



OPERATIONAL GUIDANCE NOTE

MALAWI

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1.1 – 1.5
2. Country assessment	2.1 – 2.11
3. Main categories of claims	3.1 – 3.5
Malawians connected to the MDC in Zimbabwe	3.6
Members of opposition political parties	3.7
Prison conditions	3.8
4. Discretionary Leave	4.1 – 4.2
Minors claiming in their own right	4.3
Medical treatment	4.4
5. Returns	5.1 – 5.2
6. List of source documents	

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This document summarises the general, political and human rights situation in Malawi and provides information on the nature and handling of claims frequently received from nationals/residents of that country. It must be read in conjunction with any COI Service Malawi Country of Origin Information at:
- http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/country_reports.html
- 1.2 This document is intended to provide clear guidance on whether the main types of claim are or are not likely to justify the granting of asylum, Humanitarian Protection or Discretionary Leave. Caseworkers should refer to the following Asylum Policy Instructions for further details of the policy on these areas:
- API on Assessing the Claim
API on Humanitarian Protection
API on Discretionary Leave
API on the European Convention on Human Rights
API on Article 8 ECHR
- 1.3 Claims should be considered on an individual basis, but taking full account of the information set out below, in particular Part 3 on main categories of claims. In considering claims where the main applicant has dependent family members who are a part of his/her claim, account must be taken of the situation of all the dependent family members included in the claim in accordance with the API on Article 8 ECHR.
- 1.4 Asylum and human rights claims must be considered on their individual merits. However, if following consideration, the claim is refused, caseworkers should consider whether the claim can be certified as clearly unfounded under the case by case certification power in section 94(2) of the Nationality, Immigration and Asylum Act 2002. A claim will be clearly unfounded if it is so clearly without substance that it is bound to fail. The information set out below contains relevant country information, the most

common types of claim and guidance from the courts, including guidance on whether certain types of claim are likely to be clearly unfounded.

Source documents

1.5 A full list of source documents cited in footnotes is at the end of this note.

2. Country assessment

2.1 The former British federated colony of Nyasaland achieved independence as Malawi in 1964 and Hastings Banda became the first prime minister. He quickly adopted an autocratic style, leading to ministerial rebellions in the 1960s, which in turn led to further repression. In the climate of the Cold War donors were prepared to tolerate his domestic idiosyncrasies, especially since - in contrast to his neighbours – he managed an effective economy in one of the poorest countries in the world. But with the collapse of communism the props, both domestic and international, were kicked away. Under donor and popular pressure, as well as feeling the effects of age (he was at least 90), he conceded multi-party democracy in 1993. Bakili Muluzi and his United Democratic Front (whose popular support was in the densely-populated south of the country) won the ensuing presidential and parliamentary elections in 1994.¹

2.2 Although the UDF was the largest party in parliament after the 1994 elections, it failed by three seats to win an absolute majority. Banda's Malawi Congress Party (MCP) dominated the central region and the Alliance for Democracy (AFORD) the north. In September 1994 Chakufwa Chihana, president of AFORD, joined the UDF Government as 2nd Vice-President and a coalition government was formed. But Chihana resigned in May 1996, just as the President was about to dismiss him. AFORD decided to withdraw from the coalition, but not all the AFORD ministers resigned: four remained in government, and two AFORD MPs also joined. AFORD and the MCP boycotted the December 1996 parliamentary session in protest at UDF's 'poaching' of MPs. In April 1997, MCP and AFORD decided to end the boycott (after many of their members had ignored it anyway). Dr Banda retired later that year and was replaced as leader of MCP by former vice-president Gwanda Chakuamba. Banda died in November that year and was given a state funeral. The next presidential and parliamentary elections were held in June 1999. Once again Muluzi won the presidency, but his party failed to gain an overall majority.²

2.3 In the 2004 presidential and parliamentary elections Bingu wa Mutharika – Muluzi's hand-picked successor as leader of UDF - won the presidency with 36% of the vote. The MCP's John Tembo was the immediate runner-up on 27%, and Chakuamba, now heading a coalition of opposition parties, won 26%. In the parliamentary contest the MCP overtook the UDF, and large number of independent MPs were also elected. International observers declared the poll generally free and fair. However, they highlighted previous misuse of government resources by the UDF, and the Malawi Electoral Commission's failure to adequately address problems with the voters' roll.³

2.4 Mutharika soon indicated he was his own man, in particular launching a determined attack on corruption, alienating many influential figures in the UDF, including his former patron Muluzi. Eventually Mutharika split from the party and founded his own, the Democratic People's Party, which drew support from a number of minor opposition parties and disaffected UDF MPs. Mutharika's uncompromising approach and willingness to upset his former colleagues have won him the support of many

¹ COIS Malawi Country Report 2006 (Section 4) & Foreign and Commonwealth Office Malawi Country Profile 3 April 2006

² COIS Malawi Country Report 2006 (Section 4) & FCO Country Profile

³ COIS Malawi Country Report 2006 (para 5.10 – 5.14) & FCO Country Profile

international donors.⁴ The political climate remains unstable following the April 2006 arrest and charge of Vice-President Cassim Chilumpha for treason.⁵ and the attempted arrest of former President Muluzi in July 2006 on corruption charges. In recent months, President Mutharika has sacked the Director of the Anti-Corruption Bureau (ACB), the Director of Public Prosecutions and his Attorney General. It is reported that some 50 senior officials in total have been removed from office since Mutharika came to power.⁶

- 2.5** Under Banda, Malawi's human rights record was one of the worst in the region. Freedom of assembly and expression were banned, arbitrary arrest and detention without trial were frequent, and prison conditions appalling. The failure to address donors' concerns over human rights led to the withholding of aid in 1992. Multi-party democracy brought with it constitutional and other safeguards, including a Malawi Human Rights Commission, but the UDF-led government displayed occasional heavy-handedness, particularly towards the media.⁷
- 2.6** The United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) for the period 2002 to 2006 stated that human rights as a framework for development are embodied in a number of international conventions, declarations, plans of action and other agreements of which Malawi is a signatory. Malawi has ratified major international human rights instruments as well as key human rights related International Labour Conventions. As a signatory to these instruments, the country has accepted to take necessary steps, to the extent that its resources allow, to progressively implement the provisions.⁸
- 2.7** Although observance of human rights has improved over recent years, cases of abuse still exist. Low level of knowledge of rights and responsibilities at civil society and government levels are among the major causes of abuse of human rights. One of the contributing factors to this state of affairs is the prevailing culture that does not promote accountability and transparency of the institutions that have been assigned the responsibility of ensuring that civic education is made available. This is further compromised by the low level of professional skills in human rights institutions.⁹
- 2.8** The government generally respected the human rights of its citizens in 2005; however, there were problems in some areas. HIV/AIDS and severe food shortages affecting as many as four million persons exacerbated these problems.¹⁰ In its Annual Report covering 2005, Amnesty International noted that women's rights, policing and prison conditions remained areas of concern.¹¹ The following human rights problems/individual incidents were reported in 2005: use of excessive force by police; mob violence; harsh and life-threatening prison conditions; arbitrary arrest and detention; lengthy pre-trial detention; limits on freedom of speech and press; limits on freedom of assembly; societal discrimination and violence against women; child abuse; trafficking in persons; forced child labour and limits on workers' rights.¹²
- 2.9** During 2005, the government took significant steps to punish human rights abusers and investigate corruption. An inspection of a police station in Karonga by the inspector general of the police led to a one-year imprisonment of two policemen who abused detainees. The Mutharika administration continued an ambitious anti-corruption campaign, arresting and indicting several high-ranking officials. Leaders increasingly spoke out against exploitative and hazardous child labour practices. Stiff penalties were issued to child traffickers in 2005.¹³

⁴ COIS Malawi Country Report 2006 (paras 5.15 – 5.16) FCO Country Profile

⁵ BBC Timeline: Malawi

⁶ BBC Timeline: Malawi, BBC Country Profile & FCO Country Profile

⁷ FCO Country Profile & Amnesty International (AI) Annual Report covering 2005

⁸ COIS Malawi Country Report 2006 (para 6.02)

⁹ COIS Malawi Country Report 2006 (para 6.03 & 6.04)

¹⁰ USSD 2005 (Introduction)

¹¹ AI 2005

¹² US State Department Report Malawi covering 2005 (Introduction)

¹³ USSD 2005 (Introduction)

- 2.10** A wide variety of domestic and international human rights groups operated without government restriction in 2005, training civic educators, advocating changes to existing laws and cultural practices, and investigating and publishing their findings on human rights cases. Government officials generally were cooperative and responsive to their views. Ombudsman Enock Chibwana was mandated by the law to investigate and take legal action against government officials responsible for human rights violations and other abuses. The ombudsman's freedom of action was circumscribed by legislation that requires a warrant and a three-day waiting period to gain access to certain government records. The activities of the ombudsman are subject to judicial review.¹⁴
- 2.11** The constitutionally-mandated Malawi Human Rights Commission (MHRC) was charged with monitoring, auditing, and promoting human rights provided for under the law and to carry out investigations regarding violations of human rights. The MHRC handled 1,136 complaints of human rights violations in 2004 compared to 587 complaints in 2003. Nearly half of the complaints related to the rights of prisoners and pre-trial detainees and included allegations of overstay on remand, denial of bail, and unheard appeals. Other common complaints cited in the MHRC's 2004 report related to unfair labour practices and inadequate access to justice and legal remedies. The MHRC complained of severe financial and human resource constraints which led to a backlog of cases, delayed production of reports, and failure to expand human rights monitoring.¹⁵

3. Main categories of claims

- 3.1** This Section sets out the main types of asylum claim, human rights claim and Humanitarian Protection claim (whether explicit or implied) made by those entitled to reside in Malawi. It also contains any common claims that may raise issues covered by the API on Discretionary Leave. Where appropriate it provides guidance on whether or not an individual making a claim is likely to face a real risk of persecution, unlawful killing or torture or inhuman or degrading treatment/ punishment. It also provides guidance on whether or not sufficiency of protection is available in cases where the threat comes from a non-state actor; and whether or not internal relocation is an option. The law and policies on persecution, Humanitarian Protection, sufficiency of protection and internal relocation are set out in the relevant API's, but how these affect particular categories of claim are set out in the instructions below.
- 3.2** Each claim should be assessed to determine whether there are reasonable grounds for believing that the claimant would, if returned, face persecution for a Convention reason - i.e. due to their race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion. The approach set out in *Karanakaran* should be followed when deciding how much weight to be given to the material provided in support of the claim (see the API on Assessing the Claim).
- 3.3** If the claimant does not qualify for asylum, consideration should be given as to whether a grant of Humanitarian Protection is appropriate. If the claimant qualifies for neither asylum nor Humanitarian Protection, consideration should be given as to whether he/she qualifies for Discretionary Leave, either on the basis of the particular categories detailed in Section 4 or on their individual circumstances.
- 3.4** This guidance is **not** designed to cover issues of credibility. Caseworkers will need to consider credibility issues based on all the information available to them. (For guidance on credibility see para 11 of the API on Assessing the Claim)
- 3.5** All APIs can be accessed via the IND website at:

¹⁴ USSD 2005 (Section 4)

¹⁵ USSD 2005 (Section 4)

http://www.ind.homeoffice.gov.uk/ind/en/home/laws_policy/policy_instructions/apis.html

3.6 Malawians connected to the MDC in Zimbabwe

- 3.6.1** Most Malawian claimants will base their claim on political connections to the Movement for Democratic Change (MDC) in Zimbabwe. They will claim that they are either Malawian Zimbabwean citizens or individuals with dual Malawian/Zimbabwean citizenship who are at real risk, if returned to Malawi, of being refouled to Zimbabwe where they fear persecution by the Zimbabwean authorities on account of their political activities in Zimbabwe.
- 3.6.2 *Treatment.*** There is no evidence that individuals who are Malawian citizens or who are entitled to reside in Malawi face a real risk of mistreatment by either state or non-state agents in Malawi on account of their activities in support of the MDC in Zimbabwe. Such claimants would therefore not face persecution or treatment amounting to a breach of the ECHR in Malawi. Nor is there evidence that Malawi citizens or people who are entitled to reside in Malawi would be refouled to Zimbabwe because of alleged involvement in politics in Zimbabwe.
- 3.6.3** To establish whether a claimant is a citizen of Malawi or is entitled to reside there, an overview of the nationality and citizenship laws in Malawi is set out in paragraph 5.04 of the COIS Malawi Country Report.
- 3.6.4 *Sufficiency of protection.*** There is no evidence that this category of claimant has a well founded fear of persecution or treatment likely to engage the UK's obligations under Article 3 of ECHR and the question of state protection in Malawi is not therefore relevant.
- 3.6.5 *Internal relocation.*** There is no evidence that this category of claimant has a well founded fear of persecution or treatment likely to engage the UK's obligations under Article 3 of ECHR in Malawi and the question of internal relocation in Malawi is not therefore relevant.
- 3.6.6 *Conclusion.*** Persons confirmed as Malawian citizens or those who it is confirmed are entitled to reside in Malawi would not face a real risk of persecution or treatment in breach of the ECHR in Malawi on account of their affiliation to the MDC in Zimbabwe. The grant of asylum in such cases is not appropriate and claims should be refused and certified as clearly unfounded.

3.7 Members of opposition political parties

- 3.7.1** Many claimants will apply for asylum based on ill treatment amounting to persecution at the hands of the state authorities and the ruling UDF party due to membership of, affiliation with, or perceived association with one of the main opposition parties.
- 3.7.2 *Treatment.*** Since the advent of multiparty politics in the early 1990s, freedom of association has been guaranteed under the Bill of Rights within the Constitution. Malawians are free to form or join any political party. So far more than 22 political parties have been registered, the UDF [United Democratic Front], MCP [Malawi Congress Party], AFORD [Alliance for Democracy], Malawi Democratic Party (MDP), MAFUNDE [Malawi Forum for Unity and Development], National Democratic Alliance (NDA) and the National Independence Party (NIP). The UDF, MCP and AFORD are the most dominant while NDA – a newly launched party follows on the heels of these three together with the MDP.¹⁶

¹⁶ COIS Malawi Country Report 2006 (para 5.08 & Annex B)

- 3.7.3** In the presidential elections of May 2004, the UDF's Bingu wa Mutharika won 35.89% of the vote, the MCP's John Tembo received 27.13%, Gwandaguluwe Chakuamba of the MC 25.72% and Brown Mpinganjira of the NDA 8.72%.¹⁷ In the simultaneous parliamentary contest, the MCP overtook the UDF and a large number of independent MPs were also elected. International observers declared the poll generally free and fair. However, they highlighted previous misuse of government resources by the UDF, and the Malawi Electoral Commission's failure to adequately address problems with the voters' roll.¹⁸ The shortcomings reported by observers did not however relate to any of the main opposition parties being censored or restricted by the incumbent UDF administration.¹⁹ Since the elections, a new party – the Democratic Progressive Party (DPP) has emerged in by-elections in the course of 2005 to take parliamentary seats from all the main established political parties.²⁰
- 3.7.4** In 2002 and 2003 it was reported that senior members and MPs affiliated to the MCP, NDA and AFORD were randomly attacked and beaten by the police and members of the UDF Young Democrats, a youth group affiliated to the ruling UDF.²¹ Since then there have been no reports, including during May 2004 elections, that opposition political party members of any profile have been targeted for mistreatment by UDF-affiliated groups or the state authorities. Though there have been no major reports of political disturbances or violence in recent years, there were occasional instances in 2005 when the police limited political activist meetings and demonstrations. Authorities at times during 2005 interfered with opposition party political functions or used violence to disperse crowds.²²
- 3.7.5** **Sufficiency of protection.** As this category of claimants' fear is of ill treatment/persecution by the state authorities they cannot apply to these authorities for protection.
- 3.7.6** **Internal relocation.** As this category of claimants' fear is of ill treatment/persecution by the state authorities relocation to a different area of the country to escape this threat is not feasible.
- 3.7.7** **Conclusion.** The MCP and other main opposition political parties, the NDA, AFORD, MDP, and most recently the DPP, are legal political entities that have competed against the ruling UDF in national elections over the past decade without restrictions. The MCP currently controls the most seats of any party in parliament. While there were isolated incidents some years ago of senior opposition officials from various parties being targeted by UDF-affiliated groups, there is no evidence that members, supporters or perceived affiliates of any of the main opposition political parties are targeted or mistreated by the UDF or state authorities since 2003. It is therefore not likely that such claimants would encounter persecution or mistreatment in breach of the ECHR on account of their political affiliations. The grant of asylum in such cases is not appropriate and claims should be refused and certified as clearly unfounded.

3.8 Prison conditions

- 3.8.1** Claimants may claim that they cannot return to Malawi due to the fact that there is a serious risk that they will be imprisoned on return and that prison conditions in the Malawi are so poor as to amount to torture or inhuman treatment or punishment.
- 3.8.2** The guidance in this section is concerned solely with whether prison conditions are such that they breach Article 3 of ECHR and warrant a grant of Humanitarian Protection. If imprisonment would be for a Refugee Convention reason, or in cases where for a

¹⁷ COIS Malawi Country Report 2006 (para 5.10)

¹⁸ COIS Malawi Country Report 2006 (para 5.10 – 5.15, Annex B) & FCO country profile 20 July 2005

¹⁹ COIS Malawi Country Report 2006 (para 5.13 – 5.14)

²⁰ COIS Malawi Country Report 2006 (para 5.15 – 5.16)

²¹ COIS Malawi Country Report 2006 (para 6.12)

²² USSD 2005 (Section 1b)

Convention reason a prison sentence is extended above the norm, the claim should be considered as a whole but it is not necessary for prison conditions to breach Article 3 in order to justify a grant of asylum.

- 3.8.3 Consideration.** Prison conditions remained harsh and life threatening in 2005. Overcrowding, inadequate nutrition, substandard sanitation, and poor health facilities remained serious problems. The prison system, which was meant to accommodate approximately 7,000 inmates, held 10,389 prisoners, including approximately 350 juveniles. In 2005, inmates complained that they did not receive enough food. Prison inmates were encouraged to grow vegetables and raise livestock. Community service programmes were available as alternatives to prison terms. In 2004 an average of 20 inmates died in prison each month, mostly due to HIV/AIDS. There were no available statistics on prison deaths at the end of 2005.²³
- 3.8.4** In April 2004 the government began a programme with international donors to renovate the country's four major prisons. A new prison was under construction, scheduled to open in early 2006 to replace Mzuzu prison and alleviate prison congestion in the north. Some prisons were upgraded in 2005 to include improved toilet and shower facilities and plumbing.²⁴
- 3.8.5** Although women are not kept in separate facilities, they are segregated within the prison compound and monitored by female guards. In the four maximum-security prisons, there are separate facilities for juveniles; however, the separation was inadequate in practice, and there were reports in 2005 of sexual and physical abuse of juvenile prisoners. In the other prisons, juveniles are routinely incarcerated with adults. The law requires pre-trial detainees to be held separately from convicted prisoners; however, many prisons could not comply with this law due to lack of space and inadequate facilities.²⁵
- 3.8.6** The Inspectorate of Prisons, domestic non-governmental organisations (NGOs), and international NGOs were permitted to make visits to monitor prison conditions in 2005 and to donate basic supplies. The Prison Reform Committee worked in collaboration with the Ministry of Home Affairs and the Inspectorate of Prisons to visit prisons in 2005.²⁶
- 3.8.7 Conclusion.** Whilst prison conditions in Malawi are poor with overcrowding inadequate nutrition, substandard sanitation, and poor health facilities being particular problems, these conditions will not normally be sufficiently severe to meet the high Article 3 threshold. In addition to these adverse conditions there are reports that officials act with impunity and regularly mistreat inmates. The information available does not suggest that particular groups of inmates are more at risk of such mistreatment than others. There is no evidence that the mistreatment is of such a systematic nature as to make removal a breach of Article 3 on these grounds.
- 3.8.8** Even where claimants can demonstrate a real risk of imprisonment on return to Malawi a grant of Humanitarian Protection will not generally be appropriate. However, the individual factors of each case should be considered to determine whether detention will cause a particular individual in his particular circumstances to suffer treatment contrary to Article 3, relevant factors being the likely length of detention the likely type of detention facility and the individual's age and state of health. Where in an individual case treatment does reach the Article 3 threshold a grant of Humanitarian Protection will be appropriate.

²³ USSD 2005 (Section 1d)

²⁴ USSD 2005 (Section 1d)

²⁵ USSD 2005 (Section 1d)

²⁶ USSD 2005 (Section 1d)

4. Discretionary Leave

- 4.1** Where an application for asylum and Humanitarian Protection falls to be refused there may be compelling reasons for granting Discretionary Leave (DL) to the individual concerned. (See API on Discretionary Leave) Where the claim includes dependent family members consideration must also be given to the particular situation of those dependants in accordance with the API on Article 8 ECHR.
- 4.2** With particular reference to Malawi the types of claim which may raise the issue of whether or not it will be appropriate to grant DL are likely to fall within the following categories. Each case must be considered on its individual merits and membership of one of these groups should *not* imply an automatic grant of DL. There may be other specific circumstances related to the applicant, or dependent family members who are part of the claim, not covered by the categories below which warrant a grant of DL - see the API on Discretionary Leave and the API on Article 8 ECHR.
- 4.3 Minors claiming in their own right**
- 4.3.1** Minors claiming in their own right who have not been granted asylum or HP can only be returned where they have family to return to or there are adequate reception, care and support arrangements. At the moment we do not have sufficient information to be satisfied that there are adequate reception, care and support arrangements in place.
- 4.3.2** Minors claiming in their own right without a family to return to, or where there are no adequate reception, care and support arrangements, should if they do not qualify for leave on any more favourable grounds be granted Discretionary Leave for a period of three years or until their 18th birthday, whichever is the shorter period.
- 4.4 Medical treatment**
- 4.4.1** Claimants may claim they cannot return to Malawi due to a lack of specific medical treatment. See the IDI on Medical Treatment which sets out in detail the requirements for Article 3 and/or 8 to be engaged.
- 4.4.2** A September 2004 report by the Department for International Development (DFID) noted that since the formulation of the first National Health Plan in 1964, and subsequent plans in 1973 and 1986, Malawi has made some impressive strides in the health sector. The number of health units the government put in place and the immunisation coverage on communicable diseases evidences this expanded commitment. Despite these improvements to health care delivery, the health status of the population remains relatively poor. This is due to a lack of financial and human resources, reduced donor support, increased demand for health services, the resurgence of diseases such as TB and malaria, and the escalation of the AIDS pandemic.²⁷
- 4.4.3** Among the major challenges is the consistent shortage of essential drugs and medical supplies at service delivery points. This is partly because of the chronic under funding of the health sector. Health expenditure as a percentage of GNP in Malawi is among the lowest in Sub-Saharan Africa. Problems are often compounded by mismanagement, pilferage, and less than efficient drug procurement and distribution procedures. Health indicators are amongst the worst in the world and have shown little improvement in recent years.²⁸
- 4.4.4** Where a caseworker considers that the circumstances of the individual claimant and the situation in the country reach the threshold detailed in the IDI on Medical Treatment

²⁷ COIS Malawi Country Report March 2006 (paras 5.44 & 5.60)

²⁸ COIS Malawi Country Report March 2006 (para 5.44)

making removal contrary to Article 3 or 8 a grant of discretionary leave to remain will be appropriate. Such cases should always be referred to a Senior Caseworker for consideration prior to a grant of Discretionary Leave. The Article 3 threshold will not be reached in the great majority of medical cases and a grant of Discretionary Leave will usually not be appropriate.

5. Returns

- 5.1** Factors that affect the practicality of return such as the difficulty or otherwise of obtaining a travel document should not be taken into account when considering the merits of an asylum or human rights claim. Where the claim includes dependent family members their situation on return should however be considered in line with the Immigration Rules, in particular paragraph 395C requires the consideration of all relevant factors known to the Secretary of State, and with regard to family members refers also to the factors listed in paragraphs 365-368 of the Immigration Rules.
- 5.2** Malawi nationals may return voluntarily to any region of Malawi at any time by way of the Voluntary Assisted Return and Reintegration Programme run by the International Organisation for Migration (IOM) and co-funded by the European Refugee Fund. IOM will provide advice and help with obtaining travel documents and booking flights, as well as organising reintegration assistance in Malawi. The programme was established in 2001, and is open to those awaiting an asylum decision or the outcome of an appeal, as well as failed asylum seekers. Malawi nationals wishing to avail themselves of this opportunity for assisted return to Malawi should be put in contact with the IOM offices in London on 020 7233 0001 or www.iomlondon.org.

6. List of source documents

- Amnesty International Annual Report covering 2005: Malawi at: <http://web.amnesty.org/report2006/mwi-summary-eng>
- British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC) Timeline: Malawi 5 July 2006 at http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/africa/country_profiles/2982250.stm
- UK Foreign and Commonwealth Office Malawi Country Profile last updated 3 April 2006 at: <http://www.fco.gov.uk/servlet/Front?pagename=OpenMarket/Xcelerate/ShowPage&c=Page&cid=1007029394365&a=KCountryProfile&aid=1019744969259>
- UK Home Office COI Service Malawi Country of Origin Information Report March 2006 at http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/country_reports.html
- US Department of State: Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights and Labor Country Report on Human Rights Practices 2005: Malawi Released 8 March 2006 at: <http://www.state.gov/g/drl/rls/hrrpt/2005/61579.htm>