

Book Reviews

Charles P. Gasarasi, *The Tripartite Approach to the Resettlement and Integration of Rural Refugees in Tanzania*. Research Report No 71, The Scandinavian Institute of African Studies, Uppsala, 1984.

All those concerned with the problem of refugees would be interested in reading this lucid account of the strategy undertaken by Tanzania in respect of the resettlement and integration of refugees, by Tanzanian researcher Charles P Gasarasi, a lecturer in Political Science at the University of Dar es Salaam.

Gasarasi evaluates the refugee problem initially from a continental perspective, pointing out that the number of refugees in Africa has been estimated at over 5 million, which represents roughly half of the world's total. He indicates that although the majority of African states have ratified international conventions relating to the protection of refugees, the principle of 'burden-sharing', enshrined in the 1969 OAU Convention, where member states are expected to assist one another in dealing with refugee problems, has on the whole been sadly neglected. We may view this inhospitality generously as does Gasarasi and other writers such as Kibreab (1983) who notes that hospitality – which is a function of 'resource availability' (1983:83) – is inconceivable in a state of poverty. Alternatively we may see this as an example of indifference and inhumanity on the part of many African governments which have failed dismally to meet their responsibilities and indeed have created this problem in the first place. Partly as a result of this lack of co-operation, host governments have had to seek aid from a variety of voluntary non-governmental agencies and from appropriate UN bodies.

In this context Gasarasi explores the Tanzanian experience of coping with refugees and in particular the tripartite arrangement made between the Government of the Republic of Tanzania, the office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and the Lutheran World Federation/Tanganyika Christian Refugee Service (LWF/TCRS). Tanzania has had an extensive experience of influx by refugees since 1959, principally from Zaire and Burundi, although refugees have also arrived from Rwanda, Malawi, Mozambique, Uganda, Kenya and South Africa. The Tanzanian record in dealing with these refugees presents as certainly one of the best in Africa, as

not only has Tanzania generously welcomed its refugee population, but has actively encouraged the integration of refugees through economic self-reliance – and in tens of thousands of cases the granting of Tanzanian citizenship. In recognition of his exceptional services to refugees, President Nyerere was awarded the prestigious Nansen Medal in 1983 (REFUGEES, 1983:13).

Gasarasi traces the involvement of the tripartite partners with refugees, in particular highlighting the large financial contributions made by the two non-governmental partners (for example, UNHCR spent US\$ 11.5 million in sponsoring rural refugee settlements in Tanzania between 1963 and 1979 – Gasarasi p 23). On the other hand he points to the Government's contribution in granting refugees free land on which to settle (10 acres of agricultural land per family), free primary education, health services and assistance to build a new home in a rural refugee settlement. A major factor facilitating this process, as noted by Gasarasi, concerns the availability and ease of allocation of land (ie through state grant rather than purchase), which has meant that Tanzania has the ability to afford such generosity – unlike many other African countries. In particular he emphasises the inestimable value of granting asylum to needy people.

This tripartite approach has developed since the initial Memorandum of Understanding was signed in May 1964. Gasarasi notes the early conflicts which emerged between the partners which he views as reflecting a covert struggle for power. This mainly concerned the disbursement of funds with the two non-governmental partners seeking a greater degree of control over expenditure by government. Lack of mutual trust, different terms of reference and conflicts of interest have also contributed to a breakdown in communication at various times between the operational partners. Other problems concern such factors as poor planning in the allocation of land for the settlements which led to several disastrous failures in the early years. Despite these initial difficulties and continuing conflicts of interest, Gasarasi assures us that, with the increasing experience gained by the partners, more positive results of an incremental nature have developed over time.

The question of participation by refugees in the setting up and running of the settlements is also considered. Earlier settlements did not consider this dynamic, but in the more recent settlements both refugee participation in planning projects and local people's knowledge of the area concerned have been used to beneficial effect. However, Gasarasi is critical of Tanzania's Refugee Control Act (1965) which he feels is responsible for the creation of authoritarian 'Settlement Commandants' who have often developed antagonistic relations with the refugees.

Gasarasi indicates, through good use of tables, details of expenditure and sales production which highlight the relative success of the policy of

encouraging refugee settlements to take their place in the national economy. In addition a wide range of skills and services are provided through refugee co-operatives, which have developed a local economy for the settlements. Recently many of the earlier settlements have assumed the status of ordinary Tanzanian villages, either through voluntary repatriation or, in cases where this was not a possibility, the mass naturalisation of refugees.

Gasarasi emphasises that other African countries hosting refugees would greatly benefit from this tripartite experience and believes this deserves wide dissemination. I would endorse his view, with the reservation that the development of this co-operative approach requires a particular set of favourable circumstances to facilitate this process. In addition it seems evident that the different terms of reference of the operational partners inevitably creates a degree of mistrust between them. However, we should bear in mind that in all likelihood these three agencies will need to develop a *modus operandi* in coping with refugee problems in any case. Other countries apart from Tanzania have experimented in a similar way, with one implementing donor agency working hand in glove with both Government and UN agencies such as UNHCR. Although beset with difficulties, a tripartite approach may be the only way to work towards the provision of effective co-ordination and planning for refugees in the long term.

Reviewed by N Hall, School of Social Work, Harare.

References

- | | |
|-----------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| KIBREAB G | 1983 Reflections on the African Refugee Problem: A Critical Analysis of Some Basic Assumptions. Research Report No 47, The Scandinavian Institute of African Studies, Uppsala, Sweden. |
| REFUGEES | 1983 Refugees Magazine, Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. Public Information Section, No 5, Dec 1983. 13-18. |

Zimbabwe National Family Planning Council. Zimbabwe Reproductive Health Survey 1984. Harare, June 1985.

The Zimbabwe Reproductive Health Survey (ZRHS) Report is written with clarity and principled simplicity. These are important attributes for a pathbreaking report in the field of fertility in Zimbabwe. The ZRHS was conducted between July and October 1984, and the sample is comprised of 2 574 women aged 15-49 of whom two thirds are rural residents.

The report consists of eight chapters. The first chapter provides the historical, socio-economic and demographic backdrop on which the study