reasons account for the intermittent nature of remittances. For some migrant workers life in urban areas consists of only occasional employment and meagre earnings, of which nothing is left to send home after taking care of personal expenses. This seems to be the reality many rural-urban migrants face in South Africa's towns and cities.<sup>30</sup> For others, long absences from home eventually lead to virtually severing links and communication for long periods of time, leaving families and other relatives back in the village to fend for themselves.<sup>31</sup> Others, though in fairly regular contact with home including through visits, contribute only minimally to general household upkeep, mainly because their meagre incomes do not allow for greater contributions. Nonetheless, the importance of remittances cannot be overemphasised. Although we were unable to secure specific information on amounts transferred as most respondents were either unwilling to divulge them or claimed not to remember the amounts since they varied each time, it is clear from many recipients that remittances are an important source of livelihood for both the refugees and their hosts.

As with some South African households, some refugee households would most likely not exist in their present form without remittances. For example, some households assume an extended structure because of their dependence on the incomes of one or two breadwinners who would otherwise not manage to support separate households with separate cooking and eating arrangements. One example is a 27-member household where only two married sons were employed, with the rest of the membership largely dependent on their incomes. Consequently, four potentially separate households had set up joint cooking and eating arrangements. Without the regular remittances coming from the employed members, life would have been much more difficult, degrees of uncertainty much higher. Another example is a 17-member household jointly headed by two widows one of whom worked on a commercial farm while the other stayed home to look after their children. Although the resident widow earned some money from a number of informal-sector activities, the money her co-wife sent made a big difference.

Available evidence (Cousins, 1996; Ardington, 1984; Breslin et al., 1997) testifies to the importance of state-provided safety nets in rural people's livelihood strategies. This particular village is no exception. Both the refugees and their hosts benefit from these safety nets: old-age pensions, disability allowance and child benefit. Child benefit go to unemployed parents or people with very low incomes, for children up to the age of seven. Disability allowance goes to people who for health reasons are unable to lead productive lives. The importance of these transfers is reflected in the large number of people who sign up for them on pension day and the volume of merchandise bought from itinerant traders who turn up in large numbers on the day. Pensions by far outweigh other benefits in importance and, for some families, constitute the sole source of regular income and therefore the major buffer against

---

<sup>28</sup> See, for instance, Chalmers and Edwards, 1998, chapter 3; Ardington, 1984.

<sup>29</sup> See, for instance, de Haan, 1999; also Francis, 2000.

<sup>30</sup> See for instance, 'A daily struggle for survival', Mail & Guardian June 21-27 2002:11.

<sup>31</sup> See, for example, Lubkemann, 2000.

destitution. Where a household has access to two [husband & wife] pensions, it is able to maintain a higher than average standard of living compared to households without regularly employed members or pensioners.

Literature focusing on the suffering of Mozambican refugees in South Africa points to their lack of access to pensions and other types of social security benefits otherwise enjoyed by South Africans [de Jongh, *ibid.*; Dolan, *ibid.*; Dolan & Nkuna, *ibid.*]. This view should be interpreted in the context of the period during which research for such literature was conducted. Much of it was conducted a few years following the arrival of the refugees, at a time when they were still trying to find their bearings. Currently, with respect to Tiko, the view that refugees have no access to social security is only partly accurate. Immigrants of both long-standing residence and the more recently arrived refugees enjoy these benefits in increasingly high numbers. There are three ways in which immigrants have been able to gain access over the years.

One is via longevity of residence in South Africa. Those who left Mozambique decades ago, some as early as the 1940s, have over the years acquired South African citizenship through successful application, many during the Apartheid era. At the time of application they successfully posed as South Africans. Some had to change their names to distinctly South African ones to enhance their chances.<sup>32</sup> Once they had acquired the right papers, access to benefits was guaranteed. Consequently, when they eventually attained pensionable age, they automatically became eligible for the state pension. As we have already seen, however, though they possess juridical South African nationality, following the refugee influx they opted to settle their families among their refugee compatriots. When it suits them, as during the voluntary repatriation exercise when those opting to return to Mozambique received assistance from the UNHCR<sup>33</sup>, they pass off as refugees [*va tsutsumi*, literally those who run], and as South Africans when it does not, do those working and living in towns and cities, to avoid harassment by the police.

Others, many of them refugees, became eligible for pensions following successful application for South African citizenship under eligibility criteria set up by the post-1994 government, based on long-term residence in the country. Among those that applied, many subsequently got the necessary documents. Those that were already pensioners automatically became eligible for the monthly benefits, while those that were not did so upon attaining pensionable age.

Others have acquired citizenship via arrangements made with South African nationals both in Tiko and elsewhere, under which the latter go with them to government offices and pose as their relatives: grandparents, parents, spouses, etc. The arrangements typically involve immigrants paying money to South Africans and to local leaders for letters confirming whatever claims they intend to make at the local office of the Home Affairs Department. The claims include having been born in South Africa or being Mozambican by birth, but of South African ancestry. Some refugees acquired citizenship in this fashion.<sup>34</sup> Once they had done so, the way to social

---

<sup>32</sup> See, also, Lubkemann, 2001.

<sup>33</sup> Some who volunteered to return to Mozambique eventually returned to South Africa.

<sup>34</sup> There are some, however, who were born in Mozambique of South African parents and women who had married Mozambican men and lived in Mozambique for many years, and who could prove it using *prima facie* evidence.

security benefits was thereby opened. Also, in this way they have been able to secure citizenship for their children whose right to citizenship rests on their parents' acquired citizenship. Spouses and grandchildren of immigrants who were already citizens at the time of the refugee influx have also been able to acquire citizenship on the basis of the former's nationality status. So have other, unrelated immigrants who managed to pose as close kin of those already with citizenship after paying for the privilege.

For refugees without citizenship, their children are able to acquire it by applying through schools to which they have unrestricted access, alongside fellow pupils and students of indigenous parentage. The practice is that pupils or students who come of age in any school can apply for identity cards, symbols of nationality or permanent residence, through the school administration. Such applications are made en masse without differentiating between children of indigenous and immigrant parentage. Many young people have acquired citizenship via this channel. In due course they go on to have children of their own. Depending on whether or not they fulfil other eligibility criteria, such as falling within the right income bracket, they are able to secure social security benefits for which indigenous South Africans in similar circumstances are eligible.

While some of the methods used to secure citizenship are questionable, most of the respondents who admitted to using them are, under the terms of the 1996 amnesty, eligible for citizenship or permanent residence. Decisions to circumvent established channels of application stem more from ill treatment by government officials at the offices of the Home Affairs Department or credible fear of ill treatment based on stories individual applicants have heard from those who have experienced it.

Social security has also at times taken the form of distribution of food parcels by the government during particularly difficult stress periods when hunger has been at its peak, such as when the rains had completely failed. Beneficiaries of food parcel distribution have also included the poor and vulnerable within the host community.

### Mutual aid

Mutual aid through inter-household economic and social support as well as other assistance has been critical to the refugees' ability to cope with limited income-earning opportunities, social security, and low agricultural productivity. Generally life in their segment of the village is one of intense intra-household interactions of the kind that usually characterise life in peasant and migrant communities (see, for instance, Laguerre, *ibid.*). Underlying these interactions are high levels of reciprocity among residents. The reciprocity is not restricted to residents of the Maputo-sikomu alone, however, but extends to others outside it, mostly fellow immigrants in other settlements in the area.

Mutual assistance consists of the exchange of a variety of goods and services with kin and non-kin. For example, people without food borrow from those who have, while those without money to pay for one or other need at any one time seek assistance from kin, neighbours, and friends. Those from whom assistance is sought are usually not necessarily better off in material terms than those who seek it. Of more significance is the willingness by people to assist each other, and the expectation that should one need assistance, they will get it. Mutual assistance is therefore the refugees'

emergency coping mechanism and an important feature of their livelihood strategies, as gift giving or assistance from one person to another is not always necessarily tied to scarcity on the part of the receiver. Therefore, whilst individuals may suffer high levels of material deprivation, they are not necessarily short of social resources upon which to draw in order to cope with short-term difficulties.

In his research in North Cameroon, Longhurst observed how gifts and loans between families constituted “a sharing of poverty with the knowledge that all families can be vulnerable to food shortages at any time”.<sup>35</sup> Longhurst’s observations are mirrored by mine among the refugees of Tiko, where lending or giving each other goods and services, in some cases on an on-going basis, was a common feature of day-to-day existence. While part and parcel of what seems to be deliberate strategising in order to construct and maintain livelihoods, the refugees saw the ‘sharing of poverty’ as the normal and desirable way to live with other people, as respondents pointed out.

### Credit

Rural life is usually characterised by shortage of cash and inability to pay for goods in cash. Consequently, owners of business enterprises, often as much as economic investments, tend to sell goods on credit.<sup>36</sup> Likewise, in Tiko credit is an important element in the refugees’ livelihood strategies. When money is short, local grocery shops and the butcher extend credit facilities to those who fulfil set eligibility criteria. In many cases only people with stable sources of income have access to credit facilities. Lack of ready cash has rendered many villagers, especially spouses and children of migrant labourers and pensioners, unable to do without credit. Migrant workers usually make arrangements with shop owners under which the latter provide their families with specific goods on credit until money becomes available. This can be through regular remittances or when the migrant labourers themselves return home on their periodic visits. Pensioners settle their accounts on pension day. Without credit facilities, many households would experience greater poverty and destitution and might as well cease to exist as independent entities.

### Conclusions and discussion

The foregoing discussion shows that Mozambican refugees in Limpopo Province have been resourceful and resilient in responding to uncertainty and adversity. The refusal by the Apartheid government to accord them refugee status and the general political situation in the country that rendered Apartheid South Africa virtually an outlaw state had the effect of preventing the UNHCR and other humanitarian organisations from intervening to provide assistance. Consequently, early assistance from the Homeland government, local communities and charities notwithstanding, the Mozambicans have had to rebuild their lives based on their own efforts combining different strategies.

The discussion suggests that, where circumstances allow, when left alone to use their talents and different forms of capital – economic, physical and social - they possess, refugees are capable of rebuilding their lives based on multiple livelihood strategies

---

<sup>35</sup> Longhurst, *ibid.*:30.

<sup>36</sup> See, for instance, Kobaladze, *ibid.*

and need not be a drain on national resources any more than members of the host community.

It shows, as research elsewhere (Loizos, *ibid.*; Malkki, *ibid.*) has done that, depending on the particular circumstances of their arrival and insertion into a community, refugees are able to forge productive relationships with members of the host community and enrich their host communities socially, culturally, and economically. Refugees, the paper shows, do not necessarily constitute a problem or burden for host communities; they contribute to general well-being in their areas of refuge. They can therefore be a resource, as research elsewhere shows (see Whitaker, 1999).

Whilst they may initially need external support, with time they are capable of identifying opportunities for self-sustenance using survival patterns with and without historical antecedents. General deprivation in the host community and lack of skills, contacts and education may limit what some can do. Even then, however, if unencumbered by restrictive rules, they have the capacity for self-sustenance at levels more or less similar to those of many in the host community, and that allow them to live in dignity.

Nonetheless, this case study is unique in that it departs from the usual refugee influx situations elsewhere in Africa, where circumstances permit and enable the UNHCR and other humanitarian organisations to intervene and provide much-needed assistance. In this case no humanitarian organisation from outside Gazankulu Homeland could intervene, given the Apartheid government's conduct and attitude towards the refugees. The inability by the Homeland government, local communities and charities to provide long-term meant that, inevitably, the refugees would have to fend for themselves, a situation rendered plausible and feasible by the conducive communal land tenure system in which the right and responsibility for land allocation was vested in the hands of local authorities.

Added to the feasibility of securing land for self-settlement and production was the decision by the Homeland government not to restrict the refugees movement. The latter allowed them to look for employment and earn an income as well as settle in areas where they had strong social links with fellow refugees and kin who had settled there before them and could be depended on to provide psychological and other support. Access to land, and freedom of movement were important in enabling them to re-enact livelihood strategies they had used back in Mozambique and to devise and construct new ones which, together with the old ones, have enabled them to live reasonably dignified lives based on self-sustenance.

It is difficult to say with certainty what things would have been like had the UNHCR and other humanitarian organisations been able to intervene and provide humanitarian assistance. Nonetheless, based on experiences elsewhere (see, for instance, Horst, 2003) it may be justified to conjecture that the availability of humanitarian support would have rendered self-reliance less of a priority and imperative than it turned out to be. The non-involvement of humanitarian organisations, it can be argued, therefore, was a blessing in disguise for the refugees, as it compelled them to pursue self-reliance partly via the forging of strong symbiotic relationships with members of the host community, thereby rendering the process of local integration less problematic. Also, that the refugees were dumped in communities with which they shared cultural and linguistic attributes helped, as it rendered communication and understanding easy.

That some had kinship ties with members of the host community was also an added advantage that helped accelerate the process of insertion.

This case study provides some lessons for humanitarian organisations such as the UNHCR, and for refugee-recipient countries. First, whilst it makes a lot of sense for refugees to be provided with humanitarian assistance, for purposes of long-term planning, given the potential for any particular refugee situation to become protracted<sup>37</sup>, it seems to make more sense to proactively encourage efforts at self-reliance. There is, also, a sense, however, in which this lesson is difficult to learn due to its lack of potential for general applicability. In the Homelands, as already pointed out, the land tenure system allowed for land allocation to proceed fast, as all local authorities had to do was identify areas where to settle the refugees. In countries experiencing land shortage due to population pressures or where land tenure is on the basis of individual ownership, such an outcome is virtually impossible to secure without arousing strong feelings in host communities.

A question arises: now that the refugees have virtually been more or less absorbed<sup>38</sup> into the local community, should it be taken, a priori, that all is well and has ended well? Whilst the paper shows that the refugees are generally self-reliant, there are many among them who could benefit from efforts by the South African government to improve their lives. First, in line with the terms of the Amnesty that has, nonetheless, long expired, those that have been in the country since the influx and for one or other reason never got their status regularised, could benefit from the acquisition of citizenship or permanent residence. Such an outcome would facilitate their efforts at looking for employment and minimise their susceptibility to exploitation by unscrupulous employers in the formal and informal sectors. For those involved in farming, the provision of agricultural extension services which, at the time of the fieldwork were non-existent, would boost their productivity. Together with access to improved farming technology such as ploughs and inputs such as fertilisers, pesticides and improved seeds, this should enhance the capacity of agriculture to contribute to the livelihood strategies not only of the refugees, but of the entire community. The South African government's efforts could usefully be supplemented by those of humanitarian and development organisations.

---

<sup>37</sup> Even in this particular case, local leaders and South African respondents in Tiko had, at the time the Mozambicans arrived, assumed that they would be around only for a short while and, after the war, return to Mozambique.

<sup>38</sup> I use this term advisedly, as the situation on the ground is a little more complex than portrayed here (see, for instance, Golooba-Mutebi, 2003).

## References

Andrews, B. L., 2003. When is a refugee not a refugee? Flexible social categories and host/refugee relations in Guinea. *New Issues in Refugee Research*, Working Paper No. 88. Geneva: UNHCR.

Ainslie, A., 1999. 'When 'community' is not enough: managing common property resources in rural South Africa'. *Development Southern Africa*, 16 (3): 375-402.

Ager, A., Ager, W., & Long L., 1995. 'The Differential Experience of Mozambican Refugee Women and Men'. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, Vol.8/3: 266-287.

Ardington, E., 1984. 'Decentralised Industry, Poverty and Development in Rural kwaZulu'. *Carnegie Conference Paper No. 246. Second Carnegie Inquiry into Poverty and Development in Southern Africa Conference Papers*.

Bakewell, O., 2001. Refugee aid and protection in rural Africa: working in parallel or cross-purposes? *New Issues in Refugee Research*, Working Paper No. 35. Geneva: UNHCR.

Breslin, E.D., Delius, P., & Madrid, C., 1997. 'Strengthening institutional safety nets in South Africa: sharing Operation Hunger's insights and experiences'. *Development Southern Africa*, 14 (1): 21-41.

Bryceson, D., 2000. 'Rural Africa at the Crossroads: Livelihood Practices and Policies'. *ODI Natural Resource Perspectives*, No. 52, April.

Campbell, D.J & Trechter, D.D., 1982. 'Strategies for Coping with Food Consumption Shortage in the Mandara Mountain Region of North Cameroon'. *Social Science & Medicine*, Vol. 16: 2117-2127.

Cekan, J., 1992. 'Seasonal Coping Strategies in Central Mali: Five Villages During the 'Soudure''. *Disasters*, Vol.16(1): 66-73, March.

Corbett, J., 1988. 'Famine and Household Coping Strategies'. *World Development*, Vol. 16 (9): 1099-1112.

Cousins, B., 1996. 'Livestock Production and Common Property Struggles in South Africa's Agrarian Reform'. *Journal of Peasant Studies*, Vol. 23 (2/3): 166-208.

Crehan, K., 1992. 'Rural livelihoods: Making a living'. In Bernstein, H., Crow, B., & Johnson H, (eds.) *Rural Livelihoods: Crises and Responses*. Oxford: Oxford University Press and Open University.

Daniel, E.V. and Knudsen, J. Chr. (eds) (1995) *Mistrusting Refugees*. London & Berkeley, LA.: University of California Press.

de Haan, A., 1999. 'Livelihoods and Poverty: The Role of Migration – A Critical Review of the Migration Literature'. *Journal of Development Studies*, Vol. 36, No. 2: 1-47, December.

de Jongh, M., 1994. 'Mozambican Refugee Resettlement: Survival Strategies of Involuntary Migrants in South Africa'. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, Vol. 7(2/3).



- de Wet, C., 1995a. 'Land tenure, economic differentiation and social interaction in a Ciskei settlement. *Journal of Contemporary African Studies*, 13 (1): 57-74.
- de Wet, C., 1995b. *Moving Together, Drifting Apart: Betterment Planning and Villagisation in a South African Homeland*. Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press.
- Dick, S., 2002. *Liberians in Ghana: living without humanitarian assistance*. New Issues in Refugee Research, Working Paper No. 57. Geneva: UNHCR.
- Dirks, R., 1980. 'Social Responses during Severe Food Shortages and Famine'. *Current Anthropology*, Vol. 21/1:21-44.
- Dolan, C & Nkuna, V., nd. "'Refugees", "Illegal Aliens" and the Labour Market: The Case for a Rights-based Approach to Labour Movement in South Africa'. Mimeo, Wits Rural Facility.
- Finnegan, W., 1992. *A Complicated War. The Harrowing of Mozambique*. Berkeley, LA. & London: University of California Press.
- Francis, E., 2000. *Making a Living: Changing Livelihoods in Rural Africa*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Goldman, I., et al., 2000. 'Institutional Support for Sustainable Rural Livelihoods in Southern Africa: A Framework and Methodology'. ODI Natural Resource Perspectives, Number 49, March.
- Golooba-Mutebi, F., 2003. 'Witchcraft, Trust and Reciprocity among Mozambican Refugees and their South African Hosts in a Lowveld Village'. In press.
- Golooba-Mutebi, F. & S.M. Tollman, 2004. 'Shopping for Health: Affliction and Response in a South African Village'. Forthcoming.
- Hall, M & Young, T., 1997. *Confronting Leviathan: Mozambique Since Independence*. London: C. Hurst & Co. (Publishers) Ltd.
- Hamid, G.M., 1992. 'Livelihood Patterns of Displaced Households in Greater Khartoum'. *Disasters*, Vol.16(3): 230-239, September.
- Hanlon, J., 1991. *Mozambique: Who Calls the Shots?* London: James Currey & Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- Horst, C., 2003. *Transnational nomads. How Somalis cope with refugee life in Dadaab camps of Kenya*. Ph.D dissertation. University of Amsterdam.
- Hughes, D.M., 1999. 'Refugees and Squatters: Immigration and the Politics of Territory on the Zimbabwe-Mozambique Border'. *Journal of Southern African Studies*, Vol. 25/4: 533-552.
- Human Rights Watch, 1998. "Prohibited Persons": Abuse of Undocumented Migrants, Asylum Seekers, and Refugees in South Africa. New York, Human Rights Watch.
- Jiggins, J., 1986. 'Women and Seasonality: Coping with Crisis and Calamity'. *IDS Bulletin* 17/3: 9-18.

Johnston, N. (1997) Permanent residency exemption for SADC citizens: South Africa welcoming its neighbours or monitoring 'outsiders'? The case of former Mozambican refugees in the rural eastern border region of South Africa. IDASA, Southern African Migration Programme.

Kibreab, G., 1993. "The Myth of Dependency among Camp Refugees in Somalia 1979-1989". *Journal of Refugee Studies* 6(4):321-349.

-----, 1999. 'Revisiting the Debate on People, Place, Identity and Displacement'. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, Vol. 12/4: 385-422.

Kobaladze, K., 2002. 'Non-Farm Livelihood Activities in Three Villages in Different Regions of Georgia. Results of Qualitative Fieldwork carried out during baseline phase of quantitative research'. NRI Research Project on Non-Farm Economic Activities in Romania, Georgia and Armenia. London, Natural Resources Institute Report No.: 2736.

Laguerre, M.S., 1984. *American Odyssey : Haitians in New York City*. Ithaca & London: Cornell University Press.

Loizos, P. (1999) 'Ottoman Half-lives: Long-term Perspectives on Particular Forced Migrations'. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, Vol. 12, No.3: 237-263.

Longhurst, R., 1986. 'Household Food Strategies in Response to Seasonality and Famine'. *IDS Bulletin* 17/3: 27-35.

Lubkemann, S.C., 2000. 'The Transformation of Transnationality Among Mozambican Migrants in South Africa'. *Canadian Journal of African Studies*, Vol. 34, (1): 41-63.

Malkki, L.H., 1995. *Purity and Exile: Violence, Memory, and National Cosmology among Hutu Refugees in Tanzania*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.

Mamdani, M., 1992. 'Class Formation and Rural Livelihoods: A Ugandan Case Study'. In Bernstein, H., Crow, B & Johnson, H (eds). *Rural Livelihoods: Crises and Responses*. Oxford: Oxford University Press and Open University.

Mavris, L., 2002. *Human Smugglers and social networks: transit migration through the states of former Yugoslavia*. New Issues in Refugee Research, Working Paper No. 72. Geneva: UNHCR.

McDonald, D.A., Zinyama, L., Gay, J., de Vletter, F., & Mattes, R., 2000. 'Guess Who's Coming to Dinner: Migration from Lesotho, Mozambique and Zimbabwe to South Africa'. *International Migration Review*, Vol.34/3: 813-840, Fall.

Minter, W., 1994. *Apartheid's Contras: An inquiry into the Roots of War in Angola and Mozambique*. Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press; London & New Jersey: Zed Books.

Morris, B., 1998. *The Power of Animals: An Ethnography*. Oxford & New York: Berg.

Nordstrom, C., 1997. *A Different Kind of War Story*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Pol, J.L.V., 1999. 'Stable Instability of Displaced People in Western Georgia: A Food-security and Gender Survey after Five Years'. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, Vol. 12/4: 350-365.

Pyle, A.S., 1992. 'The Resilience of Households to Famine in El Fasher, Sudan, 1982-1989'. *Disasters*, Vol. 16 (1): 19-27, March.

Scoones, I., Chibudu, C., Chikwa, S., et al., 1996. *Hazards and opportunities. Farming Livelihoods in Dryland Africa: Lessons from Zimbabwe*. London: Zed Books.

Toulmin, C., 1986. 'Access to Food, Dry Season Strategies and Household Size amongst the Bambara of Central of Central Mali'. *IDS Bulletin*, Vol. 17/3: 58-66.

Urdang, S., 1989. *And They Still Dance: Women, War, and the Struggle for Change in Mozambique*. New York: Monthly Review Press.

UNHCR, 1951. *Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees*. Geneva: UNHCR.

Whitaker, B.E., 1999. *Changing opportunities: refugees and host communities in western Tanzania*. *New Issues in Refugee Research, Working Paper No. 11*. Geneva: UNHCR.

White, C., 1986. 'Food Shortages and Seasonality in WoDaaBe Communities in Niger'. *IDS Bulletin* 17/3: 19-26.

Zetter, R. (1999) "Labelling Refugees: Forming and Transforming a bureaucratic Identity". *Journal of Refugee Studies* 4(1):39-62.