

https://dspace.org/

Local integration as a durable solution: A study of Congolese refugees in Johannesburg

Hlobo, Rampeoane

2006-11-15T11:58:00Z
http://hdl.handle.net/10539/1740

Downloaded from a DSpace repository. https://dspace.org/

LOCAL INTEGRATION AS A DURABLE SOLUTION:

A STUDY OF CONGOLESE REFUGEES IN JOHANNESBURG.

By

Rampeoane Hlobo

A thesis submitted to the faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Masters of Arts in Forced Migration Studies

Johannesburg 2004

ABSTRACT

This is a study of local integration of Congolese refugees from The Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) living in Johannesburg. The point of departure is from Jacobsen's assertion that refugees are de facto integrated when they are not in physical danger, are able to sustain livelihoods through access to land or employment, and can support themselves and their families, are socially networked into host communities so that intermarriage is common, ceremonies like weddings and funerals are attended by everyone and there is no distinction between refugees and local communities. The study looks at the amount of interaction between refugees and South Africans, the dynamics involved in social integration and the perception of integration by refugees and service providers. Refugees and service providers in Johannesburg were interviewed and conclusions are drawn from their responses and the literature consulted.

DECLARATION

I declare that this thesis is my own unaided work. It is submitted for the degree of Masters of Arts in Forced Migration Studies in the Graduate School for Humanities and Social Sciences, in the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg. It has not been submitted before for any other degree or examination in any other University.

_____

Rampeoane Hlobo

31 December 2004

DEDICATION

To Papa, Ntheti and Karabo for the love and support that you have given to me as a son and a brother.

To Mamane, my late mother who was a real gift from God.

To the Almighty who made it all possible.

Ad Maiorem Dei Gloriam

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to give my sincere gratitude and appreciation to both Dr. Sally Peberdy and Prof. Rodreck Mupedziswa for their guidance and help during the preparations and writing of this research report. Their assistance, support, encouragement and patience are highly appreciated. Thank you very much.

Sr. Cathy Murugan for allowing me to use the JRS Johannesburg Office and for her support and interest in the study. Many thanks to the JRS team for their patience and support while doing the study in their office.

To the Service Providers that gave up their precious time to share their experiences for the purpose of the study, I thank you very much. Your contribution is highly appreciated.

My sincere gratitude goes to all the refugees who participated in the study and generously shared the lives and experiences as refugees in Johannesburg. I thank you very much and I hope that one day your country will know peace so that those who so much yearn to go back may be able to do so. Encore une fois, merci beaucoup !

To Mike and Graham for your continuous support and encouragement and to Anthony for your insight and precious time. Thank you very much. Highly appreciated.

CONTENTS **Page**

1.	**Introduction**	**1**
1.1	Overview	1
1.2	South African Context	4
1.3	Support Structures	5
1.4	Aims and Objectives	5
1.5	Rationale	6
1.6	Outline of the Study	7
2.	**Methodology**	**9**
2.1	Background	9
2.2	Location	12
2.3	Population	12
2.4	Key Informants	13
2.5	Sampling	14
2.6	Limitations	15
2.7	Ethical Considerations	16
3.	**Literature Review**	**19**
3.1	Xenophobia	27
3.2	Legal Instruments	30

4. Presentation and Analysis of Study Findings: Perceptions and Experiences of Congolese Refugees **47**

5. Presentation and Analysis of Study Findings: The Role of Service Providers in Access to Service Provision **78**

6. Conclusions and Recommendations **97**

6.1 Host Community 97

6.2 Xenophobia 98

6.3 Religion 98

6.4 Refugees 99

6.5 Non- Governmental Organisations (NGO) 99

6.6 Government 100

6.7 Root Causes 102

6.8 Recommendations 103

7 **Bibliography** **107**

Appendices

Appendix A: List of Service Providers interviewed 114

Appendix B: Questionnaire for Refugee Youth 115

Appendix C: Questionnaire for Refugee Adults 117

Appendix D: Questionnaire for Service Providers 120

Appendix E: Informed Consent Form for Refugees 121

Appendix F: Informed Consent Form for Service Providers 122

Appendix G: Tape Recording Consent Form 123

LIST OF TABLES Page

Table 1: Information about Congolese Refugee Youth 48

Table 2: Information about Congolese Refugee Women 49

Table 3: Information about Congolese Refugee Men 50

Table 4: Interaction of Congolese Refugee Youth with South Africans 52

Table 5: Interaction of Congolese Refugee Women with South Africans 53

Table 6: Interaction of Congolese Refugee Men with South Africans 55

Table 7: Attitude of Congolese Refugee Women towards Government 57

Table 8: Attitude of Congolese Refugee Men toward the government 58

Table 9: Xenophobic Experiences of Congolese Refugee Youth 61

Table 10: Xenophobic Experiences of Congolese Refugee Women 62

Table 11: Xenophobic Experiences of Congolese Refugee Men 63

Table 12: Perceptions of Integration: Congolese Refugee Youth 68

Table 13: Perceptions of Integration: Congolese Refugee Women 70

Table 14: Perceptions of Integration: Congolese Refugee Men 72

Table 15: Information on Religion: Congolese Refugee Youth 75

Table 16: Information on Religion: Congolese Refugee Women 76

Table 17: Information on Religion: Congolese Refugee Men 76

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Overview

Forced migration has become an issue of great concern throughout the world today. Concerns ranging from the causes, to protection and the magnitude of the problem, of forced migration have been raised and debated.[1] According to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), the United Nations (UN) agency responsible for the protection and assistance of refugees, as at 1 January 2002, there were about twenty million people of concern to the agency worldwide (UNHCR, 2002a: 1). In addition to these who are considered as refugees, there are more than 26 million people who are internally displaced or have not crossed international borders (Westin, 1999: 24).[2] Africa constitutes over twelve per cent of the global population, and yet the continent has twenty-eight per cent of refugees and just fewer than fifty per cent of the internally displaced persons[3] (IDPs) in the world (Crisp, 2000: 158). All in all, the total number of displaced Africans is in the region of 12, 7 million people. Of the twenty top refugee-producing countries around the world, nine are found in Africa (*ibid*).

---

[1] Forced Migration refers to involuntary movement of people from one place (country, Region, city, etc.) to another. Forced migration often occurs, but not always, because of violations of human rights, wars, religious or political persecutions, etc.

[2] The 1951 Geneva Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees defines a refugee as a person who "… owing to well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion, is outside the country of his nationality and is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to avail himself of the protection of that country; or who, not having nationality and being outside the country of his former habitual residence as a result of such events, is unable, or owing to such fear, is unwilling to return to it" (UNHCR, 1951). In addition to the aforementioned definition, the 1969 OAU Convention Governing the Specific Aspects of Refugee Problems in Africa adds that the term refugee " shall also apply to every person who, owing to external aggression, occupation, foreign domination or events seriously disturbing public order in either part or the whole of his country of origin or nationality, is compelled to leave his place of habitual residence in order to seek refugee in another place outside his country of origin or nationality" (UNHCR 1969).

[3] Internally displaced persons refer to people who have been forced to move from their place of habitual residence to a different place within the borders of the same country.

The 1990s saw South Africa emerging as a new destination for refugees from elsewhere in Africa, settling in urban centres (Crush & McDonald, 2000: 6; Landau & Jacobsen, 2004: 44). According to UNHCR, between mid 1994 and April 2001 South Africa had received over sixty-four thousand asylum seekers.[4] Out of this, over sixteen thousand had been successfully adjudicated and granted refugee status (UNHCR, 2001). In 2003 alone, thirty- one thousand six hundred new applications were registered in South Africa, bringing the total number of applications since 1994 to one hundred and fifty- two thousand four hundred and fourteen (152 414) (Groot 2004: 38). Statistics from the Department of Home Affairs (DHA), Johannesburg Refugee Office in Braamfontein alone, show that as at 10 January 2002, over thirty- six thousand applications had been received (DHA, 2002). Although these statistics are from only one Refugee Reception Centre, they suggest a marked concentration of refugees in the Johannesburg area. Among them is a contingent (about 8106) of people that fled the Democratic Republic of Congo[5] (DRC) and filed their applications for asylum in Johannesburg, a segment of which have been granted asylum (*ibid*). However, Morris (1999) asserts that in 1995 there were estimates of about 23 000 Congolese living in the Johannesburg area, with Hillbrow being the primary area (Morris, 1999: 307).

[4] An asylum seeker refers to anyone who has applied for asylum or to be recognised as a refugee. Unlike those who have been accorded refugee status, asylum seekers have no right to study or take up employment in South Africa (Crush & Williams 2002: 2).

[5] DRC is a central African country and a former colony of Belgium. It came to independence on 30 June 1960 under the presidency of Kasavubu and Prime Minister Lumumba. From 1965 to 1997 Mobutu Sese Seko took over the leadership of the country whose name was changed to Zaire. In May 1997 Mobutu was toppled by a rebellion led by Laurent Kabila who changed the name of the country to DRC. Kabila was assassinated on 16 January 2001 and his son Joseph Kabila succeeded his father as president of the DRC (http//www.cia.gov/cia/publications/factbook/geos/cg.html ; http//www.lcweb2.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query)

In 1991 when it was ultimately permitted to operate in South Africa, the UNHCR started addressing durable solutions for returning South African exiles and the 300 000 Mozambican refugees who had fled the civil war in their country, but had never been formally recognised as refugees by the South African government (Crush & Williams 2002: 2). Not long after the South African government had introduced asylum determination procedure for individual applicants in 1993, trickles of applicants started arriving, with the flow rising between 1995 and 1998. The numbers later levelled off at around 20 000 applicants per year with the majority coming from Angola, the Great Lakes region (DRC, Rwanda and Burundi) and the Horn of Africa (*ibid*). Considering the backlog, most (88%) of the successfully adjudicated applications come from three countries: Angola, Somalia and the DRC (*ibid*).

This study focuses on the social integration of Congolese refugees in Johannesburg. Incidentally the Congolese refugees are by far the majority of refugees coming for assistance at the JRS office in Johannesburg.[6] According to the Department of Home Affairs' (Johannesburg) statistics, they are also the single majority nationals to have filed applications for asylum in the Johannesburg office of Home Affairs (Department of Home Affairs, 2002). Key questions raised, attempt to establish the extent to which this group is integrated into the local community. Are the refugees more vulnerable than South Africans when it comes to such issues as physical safety and security? Has social interaction and access to socio- economic services reached a level that has no distinction between the refugees and the local community as asserted by Jacobsen?

[6] Monthly and annual statistics of people who came and were served at the JRS Johannesburg office show that Congolese from DRC were the majority of people coming to JRS for assistance.

The UNHCR has identified three durable solutions for refugees: voluntary repatriation (back) to their home country; resettlement to a third country; or integration into the host society (Harrell-Bond, 1986: 1). On 14 December 1950 the United Nations General Assembly adopted Resolution 428 (V). This resolution calls upon Governments to co-operate with the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) in performing functions that concern refugees falling under the competence of the UNHCR by, *inter alia*, promoting the assimilation of refugees and by facilitating their naturalization (UNHCR, 1950: 6).

1.2 South African Context

However many asylum applications in South Africa have been perceived as being bogus and as a result of this view held by many in official circles, the DHA has consequently introduced a variety of restrictive policies among which there is prohibition of work and study for asylum seekers (Crush & Williams 2002: 2).[7] In addition, the inefficiency or incapability of the DHA to process asylum applications has led to a serious backlog that has subsequently left asylum applicants waiting for a decision for a period that extends from seven months to four years (CASE, 2003: 127).

The mid 1990s also saw the attitude of South Africans towards foreigners becoming increasingly antagonistic, sometimes resulting in violent attacks on non- South Africans

[7] Minister Buthelezi, minister of Home Affairs, in his speech to the Ministerial Meeting on the 50th Anniversary of the 1951 Geneva Convention asserted that the majority of asylum applications in South Africa were manifestly unfounded at a rate of 80% (Crush & Williams 2002: 14). The CASE (2003) illustrates this prohibition as one of the main difficulties.

and sometimes culminating in deaths (Crush, 2001:22; Landau & Jacobsen, 2004: 44). This prevailing climate of xenophobia is also reflected in the media by perpetuating negative stereotypes about non- South Africans and consequently contributing to xenophobia (Danso & McDonald, 2000: 13).[8]

1.3 Support Structures

For their support and for material assistance, especially food, asylum seekers and refugees rely heavily on churches, mosques and NGOs (CASE, 2003: 89). Social networks like friends, family and relatives seem to be essential support structures for asylum seekers and refugees, especially upon arrival (*ibid*). Asylum seekers are effectively forced by the situation to illegally take up employment for their survival as neither the government nor UNHCR and NGOs are in a position to provide adequate material assistance for them (Crush & Williams, 2002: 14).

1.4 Aims and Objectives

The aim of the study is to determine the extent to which members of the Congolese (DRC) community are socially integrated in the Johannesburg area and subsequently establishing to what extent is Jacobsen's definition of integration, a reality with regard to Congolese refugees in Johannesburg.

Specific Objectives:

1. To establish the level or extent of social interaction between the host community and the Congolese refugees in Johannesburg in terms of attendance of marriage and burial ceremonies, church services or even intermarriage.

[8] The Concise Oxford Dictionary defines xenophobia as a morbid dislike of foreigners.

2. To establish the extent to which Congolese refugee are willing to integrate into the local community
3. To establish from the perspective of the Congolese refugee, factors that would help facilitate or enhance local integration
4. To examine the extent to which the Congolese refugees in Johannesburg feel free from physical danger.
5. To establish the extent to which they are involved or engaged in community activities.

1.5 Rationale

Integration as a durable solution for urban refugees[9] in South Africa and specifically Johannesburg has not been fully explored and this study does not claim to have fully explored urban refugee integration in Johannesburg. As the lives of urban refugees in Africa in general and indeed in South Africa in particular, remain relatively unexplored, this study makes a contribution to the study of forced migration in South Africa and on the continent. No similar studies have been carried out and as local integration is considered as a durable solution, it is therefore imperative that a study on integration of refugees be carried out. The findings of the study may be pointing the way for future research in other refugee communities or issues as the facts may be known but the research area in question may still have been under-researched (Clark & Causer1991: 164).

[9] Urban refugees refer to refugees settled or living in urban areas or cities.

Integration has been described by the UNHCR as a "process by which the refugee is assimilated into the social and economic life of a new national community" (Kuhlam, 1994: 119). Somewhere else, in addition to social and economic components of integration, the UNHCR has added the legal component to the definition of integration (UNHCR, 2002b: 2; UNHCR, 2003: 25). As it has been considered as one of the durable solutions for refugee problems, the importance of integration cannot be over emphasised. With the unending conflicts like in the Great Lakes region and humanitarian disasters that lead to the displacement of people, integration into local or host community becomes an important issue. It is important because if refugees and other forced migrants are integrated into the host community, there is less likely to be conflict and hostility erupting for scarce resources (Eyber, 2004: 74). It may also help build self- confidence and self- esteem amongst young refugees so as to be able to contribute positively in their host communities (*ibid*).

1.6 Outline of the study

This study of social integration of DRC refugees in Johannesburg is divided into seven chapters that attempt to address the question. Chapter one gives the background information and the South African context of refugees and asylum seekers. The study is also introduced in the same chapter. In chapter two the methodology used for the study is outlined. The chapter outlines or explains the strategies used during the study and the considerations thereof. Chapter three reviews the consulted literature for the study. Chapter four is the presentation of the research findings of Congolese refugee youth and adults including community leaders and the analysis thereof. In chapter five the

presentations and analysis of the research findings of research with service providers are presented. The conclusions and recommendations are contained in chapter six.

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1 Background

The study started by reading and reviewing the literature about refugee issues and refugee integration in general. It included a perusal of written material including newspaper articles that carried relevant published and unpublished articles. It was important to start with these readings as they allowed some familiarity of the subject and delimiting of the research topic (Mathias & Gale, 1991: 13). It involved primary research that was interviews with refugees from the DRC, key interviews with service providers and community leaders. Secondary research for the study involved further review of grey and other relevant literature.

From February until March 2003 refugees were asked to participate in the study by the researcher, who clearly informed them of the purpose of the study. Two social workers in the JRS office also helped in finding refugees who were willing to partake. The purpose of the study was explained to the participants by the social workers as the researcher had it explained to the latter (Ritchie et al. 2003: 93). Participants who agreed to partake were clearly reminded (before we started) of the purpose (Lewis, 2003: 66; Rees, 1991: 144) of the research and their rights as voluntary participants were explained to them. As the essence of the principle of informed consent is that human subjects of research should be allowed to agree or refuse to partake in the light of information concerning the nature and purpose of the study (Homan, 1991: 69), this process was followed to ensure that the researcher was being sensitive to their interests and rights (*ibid*).

Interviewees were interviewed at the JRS office and they were selected on their availability or willingness to participate in the study. For the selection of participants in the study, a simple random sampling technique was employed to carry out the study. Sometimes called 'convenience' (Ritchie et al, 2003; Singleton et al, 1993; Burgess, 1984; Honigmann, 1982; Maxwell, 1996), it is a type of sampling where cases are selected on the bases of their availability. It is individuals or a group of individuals who are readily available and willing to participate in the study (Henry, 1998: 105). As already interviewed participants referred a few of other interviewees, snowball sampling was therefore also used in the study. Snowball sampling is a chain referral where members of the target population refer other members of the target population who meet the criteria for the study (Singleton et al, 1993: 164).

An interview schedule was prepared for refugees who were interviewed at the JRS Offices. The schedule carried questions that were open-ended and closed –ended to be able to have a certain control in avoiding irrelevant information but at the same time[10] allowing other information that refugees would like to give for the study. As the DRC refugees are of francophone background, in some cases the researcher used the French language to clarify or explain whatever was not clear or understood by participants. A personal interview method was applied as it allows some room for flexibility and clarification of terms that are not clear etc. It also allows the interviewer to ensure that the questions are answered in the appropriate manner (Frank- Nachmias & Nachmias, 1996: 237). Some researchers have asserted that unstructured, open-ended questions allow

[10] See Appendix B and Appendix C for the questionnaires.

respondents to answer from a variety of dimensions. They furthermore argue that questions must be carefully selected and phrased in advance to elicit maximum responses by all participants. "Questions that include words such as how, why, under what conditions, and similar probes suggest to respondents that the researcher is interested in complexity and facilitating discussion" (Lewis, 2002).

Having personally worked for Jesuit Refugee Service for three years and been in contact with Congolese refugees and worked with and among them that has been for me another form of immersion into and a direct observer of, the Congolese refugees in Johannesburg. An intensive study of a specific individuals or specific context has no single way of being carried out, and a combination of methods (e.g., unstructured interviewing, direct observation) can be used (http://www.trochim.human.cornell.edu/kb ; Ritchie 2003: 38). Observation in understanding the social world is crucial as social, historical and cultural factors are important in shaping people's understanding of their world (Snape & Spencer, 2003: 7). A direct observer does not try to become a participant in the group. However, the direct observer does strive to be as unobtrusive as possible so as not to bias the observations. Second, direct observation suggests a more detached perspective that allows events, actions and experiences to be 'seen' through the eyes of the researcher often without construction on the part of those involved. The researcher is watching rather than taking part (http://www.trochim.human.cornell.edu/; Ritchie, 2003: 35).

2.2 Location

The study was carried out in Johannesburg, with the participation of refugees living in the areas like Hillbrow, Berea, Bertrams, Yeoville, Alberton, Katlehong and Parktown. The study focused on Johannesburg because the city has become a focal point for much migratory flow into South Africa (Rogerson, 1997: 1). Johannesburg, a city that experienced inner- city transition like many of its surroundings, in a rapid and multifaceted process with the most profound and visible change being the shift in racial composition of flat-dwellers (Morris, 1999: 331).[11] It has like other inner-city areas including Hillbrow, never had stability as a norm and the neighbourhood population has always been a mobile one (Morris, 1999: 290). Many of the white Zimbabweans who had fled independence and majority rule in Zimbabwe headed for Johannesburg, especially Hillbrow (Morris, 1996: 81). Johannesburg is an area that hosts many refugees and asylum- seekers and is therefore appropriate for the study as it is still the most popular destination for migrants (Electronic Mail & Guardian 1998).

2.3 Population

The research focused specifically on refugees from the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) living in Johannesburg, who have been granted refugee status[12] in South Africa. The focus was specifically on those who have been granted status because they, de jure, seem to have more rights and access to as many services as South Africans. Therefore, legally speaking, they should be treated like South Africans. In the second half of

[11] A young, urban based, relatively educated and well paid section of black population which was not representative of the ghetto poor, initiated the inward movement of black tenants into the inner-city.
[12] At the time of the study only refugees who had been granted status had among others, the right to study and take up employment in South Africa. Asylum- seekers were not allowed to study and take up employment while they were still awaiting decision on their asylum application.

the1990s the demographic shifts around Johannesburg like Hillbrow has been a substantial increase of foreign Africans, notably DRC (Morris, 1999: 307). The DRC refugees appear to be in the majority of all refugee groups in the Johannesburg area and constitute a useful population in conducting the study on integration.

2.4 Key Informants

There are a number of organisations that provide services to refugees, government (local, provincial, national), UN organisations (UNHCR, IOM), NGOs, legal practitioners and institutions etc. Some of these different service providers, viz. government personnel, NGO personnel providing for refugees' socio-economic needs, pastoral care, legal counselling and the DRC Community leaders, participated in the study.[13] When a study requires that the same information items be obtained from multiple individuals, it is desirable for the researcher to create a structured interview guide. There are also instances where a semi- structured or even unstructured interview may be appropriate. (Bickman et al., 1998: 22). An interview guide was prepared for key informants (NGO and government representatives).

A UNHCR representative, responsible for the implementation of durable solution programmes for refugees was interviewed in his office in Pretoria. As the service provider for socio- economic needs of refugees and asylum- seekers and an implementing partner of the UNHCR, the role played by Jesuit Refugee Service (JRS) in the study was a significant one. The Project Director of the JRS office in Johannesburg, a social worker

[13] See Appendix A for a list of service providers interviewed.

by profession, was also interviewed at her office. The Refugee Pastoral Centre of the Johannesburg Catholic Diocese which provides for the spiritual needs of many refugees was helpful in giving enlightenment on the role of religion in integration. A nun, originally from Congo, working with refugees, most of whom are Congolese, participated in the interview at her office in Johannesburg. The participation of Wits Law Clinic (WLC) as legal service provider for refugees and an implementing partner of UNHCR highlighted the problems that refugees face and consequently becoming impeding integration. A representative from the Law Clinic, who is an attorney specialising in refugee law and a member of the National Consortium for Refugee affairs (NCRA), participated in the interviews. The Department of Home Affairs helped in highlighting the implementation of the refuge act vis-à-vis integration. An official, who is the head of the Home Affairs (Johannesburg Refugee Reception Centre) Braamfontein, participated in the interviews.

2.5 Sampling

In order to establish as much as possible, the different dynamics that may exist in gender and age differences, men, women, school-going and non school- going youth were interviewed. To make it a total of thirty interviewees, a sample of ten adult males, ten adult females and ten (five males and five females) youth from the DRC, were selected for participation in the study. Although the sample selected was not a large one, conclusions could still be drawn as Holloway (1997) has asserted that a sample size of a qualitative study is relatively small but consists of relatively rich cases and therefore large samples are rarely selected. In-depth interviews and immersion in a culture make a

large sample size unnecessary and therefore are usually small in size (Holloway, 1997: 142; Ritchie et al. 2003: 83). There is also a point of diminishing return where a large sample is repetitive and no longer contributes to new evidence (Ritchie et al. 2003). As the sample chosen is also not representative of the DRC refugee population that is highly dominated by adult men, it is worth noting that qualitative research cannot be generalised on statistical basis (Lewis & Ritchie 2003: 269).[14] It is rather, the content of the range of views, experiences, outcomes or other phenomena studied; factors and circumstances that form and influence them that can be inferred to the researched population (*ibid*). It is therefore possible to draw conclusions from this qualitative study in relation to the parent population from which the sample has been drawn (*ibid*).

2.6 Limitations

Using JRS offices as a point of contact with refugees had a limitation of excluding refugees who are self- sufficient or who do not come to JRS for assistance. However the exercise still provided some useful insights into the plight of refugees and four of the refugees interviewed are actually employed. The four, although not much, did give a slight dynamic or variety in the information shared. The contacts with DRC community leaders did somehow address this limitation, to a certain extent but not totally. JRS' contact with different Congolese communities or groups was helpful in creating contacts with them.

[14] According to statistics from the DHA the majority of asylum- seekers and refugees from the DRC are adult men.

Although conclusions can be drawn from the sample used in this study, a representative sample for Congolese refugees would have probably been better than a less representative one. Therefore thee lack of a representative sample was somehow a limitation for this study.

2.7 Ethical Considerations

As some of the refugees interviewed were young, and in order to comply with the research ethical obligations of a request for direct consent when interviewing minors (Homan 1991: 82), social workers at the JRS office fulfilled the role of gatekeepers. The social workers had been working with these youth and played a parental role in the lives of these youth. They had a close relationship with the youth and there was a trust relationship between both parties as these social workers often acted ***in loco parentis*** in the lives of these youth. The notion that a vicarious consent by gatekeepers or parents of minors should be obtained (Homan 1991: 122) was therefore adhered to. As it maybe the cases that competence to understand and make decisions about research participation is conceptually distinct from voluntariness, these qualities become blurred in the case of certain people. Children or poorly educated, for instance may not understand their right to refuse to participate when asked by someone of apparent authority (Sieber, 1998: 131). Hence the role of gatekeepers was helpful in observing the necessary ethical considerations. As a result, 'informed' became, as Sieber (1998) has asserted, knowing what a reasonable person in the same situation would want to know before giving consent (Sieber, 1998: 131).

The interviews were carried out on a voluntary basis. Voluntary informed consent should not simply be a consent form. It should be a constant two- way communication process between research participants and the researcher, including specific agreement about the conditions of the research participation. Consent forms to ensure the confidentiality of the interview and the use of responses for strictly academic purposes were drawn for the interviewees to sign.[15] They received clear verbal and written explanations of their rights to participate or not to participate in the study at their own convenience as they please. Lastly, they were notified that they have the right to answer or not to answer any of the questions during the interviews and to even stop the interview if and when they felt like stopping.

As refugees, especially those who come to JRS for assistance, are mostly in need especially of material assistance, it was crucial to clearly explain the purpose of the study and to make it clear to them that there were no remunerations for participation in the study. Voluntary participation was attained without threat or undue inducement and the researcher urged each subject to make a decision that best serve his or her interests. Participation was not tied to other things, such as obtaining benefits of some kind, especially if participants are indigent or vulnerable to coercion (Sieber, 1998: 130; Homan, 1991: 69).

To guarantee the protection of the rights of refugees interviewed, the JRS office where the interviews were carried out, received a clear explanation of what rights do the interviewees have in agreeing to participate in the study. To ensure privacy and informed

[15] See Appendix E for the consent form.

consent Sieber (1998) suggests that the researcher specifies the kinds of things that will occur in the study. More so, the kind of information that will be sought and given, and the procedures that will be used to assure anonymity or confidentiality. The interviewee can then decide whether or not to participate under those conditions (Sieber, 1998: 139). It is also apparent that if interviewees are assured of confidentiality, they are likely to yield even more sensitive information (Homan 1991: 141). A social worker in the JRS office helped in this regard.

Participants do not share highly personal information with the researcher unless there are certain that their data will be kept from falling into wrong hands such as those who would gossip, blackmail, and take adverse personal action against the subject. The researcher must employ adequate safeguards of confidentiality. Many people, especially members of the minority populations doubt such promises unless the details are spelled out clearly. Alternatively the researcher can gather data anonymously by not gathering any unique identifiers like the participants' names, drivers' licences etc. It is crucial that the researcher undertakes to withhold all information that may help identify the interviewee (Homan, 1991: 143; Sieber, 1998: 141- 142). The study was carried out in adherence of these suggested Ethical considerations and to secure anonymity and confidentiality (Lewis, 2003: 67; Homan, 1991: 142), only first names of interviewees were asked for communication purposes and in the report they are referred to as Interviewee 1 – Interviewee 10.

3. LITERATURE REVIEW

In a report that came out of the 4th Meeting of the Global Consultations On International Protection dated 25 April 2002, local integration is defined as a process that has three inter- related and specific dimensions (UNHCR, 2002b: 2).

a) Legal Process: whereby refugees are granted a progressively wide range of rights and entitlements by the host state that are broadly commensurate with those enjoyed by its citizens.
b) Economic Process: Refugees becoming less reliant on State aid or humanitarian assistance and becoming more self- reliant and endeavouring sustainable livelihood, and subsequently contributing to the economic life of the host country.
c) Social and Cultural Process: It is a process of acclimatization by the refugees and accommodation by the local communities that enables refugees to live amongst or alongside the host population. This comes without discrimination and allows refugees to actively contribute to the social life of their country of asylum (*ibid.)*.

Jacobsen argues that refugees are de facto integrated when they are not in physical danger; are able to sustain livelihoods through access to land or employment and can support themselves and their families; are socially networked into host communities so that intermarriage is common; ceremonies like weddings and funerals are attended by everyone; and there is no distinction between refugees and hosts (Jacobsen, 2001: 15). Some Guatemalan refugee women in Mexico agreed Guatemalans could marry Mexicans if the couple got along. However most thought that Mexicans were not Guatemalans

(Dona and Berry 1999: 181) They had negative comments about Mexicans and little trust in them, but were grateful to the Mexicans for their hospitality. Furthermore there were exchange of invitations to Mexican and Guatemalan parties and participation between both nationalities in such events. They had other reciprocal benefits of such interactions that supported integration (*ibid*). Preston (1999: 25) points out that integration refers to the ability of individuals and groups to interact cohesively, overcoming differences without a breakdown of social relationships and conflict. Refugee integration is the building of a new life with dignity while becoming an independent and productive member of society being able to fend for oneself. In the process of integration, refugees increasingly participate in all levels of society and become full citizens (Yousif 2001:19).

The purpose of this study is to determine the extent to which refugees from the Democratic Republic of Congo are socially integrated in the Johannesburg area and to establish to what extent is Jacobsen's definition of integration a reality with regard to Congolese refugees in Johannesburg. Although the study is basically looking at integration from the point of view of Jacobsen, the concept of integration is a very complex and problematic one, hence the need to look at a few attempts to clarify or explain integration. Social integration refers to the way refugees relate to the social environment in the host country (Bulcha, 1988: 174). While Jacobsen has put forward her definition of integration, others have also come up with their definitions of integration. Valtonen (1994) argues that integration refers to a situation where a group interacts with larger society and also maintains its own identity. Here integration has a positive connotation as it creates a place for the adapting group's identity (Valtonen, 1994: 66).

Kuhlman (1991) has criticised the UNHCR's definition ('the process by which the refugee is assimilated into social and economic life of a new national community') as being tautological since it merely replaces the term to be defined with another word which is presumed to be its synonym (Kuhlman, 1991: 2). Harrell- Bond defines integration as a situation in which host and refugee communities co-exist and share the same the same resources (both economic and social). There is no greater mutual conflict than that exist within the host community (Harrell- Bond, 1986: 7). Therefore there is equality of opportunity, cultural diversity and mutual tolerance (Favell, 2001: 116). Kuhlman argues that this definition has the merit as it views integration as a reciprocal phenomenon. It is something happening not only to refugees but to host the community as well (Kuhlman, 1991: 3).

Kuhlman gives an ideal but rather optimistic definition of integration as the ability of refugees to participate in the host economy in ways commensurate with their skills and compatible with their cultural values; attain a standard of living (economic, housing, public utilities, health services, and education) that satisfies culturally determined minimum requirements; be able to undergo socio-cultural change while maintaining their own identity and adjust psychologically to their new situation; have their influx not deteriorating the standards of living and economic opportunities for the members of the host communities; have friction between the refugee and host community no worse than within host population itself. This he argues would be a durable solution to problems

arising from flight and we would be able to say that a durable solution has been achieved. (Kuhlman, 1991: 7).

Local integration as the second preferred durable solution proposed by the UNHCR, can however, be carried out only with the agreement of the host government. As refugee numbers have increased, local integration has "… tended to be increasingly restricted" globally (Musalo et al., 1997: 42). Some countries, particularly in Europe have been preoccupied with ensuring the "temporariness" of refugee protection and their rapid repatriation (Frelick, 2001:42). Stein (1986) argues that beside political or cultural factors leading to a decision against permanent acceptance of refugees, low- income hosts countries may be reluctant to allow refugees to remain, as there may be insufficient jobs or arable land available, not even for the local people. Therefore no durable solution can mean open- ended, expensive care and maintenance of refugees (Stein, 1986: 265).

In the developed world, where the influx of refugees is small and highly regulated, the model emphasizes modes and mechanisms of integration in areas like education and employment (Zetter 1999: 55). In Africa some refugees settle in rural areas while others face the challenge of settling in urban areas. However, Westin has argued that in Sub-Saharan Africa, the most operational solution has been integration on self-settlement basis in local communities mainly concentrated in the border areas of the first country of reception (Westin 1999: 40). Africa has been perceived as a continent that has been considerably successful in implementing local integration as a durable solution. (Slater 1988) It has been by far the most commonly adopted solution to refugee problems in

Africa. African asylum states are amongst the world's poorest states and consequently few resources are available for diversion to refugees (*ibid*). While both rural and urban refugees face the challenge of integrating, urban refugees are faced with problems like language barriers and legislation that prohibits working and lack of employment. One group that has settled in South Africa's Johannesburg city, like many other refugees from different countries, and is faced with these challenges are the Congolese from the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC).

In recent years it has become clear that some countries have become less sympathetic with little solidarity for refugees who flee independent neighbouring countries rather than imperialism. This experience coupled with the growing populations and economic problems of many low- income countries has resulted in reluctance of accepting refugees for integration and an increased predilection to view refugees as temporary settlers (Stein, 1986: 266). In his comment on the speech delivered by the Tanzanian minister of Foreign Affairs at the International Workshop on the Refugee Crisis, Rutinwa (1996a) argues that the former Tanzanian government policy was not meant to turn Tanzania into the first port of call for refugees in every political crisis, but to provide temporary relief to refugees while permanent solutions to the problem were endeavoured (Rutinwa, 1996a: 298). He further argues that the government was abandoning the "Open Door Policy" because it was not achieving what it was intended to. Instead, it was encouraging nearby countries to take Tanzania for a ride (*ibid*). Clearly this laid bare the changing attitude toward refugee support even though the problem still exists.

While on the other hand, for some countries the 'spirit' may be willing but the resources may be in short supply. Countries like Zimbabwe felt they could not share their resources (land) while the local population was starving (Mupedziswa, 1993: 142). In South Africa, despite the unending efforts of non-governmental organisations, most South Africans regard the refugees in their midst as fakes and fraudsters (Crush 2001: 20; Crush & Williams 2002: 14). However, in a survey conducted in 1999 by SAMP, South Africans interviewed, appeared to be prepared to accept that many new arrivals in South Africa were indeed genuine refugees and agreed to the proposition that refugees warrant protection (*ibid*). Although the survey illustrated positive attitudes, there is harassment (The Star 9 April 2002) and lack of support for refugees.

Having said that, it seems the question of burden sharing cannot be over- emphasised. Rutinwa (1996b) has also argued that the current situation is getting worse with donor community not being prepared to extend additional aid and their commitment to care and maintenance of refugees in host states for a long period. He argues that this scenario put refugees in a situation where they should either be repatriated or become the sole responsibility of the host government (Rutinwa, 1996b: 318). As Westin has argued the refugee problem in Africa has reached such a proportion that it needs concerted efforts of the international community, with the only realistic long term approach being to address the root causes that generates refugee flows (Westin, 1999: 31). In a speech delivered at the International Workshop on the Refugee Crisis in the Great Lakes in Arusha, the Tanzanian Minister of Foreign Affairs argued that experience had proved that measures of granting permanent refugee status were not a formula for permanent solution to the

refugee crisis. The minister emphasised the fact that the solution lied in the countries of origin rather than in the countries of asylum, which are burdened, with obligations on the refugees (Rutinwa, 1996a: 298). Jacobsen (2001) highlights the problem of resources burden, asserting that many African countries have cited the problem of limited capacity of their national economies to absorb refugees as the reason for resisting local integration (Jacobsen, 2001: 18).[16]

Hathaway sees part of the problem being the individuated state responsibility, that is refugees are solely the legal responsibility of the host state and that state's responsibility, is based on accidents of geography and that state's ability to control its borders. Therefore any assistance received from other countries or the UNHCR is a matter of charity and not of legal obligation. He argues that this is unfair, inadequate and ultimately unsustainable (Hathaway, 2001: 43). Other countries like Finland, which had a population of approximately 160, 000 in 1994, resorted to offer an annual national refugee quota of 500. However, within the country, individual municipalities' settlement activities are available and necessitate an ad hoc acceptance of municipal resettlement places as they are offered (Valtonen, 1994: 63). As Finland offers places intermittently, chances of refuges community growing to a substantial size are minimal.

For local integration to work as a durable solution, it is imperative that certain conditions be in place. Efforts to integrate refugees should be actively supported by the host government, while the local population must be willing to support refugees' long-term

[16] South African Department of Home Affairs Officials they complain of being overburdened with refugees status applications and not having enough human and technical resources to process and help the applicants (Smith 2003: 5- 6).

presence in their areas (UNHCR et al.: 75). The UNHCR argues that local integration should be envisaged in such a way that rural refugees have agricultural land available and markets, employment and income- generating activities (*ibid).* Opportunities to be fully incorporated into the new society, including opportunities to acquire citizenship with the rights that come with it, should be presented to refugees (*ibid*). Therefore similar support adapted to the needs of refugees in urban areas should be improvised. Cooperation or some form of synergy is necessary for integration to take place. This would however, need cooperation between host states, UNHCR and its implementing partners, the host community, and refugees. Although experience demonstrate this to be a rare phenomenon. How does this work, especially in Johannesburg?

In the Southern African region, local integration may be a problem as a result of several challenges. The tension that is raised by the crucial responsibility of the government to provide for citizens especially the poor ones and to meet the basic needs of refugees has placed many governments between a rock and a hard place. Geddo (2001) has pointed out that because of *inter alia,* lack of employment, education, shelter, health care and socio-economic provisions that are in short supply for the majority of citizens throughout Southern Africa render local integration a potential problem. More so when considering that they have recently become independent and national imperative to provide for citizens causes a great deal of tension when basic need for refugees are raised (Geddo, 2001: 66).

3.1 Xenophobia

South Africa has been labelled as a country of general hostility toward foreigners and it is in general xenophobic and antagonistic toward foreigners (Crush, 2001: 1; Harris, 2001: 36; Morris, 1999: 305). This statement is supported by mainstream media representations of foreigners and public actions and statements against them (Harris 2001: 36). The media exacerbates the situation with news coverage portraying refugees in negative stereo- types or being sensational and using words like "influx" or "overflow" to fuel xenophobia and false impression that there are millions of refugees in South Africa (Crush 2001: 11; Hlobo 2001: 11; Danso & McDonald 2000: 13).

Circumstances in many South African communities have been challenging to integration and that has raised some concerns from the UNHCR and the NGO community. A 21-year-old man from DRC was attacked by a group of South Africans in Pretoria because he was a foreigner and spoke a foreign language. They robbed him of his clothes and everything he had, including his refugee permit and poured acid on his body (Hlobo 2001: 10). In January 2001 residents of Du Noon, outside Cape Town declared that all African refugees must leave their area permanently. This declaration came after xenophobic attacks in that area (Independent Online, 06 January 2001).

Non- nationals have been accused of the ills of the country (Human Rights Watch, 1998: 4) and it has been alleged that many South Africans have come to believe that foreigners or non- nationals are taking jobs from them (Human Rights Committee, 2000: 11). This seems to be a common trend as it is also the case in Sudan where refugees were blamed

for causing economic shortages. They have been blamed of causing shortages in services and commodities and rapid rise in prices (Bulcha, 1988: 191). However Landau and Jacobsen (2004) report that forced migrants who were interviewed in Johannesburg and had their businesses, were creating jobs, even for South Africans (Landau & Jacobsen, 2004: 46).[17] Oyewole (2000) argues that it is important to highlight the fact that there are many black immigrants who are contributing positively to the economic, social and cultural development of South Africa. This need to be appreciated just as the fact that the negative stereotypes about all black foreigners being criminals or illegal immigrants need to be seen as being contradictory to the spirit of "African Renaissance" (Oyewole, 2000: 31). Considering that in general South Africans' attitude and stereotypes toward foreigners are not produced by direct personal experience or direct contact with non-South Africans (Mattes et al, 1999: 20), it is necessary to investigate and if need be, to challenge these perceptions. Does the amount of interaction taking place between South Africans and refugees merit this judgement or warrant these perceptions?

There are also examples of institutionalised xenophobia where agents of the State like the South African Police Service (SAPS) have victimized non- South Africans or people who appeared (according to their stereotypes) to be foreigners (The Star 14 March 2001). The police have in some instances become a law unto themselves harassing refugees, illegally arresting them and sometimes tearing their refugee documents (*ibid*; Landau & Jacobsen, 2004: 44). Government departments like Social Services and Health have also discriminated against refugees and simply made themselves inaccessible to refugees, by

[17] The study reports that 34 % (of 345) of the interviewed migrants had more than 67% South African employees, as opposed to 20% (of 392) South Africans who reported having paid someone to do work for them (Landau & Jacobsen, 2004: 46).

refusing unaccompanied minors and refugee adults into shelters because they are not South Africans. Some hospitals have refused to give medical attention to refugees and agencies like JRS had to intervene on behalf of refugees (CASE 2001: 69; Hlobo 2001: 11).

In its Global Report of the year 2000, UNHCR reported that with an unemployment rate of 40% in some urban areas of South Africa, refugees' efforts to find employment were hampered. UNHCR further observed that refugees continued to be victims of public hostility toward foreigners and to be blamed for competing with the local population for scarce resources (UNHCR, 2000: 223). Sommers (2001) asserts that for refugees in Dar es Salaam it was not easy as they lived in suspended air of tension and potential violence, which made the capital city feel dangerous. Refugees perceived themselves as potential targets of urban violence, something that Tanzanians were also worried about. This tense atmosphere, he argues, put people in the capital on the alert and it generated refugee anxieties and feelings of fear and dread. (Sommers, 2001: 118). The World Refugee Survey (2000) reported that anti-foreigner attitudes in South Africa, fuelled charges that undocumented economic migrants were abusing the asylum procedures and that UNHCR had reported 30 refugee deaths in four years as a result of attacks against foreigners by South Africans. (U.S. Committee for Refugees, 2000: 117). It is not clear as to what extent these reports are an issue, more especially with their impact on integration of refugees; hence further study was necessary to be carried out.

Amidst all these incidents of xenophobia, it is crucial to highlight the fact that some politicians, including the President Thabo Mbeki and other organisations[18] like the Congress of South African Trade Unions (COSATU), have condemned xenophobia in public. In May 2001 the President of South Africa Thabo Mbeki called all South Africans to be vigilant against any evidence of xenophobia. Mbeki asserted that it was fundamentally wrong and unacceptable that South Africans should treat people who came to South Africa as friends as though they were enemies. (Crush 2001: 1). In its media statement of 8 February 2001, COSATU criticised, unequivocally the level of xenophobia in South Africa after the South African Broadcasting Cooperation (SABC) had televised shocking incidents of xenophobia. The union expressed shock and disgust at the unacceptable level of xenophobia in South Africa (Crush, 2001: 31). It is within this climate that the UNHCR has identified local integration as a durable solution for refugees.

3.2 Legal Instruments

The 1969 OAU Convention has, apart from broadening the Refugee definition, strengthened the institution of asylum (Goodwin- Gill, 1998: 178). Article *II* of the Convention states that "Member States of the OAU shall use their best endeavours… to receive refugees and to secure settlement of those refugees who, for well- founded reasons, are unable or unwilling to return to their country of origin or nationality" (UNHCR, 1969).

[18] The ANC have also reacted in a letter on their policy on xenophobia. The letter titled "Xenophobia: Intolerance Towards Fellow Africans Must Be Tackled" appeared in ANC Today 31 August 2001.

Integration as part refugee protection strategy has come under serious challenge as a result of non-cooperation by contracting states. This may be because neither international legal instruments nor treaties oblige any state to accord durable solutions. (Goodwin-Gill, 1998: 268)

Section 232 of The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa states that "customary international law is law in the Republic unless it is inconsistent with the Constitution or Act of Parliament" (RSA 1996). It therefore notes that as South Africa had by 1996 ratified the1951 Geneva Convention and 1969 OAU Convention relating to the status of refugees, and hence these instruments are therefore obligatory in South Africa as they are not inconsistent with the Constitution. The Preamble of the Refugee Act 130 of 1998 unequivocally further asserts that in South Africa, due to the international conventions and legal human rights instruments acceded to, refugees have a right to be treated in accordance with the standards and principles established in international law (RSA, 1998). Article 12 of the Constitution talks about "everyone" having the right to freedom and security, including, the right to be free from all forms of violence from either public or private sources. It therefore renders everyone within the borders of South Africa, at least in theory, safe and free. Even though the practice may be contrary to what has been legislated. Therefore legally speaking refugees have their rights protected just as South Africans have theirs protected.

The Refugee Act, although explicitly clear about refugees having access to health care and basic primary education, it is not clear about access to social services. However, the

Refugee Act extends these rights to refugees as part of their enjoyment of full legal protection coupled with the rights in the Bill of Rights (CASE, 2001: 56). Section 27(d) and (e) of the Act entitles the refugee to an identity document and a South African travel document (RSA 1998, De la Hunt, 2002). This will enable refugees to inter *alia* to participate in banking activities and many other activities that may require an identity document. It would *de jure;* help them to travel like any other South African would. Other parts[19] of Section 27 of the Act include enjoyment of legal protection and a written recognition of refugee status (*ibid*).

The Bill of Rights in Chapter two of the South African Constitution guarantees unprecedented rights to everyone living within the boundaries of South Africa.[20] All the rights but two sets (the right to vote and the right to engage in freedom of trade, occupation and profession) are extended to everyone in the country. (Crush 2001: 17). Human Rights Committee further emphasises that these rights in Chapter Two of the Constitution or the Bill of Rights are clearly not based on nationality and only specific

[19] 27(a) A refugee is entitled to a written recognition of refugee status in the prescribed form
(b)A refugee enjoys full legal protection, which includes the rights set out in Chapter 2 of the Constitution and the right to remain in the Republic in accordance with the provisions of the Refugee Act

[20] Everyone is equal before the law and has a right to equal protection and benefit of the law; has inherent dignity and the right to have their dignity respected; has a right to life; has a right to freedom and security of the person; has a right not to be subjected to slavery, servitude and forced labour; has a right to privacy; has a right to freedom of religion, belief and opinion; has a right to freedom of expression (except propaganda of war, incitement of violence or advocacy of hatred that is based on race, ethnicity, gender, or religion and that constitutes incitement to cause harm); has the right, peacefully and unarmed, to assemble, to demonstrate, to picket and to present petitions; has the right to freedom of association; has the right to freedom of movement and residence; has the right to fair labour practices; has the right to an environment that is not harmful to their health or well-being; has a right to housing; has a right to health care, food, water, and social security; has the right to education; has the right to cultural, religious and linguistic association; has the right of access to information; has the right to just administrative action; has the right to access to courts; has the rights of arrested, detained and accused persons and no one may be deprived of property except in terms of law of general application. Only South African citizens have political rights; may not be deprived of citizenship; have the right to enter, to remain and to reside anywhere in the Republic; have the right to a passport; have the right to freedom of trade, occupation and profession.

rights are limited to South African citizens and therefore there is no fundamental distinction between citizens and non- citizens. Most of the rights in the Bill of Rights are for universal application as they are for the benefit of "everyone" (Human Rights Committee, 2001: 29).

The legal framework that exists does in theory offer protection and freedom to refugees, at least on paper. Though in practise it has been something else. Refugees have struggled to have identity documents or travel documents issued to them and consequently some have not been able to access services like bank accounts as a result of lack of these documents. This happens even though the director- general of the Department of Home Affairs had promised that by June 2001, 15 000 refugees would have received their identity documents that would enable refugees to access services (The Star, 2 May 2001). The law does not seem to be an impediment but the conditions under which the law has to be applied, seem to be a serious hindrance. One wonders if this legal framework is obsolete or it is just lack of political will to implement the law.

However, Article 34 of the 1951 Geneva Convention binds asylum state or rather "Contracting States" to facilitate the assimilation and naturalisation of refugees (UNHCR, 1951). Although being an important aspect of integration, this is generally not accepted in Africa and is not pointed out in UNHCR publications nowadays as it would not be supported by asylum states (Kuhlman, 1991: 3).

In the international legal instruments, there exist certain articles that are meant to facilitate the idea of integration of refugees into local or host communities. Article 23 of the Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees, a convention that South Africa has ratified, invokes same treatment for refugees as nationals. It uses a stronger word "shall", therefore putting into place (at least on paper) the necessary legal framework for the treatment and integration of refugees. " The Contracting States shall accord to refugees lawfully staying in their territory the same treatment with respect to public relief and assistance as is accorded to their nationals." (UNHCR, 1951). Having ratified the international legal instruments pertaining to refugees and having a Refugee Act that is explicitly clear about refugees having access to health care and basic primary education, the Act is however, not clear regarding access to social services.[21] The services are however enshrined in the Act as part of refugees' enjoyment of full legal protection and the Bill of Rights (CASE, 2001: 56). Nonetheless, the legal framework that exists does not necessarily mean that the atmosphere for integration is necessarily conducive.

The South African government policy seems to give sufficient provision for the promotion of integration. The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) EXCOM report for 1994 – 95 has referred to South Africa's asylum policies as liberal, a point supported by De la Hunt (1998). She asserts that refugees in South Africa enjoyed important rights that were not universally enjoyed. These included the right to seek employment, the right to move freely within the country, and once refugee status had been granted, the right to a travel document to facilitate travelling outside

[21] Refugee Act No. 130 of 1998

South Africa, free medical care and primary education and sometimes, social assistance (De la Hunt, 1998: 138).

However the majority of refugees interviewed by Korac in the year 2000 – 2001, in Rome, had temporary humanitarian permits granted without any lengthy determination to stay (Korac, 2002: 31). These refugees argued that it was lack of an initial reception system that forced them to become self- sufficient (*ibid*). This point is somehow supported by the study carried out by ECRE where in their findings they report that welfare states of some countries in Europe are so bureaucratic and inflexible, sometimes so generous, that their proceedings inhibit initiatives by refugees to become independent (ECRE, 1992: 83). As Muller asserts that, recognised refugees in the USA are eligible for federally sponsored assistance programmes aimed at easing their economic integration and subsequently render them to become self- sufficient. The emphasis is extensively on English language and vocational training. Refugees enrolled in these programmes and their families are also assisted financially. Regrettably, these refugee programmes are controversial in that they do encourage dependency on government and consequently delaying self- sufficiency (Muller, 1998: 41). Or are they just safety nets that refugees need in order to secure their integration into the general population?

Burundian refugees interviewed in Tanzania complained about the unfair treatment they got with regard to tax collection (Sommers, 2001: 119). They felt that their efforts to be self- sufficient and be integrated were sabotaged by the Tanzanian government. According to Sommers (2001), this is a point that Malkki (1995) cited. Tanzanian

authorities never prevented refugees from pursuing economic opportunities but made it difficult for them to do it. Refuges believed that they paid more taxes than Tanzanian citizens (Sommers, 2001: 118). Refugees felt that the yearly tax that they had to pay was the worst example of their ill treatment. The tax was too much for them and the methods of extraction were highly offensive and subsequently some were forced to risk returning home to Burundi. One refugee felt he could never be a Tanzanian because of this (Sommers, 2001:119).

How this may relate in South Africa is not clear? Lack of support, does it increase self-sufficiency or there is that need for initial support? Is lack of support delaying self-sufficiency and consequently, integration? Considering the fact that the refugees in Rome had an immediate right to work and study, something that asylum- seekers do not have on their arrival in South Africa.

A note worthy point with regard to refugees in South Africa is that refugees who have the right to work and study, still struggle to open bank accounts and to have proper identity documents (The Star, 2 May 2001). Although a very senior Home Affairs Official said that they had discussed the issue of bank accounts with banks and there would be no problems as the banks were willing to do business with refugees having the identity documents (*ibid*). He added that refugees could also enrol with educational institutions using these identity documents (*ibid*). Therefore their efforts are subsequently frustrated by lack of proper documentation. This can easily be interpreted as a strategy to frustrate refugee efforts as with the case with Burundian refugees in Tanzania.

Local integration, as Jacobsen has argued, will only work if it is accepted by host governments, the local community and refugees (Jacobsen, 2001: 40). Whether it is possible or not, especially in the current situation in South Africa, it is still a contentious question with controversies that remain to be addressed. "The promotion of local integration for refugees depends on the degree of understanding of their plight on the part of local communities and, at the very least, an acceptance of their presence. That acceptance is still rare in South Africa…" (UNHCR, 2000: 223). It is also imperative that this acceptance becomes more than a legal promulgation as Mupedziswa (1993) asserted that for successful integration to take place there is a need for cooperation of local community, the leadership from both refugees and local community, and the government (Mupedziswa, 1993: 140). It would be desirable, at least in theory, to develop ways in which the local population and refugees could be part of the process. NGOs and the UN agencies have rhetorically supported this notion. Unfortunately it is not easy to make it work, even where government agencies are supportive (Gorman, 1987: 129). It is not clear to what extent the conditions implied in this assertion are known or have been proven to exist in the case of South Africa. It would be useful to determine if they do exist and whether they can be attained so that successful integration could be attained, that is if indeed it is a feasible durable solution.

In Johannesburg for an example, some refugees and other migrants have indeed managed to create jobs for locals or indigenous South Africans but they have not yet been generally perceived as contributing to the development of the economy of South Africa.

Immigrants are still viewed as a burden to the strained economy and taking jobs from South Africans. In a study carried out with immigrant and refugee entrepreneurs, Rogerson (1997) found that many of these entrepreneurs did create jobs or employ for South Africans. Even though they employed South Africans after they had employed one or two non- South Africans before (Rogerson, 1997: 15). This is one of the many examples that refugee advocate could use to persuade the government that refugees are not necessarily a burden and a threat. As Jacobsen has argued that serious efforts should be made to determine the real effects of local integration and to verify to the host government that local integration can benefit both refugees and host communities, consequently rendering the government to cooperate in assisting refugees (Jacobsen, 2001: 34).

A number of studies have been carried out on the plight of refugees in Johannesburg. Majodina and Peberdy (2000) carried out a study of the Somali community in Johannesburg in which the aim was to provide information about the extent to which the Somali community had fitted in South African Society. The study focused on the demographic, economic, housing and psycho- social conditions of the Somali community (Majodina and Peberdy, 2000: 7). The interaction with the local community or the willingness thereof, including integration, were never comprehensively investigated and therefore leaving a crucial gap in terms of addressing the issues of integration. Timngum (2001) in his study of the Cameroonian urban refugees in Johannesburg investigated the socio- economic profiles of this community. He looked at the history of their migration and demographics together with their housing profiles. He also investigated their access

to social services (Timngum, 2001: 5). However, in their 2003 survey, CASE does briefly look into the interaction of refugees with local communities. Although the study looks into the interactions between the refugees and the host communities, it does not report on the quality of the interaction.

The studies, although focusing on the experiences, did not specifically concentrate on the issue of integration and its possibility in South Africa. Questions of human relations between the two refugee communities and the local communities were not substantially explored, and that is what this study looks into. In any event, the studies have shown that there may be differences based on country of origin. Hence the Somalis and the Cameroonians have been studied, while the Congolese have not. It was therefore pertinent that the Congolese in Johannesburg be the subject of a separate study.

One of the objectives of this study is to look at the factors that influence integration. Before looking at how refugees perceive them, it would be necessary to look at what has been argued to influence or affect integration. There are four groups of factors that determine the general migration process: the origin related or push factors, destination related or pull factors, personal factors and intervening obstacles or factors such as cost and difficulties of transport (Kuhlman, 1991: 8). Wijbrandi suggests four groups of factors determining integration: characteristics of the conflicts in the country of origin, characteristics of the country of first asylum, characteristics of the refugee population and characteristics of the type of assistance given to refugees (Wijbrandi quoted in Kuhlman, 1991: 10). However, Kuhlman does not agree with the importance awarded to the way

unwarranted importance given to refugee assistance. He argues that it is certainly less important than the refugee policy followed by the host government (*ibid*).

The type of community or society where social integration is to place is also a crucial factor that will encourage or discourage social integration. As it is in the European continent, according to a study carried out by the European Council on Refugees and Exiles (ECRE), Belgium, Luxembourg seem to be the leading countries that are seemingly making refugees feel socially accepted and being able to adjust and integrate at different levels irrespective of the labour markets difficulties (ECRE, 1992: 83). Situational factors that concern the background of refugees influence their integration into host society. Heterogeneous societies more than the homogeneous societies, are more open, accommodative to differences, interaction and accommodation (Bulcha, 1988: 175). Although in both heterogeneous and homogeneous societies foreigners are often blamed for social and economic problems, more so if they are large in number (*ibid*). In some instances, however, we have seen exaggerated numbers used to incite the public and create these false perceptions. However it is not only the host community's factors that determine social integration. The refugees themselves, their social and cultural backgrounds equally determine social integration. Refugees coming from a homogeneous background may experience difficulties in a heterogeneous society (*ibid*). As Congolese come from a heterogeneous society, and are living in another heterogeneous society in Johannesburg, it is will be necessary to see how this community is faring.

One can easily argue that social integration is affected, whether positively or negatively, by several factors. Be it the type of host may community or refugee community; economic or social factors; et cetera. However, it seems that when there is no lack of resources or competition thereof, the host community appreciate the presence of refugees and they can then be perceived as valuable community members. For instance, in Kanongesha, a Zambian village that has self- settled Angolan refugees, refugees were perceived as asserts to the community (Bakewell, 2000: 362). Bakewell asserts that refugees in this area are not referred to as refugees and they live completely intermingled with the host community. Intermarriage is common and it is entered into with no consideration of the spouse's potential refugee background. Even when they arrived in the beginning, friendships did not respect any distinction between refugee and non-refugee. Ceremonies such as circumcision, funerals and weddings were subsequently attended by all, irrespective of their origin (*ibid*). A question that could be raised is why there seem to be a lack of or little tension with regard to local integration in the rural areas or villages as opposed to the urban areas and cities. Local Tanzanian villagers' reaction to those seeking protection and refuge manifested genuine solidarity and support (Westin, 1999: 28). Whereas in a study carried out by Sommers (2001) on Burundian refugees in the capital of Tanzania there seemed to be no trust and support for the refugees. It is a phenomenon quite familiar in urban areas especially big cities.

Social integration and interaction with the host community seem to be taking place or initiated in places like schools and work. Vietnamese refugees in Turku, city of Finland, were found to have very limited interaction with Finnish host community. There was a

strong intra- group interaction and secondary contacts with Finns occurred in work places and schools. Difficulties of language and communication and lack of opportunities to meet rather than desire to be separate or apart were reasons for this phenomenon (Valtonen, 1994: 76). The personality of a refugee plays an important role in the strategies adopted for integration. Some refugees they are good social strategists and their personalities enable them to reach out to others, be optimistic and able to adjust even if they have been traumatised or have been through traumatic experiences (ECRE, 1992: 65).

Although there may be opportunities to interact and adapt to the host environment, it is not always the case that refugees would want or prefer to interact with the local population. In some instances they would rather interact with people of their culture or of the same origin or compatriots. A study carried out on Vietnamese refugees resettled in Norway, it illustrated the complex interplay of background, cultural and social factors that influence resettlement and adaptation (Valtonen, 1994: 67). The study points out that interaction of these refugees with Norwegians do not compensate for loss of family and friends and therefore the more preferred or real source of personnel network building is compatriots (*ibid*). A study on Hillbrow by Morris (1999) show that francophone Africans were drawn together because they had common language, shared nationality or even culture (Morris, 1999: 305). As a result many found it difficult to interact with South Africans (*ibid*). However Bulcha (1988) argues that the loss, break-up of kinship ties, friendship etc. as a result of being uprooted, is ameliorated by re- establishing personal relations in the host surroundings. He further quotes Stone's argument that the

development or non- development of friendship with the members of the host community is a crucial element in the social integration of immigrants (Bulcha, 1988: 174). Refugees can learn about the new community only by entering into relationships with members of the host community. These interpersonal relationships become the basis for the development of common values coupled with recognition and pursuit of common interests (*ibid).*

In the process of integration or lack of it, many refugee rights are being violated or not observed. In many cases it is states that have signed all these conventions and or agreements that should be protecting or propagating refugee rights. Hathaway (2001) has argued that the Refugee Convention does not compel permanent admission but protection during the time when it is unsafe in the country of origin. "Critically, the Refugee Convention imposes no obligation to grant permanent admission, but rather requires only protection against refoulment and protection of basic human rights for the duration of the risk in the refugee's country of origin" (Hathaway, 2001: 42). Though domestic policies of many states have equated recognition as a refugee with the right to permanent residence, he argues that it was not because of the international legal obligation but in the interest of the receiving states (*ibid*).

In his critique of the work of Hathaway, Frelick (2001) observes that the 1951 UNHCR Convention enumerates a series of rights due to refugees, arguing further that these

rights[22] facilitate refugee integration into host communities or societies. Frelick argues further that the purpose is made explicit in article 34, which uses a strong word "shall" rather than "may" (Frelick, 2001: 45) when referring to facilitating the assimilation and naturalization of refugees.

However, Hathaway (2001) argues that refugees were permanently integrated in the North because of acute shortage of labour during the post- war period and the Cold War ideological "brownie points" by enfranchisement of "enemies of one's enemies". While during the apartheid era, in Africa, it was political solidarity and the ethnic ties that existed across colonially imposed borders that led to assimilation of refugees (Hathaway, 2001: 42).

Despite the 1969 OAU Convention, in a unprecedented and shocking move in 1995, Tanzania, that had been hitherto, the most faithful and adherent of a generous "open door policy" decided to abandon its policy. Rutinwa (1996a) asserts that it was a decision that caused both international and domestic uproar, with the international community accusing Tanzania of contravening its obligations under the 1951 Geneva Convention and the 1969 OAU Convention. Despite efforts by the UNHCR to appeal with the government to open its borders to refugees, the government beefed up its border patrols by sending troops to its frontier with Rwanda and Burundi to enforce its decision (Rutinwa, 1996a: 296).

[22] Art. 3, non-discrimination; Art. 4, freedom of religion; Art.13 & 14, property rights; Art.16, access to courts; Art. 17- 19, employment; Art. 21, housing; Art. 22, education; Art. 23, welfare; Art.26, freedom of movement; Art. 30, transfer of assets.

Although many factors may have influenced the Tanzanian government to take such a drastic step, it still raises many brows for a government to decide to reverse a long-standing State's practice. More so, if it is affecting many lives or threatening them, especially by sending them back to where they will potentially face danger. If a host country like Tanzania with its long-standing reputation of refugee reception can do this, then integration is clearly under serious challenge. At least in Tanzania! This *refoulement* leaves a certain amount of insecurity that refugees will be living with. As Rutinwa (1996a) argues that one of the reasons why there was this change of policy is because of the then impending elections. As a result of the impact that refugee inflow into Tanzania had, the attitude of the people was hostile to refugees. Politicians were aware of the mood and they promised to send all refugees back. The ruling party did indeed do that as it had the advantage of being in power (Rutinwa, 1996a: 299). As MacDonald has asserted, that the political elite are primarily concerned with the impact of issues on the voting public whereby political will is directed towards putting a good face of the government actions and its effectiveness (MacDonald, 2001: 125).

Looking at Jacobsen's assertion about integration, there seems to be a need for a study that can look at these issues in South Africa, more so in Johannesburg. There is no literature that has covered the areas that she talks about when addressing the issue of integration. The study looks at those social issues that Jacobsen has asserted as ideal for local integration. The literature highlights the problem of burden sharing and lack of commitment to international obligations by many member states. Consequently poor countries have to bear the burden alone or with very little cooperation from the

international community. As it was the case with Tanzania, this then forces countries to change their attitude toward refugee protection and support. It is somehow clear that it is not only support from the government that can help refugees to be self- sufficient and integrate into the host community. As it was the case with refugees in Rome who managed to become self-sufficient without the assistance of the government. What are the factors helping?

4. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF STUDY FINDINGS: PERCEPTIONS AND EXPERIENCES OF CONGOLESE REFUGEES

The interviewees reported here below were carried out with the total promise of confidentiality and responses to questions asked are not to be written out with reference to the interviewees' names. During the study, in addition to the refugees interviewed, four community leaders participated in the study. Due to unsuccessful efforts to get some female leaders, the study ended up with only male community leaders. They are leaders of The Congolese Refugees in Johannesburg, Preparation Centre for the Integration of Refugees, and two Pastors from two different churches regarded as community leaders.

4.1 Demographics of the study

The Congolese youth interviewed were five males and five females aged between 17 and 19 years old. Five of them are originally from Lubumbashi. Two of them come from the Katanga area. Another two came from Mbuju- Mayi and lastly, one from South Kivu. All of them have therefore come from urban areas of DRC. In Johannesburg, four are living in Berea; four are living in Hillbrow; one is living in Parktown while one is living in Katlehong Township in the East Rand. Their duration or stay in South Africa varies from eighteen months to four years. All but one are learners in high schools in Johannesburg.

Table 1: Information about Congolese Refugee Youth

Respondent	Gender	Age	Origin	Duration in SA	Residence in JHB	School
1	Female	18 years	Katanga (Urban)	18 Months	Berea	Yes
2	Female	19 years	Lubumbashi (Urban)	2 years	Hillbrow	No
3	Female	17 years	Lubumbashi (Urban)	3 years	Berea	Yes
4	Female	18 years	Lubumbashi (Urban)	3 years	Hillbrow	Yes
5	Female	18 years	Mbuju-Mayi (Urban)	20 months	Berea	Yes
6	Male	18 years	Lubumbashi (Urban)	3 years	Hillbrow	Yes
7	Male	17 years	South-Kivu (Urban)	2 years	Katlehong Township	Yes
8	Male	17 years	Mbuji-Mayi (Urban)	2 years	Hillbrow	Yes
9	Male	17 years	Lubumbashi (Urban)	4 years	Parktown	Yes
10	Male	18 years	Katanga (Urban)	2 years	Berea	Yes

The ten women who participated in the study were between the age of thirty and fifty-five years old. All were married. Six had tertiary qualifications or were in tertiary education when they left DRC for South Africa. Four had only secondary or high school qualifications. Four came from Kinshasa, four from Lubumbashi, one from Kisangani and one from Mbuji- Mayi. Two had just been in South Africa for one year; one for three years; three for four years; one for seven years and three for eight years. In Johannesburg, five lived in Berea; two lived in Yeoville; one in Steeldale; one in Bellevue East and one in Roseternville. Seven were not employed; two were self-employed and only one was employed.

Table 2: Information about Congolese Refugee Women

Respondent	**Education Level**	**Age** Yrs.	**Origin**	**Duration in SA**	**JHB Residence**	**Marital Status**	**Employment in JHB**
1	Tertiary	35-40	Mbuji-Mayi (Urban)	4 years	Steeldale	Married	No
2	High School	30-35	Lubumbashi (Urban)	8 years	Yeoville	Married	No
3	High School	30-35	Kinshasa (Urban)	4 years	Berea	Married	No
4	Tertiary	30-35	Lubumbashi (Urban)	3 years	Yeoville	Married	No
5	High School	30-35	Lubumbashi (Urban)	7 years	Bellevue East	Married	No
6	Tertiary	40-45	Kinshasa (Urban)	4 years	Berea	Single	Yes
7	High School	40-45	Kinshasa (Urban)	8 years	Berea	Married	Self-employed
8	Tertiary	40-45	Lubumbashi (Urban)	8 years	Berea	Married	Self- employed
9	Tertiary	40-45	Kinshasa (Urban)	1 year	Rosetenville	Married	No
10	Tertiary	50-55	Kisangani (Urban)	1 years	Berea	Married	No

The ten Congolese refugee men who participated in the study were between the age of thirty and sixty years old. All but one, were married. All of them had tertiary qualifications or were in tertiary education when they left DRC for South Africa. One came from Kinshasa; five from Lubumbashi; one from Kisangani and one from Bukavu; one from Kalemi and one from Katanga. One had just been in South Africa for one year; one for eighteen months; two for two years; one for three years; one for four years; three for six years and one for eight years. In Johannesburg, five lived in Berea; one lived in Yeoville; one in Betrams; one in Bellevue East; one in Malvern and one in Bez Valley. Six were not employed; three were employed and only one was self- employed.

Table 3: Information about Congolese Refugee Men

Respondent	Education Level	Age Yrs.	Origin	Duration in SA	JHB Residence	Marital Status	Employment in JHB
1	Tertiary	30-35	Katanga (Urban)	6 years	Bez Valley	Single	Yes
2	Tertiary	55-60	Kisangani (Urban)	1 year	Berea	Married	No
3	Tertiary	30-35	Lubumbashi (Urban)	2 years	Berea	Married	No
4	Tertiary	25-30	Lubumbashi (Urban)	1 ½ years	Yeoville	Married	Self- employed
5	Tertiary	45-50	Kinshasa (Urban)	3 years	Berea	Married	No
6	Tertiary	40-45	Lubumbashi (Urban)	8 years	Berea	Married	No
7	Tertiary	45-50	Kalemi (Urban)	6 years	Malvern	Married	No
8	Tertiary	35-40	Lubumbashi (Urban)	4 years	Berea	Married	Yes
9	Tertiary	30-35	Lubumbashi (Urban)	2 years	Betrams	Married	No
10	Tertiary	30-35	Bukavu (Urban)	6 years	Bellevue East	Married	Yes

As mentioned above, all four community leaders are males between thirty and fifty years. Two are originally from Lubumbashi, one from Uvira and one from Kalemi, all urban areas of DRC and have been living in Johannesburg between two and seven years. All four are married and had tertiary qualifications before arriving in South Africa, but only two are employed in Johannesburg.

4.2 Interaction With South Africans

Eight of the youth interviewed said they had South African friends while one said his best friend was a South African and only one had no South African friend. Of the eight that had South African friends, only one had met her South African friends at her church. The others met their South African friends in school. Though six others had South African friends at their different churches, friendships with South Africans seem to have been

started in school. The reasons for choosing South Africans as their friends varied and they were:

> "Because they are in my church"
> "I like them"
> "Their behaviour towards me is that of care"
> "I'm just open to anyone who is happy with me"
> "They are nice to me".

Eight of them interacted mostly in school with their South African friends. Though some interaction happened in church, it seemed to be formal as it was for prayer meetings, evangelisation, and choir practices. Therefore, it was not necessarily to socialise but to carry out church activities. Only two mentioned sports activities and or entertainment activities as part of activities done with South African friends.

Eight of the youth had at least once been to visit South African homes for social visits and three of them were doing it regularly. For one, visits to South African homes were only for church activities like evangelisations and not to see friends, while one had never visited a South African home. Those who visited South African homes said the parents of their friends were welcoming and very nice to them. Only one felt that some parents looked unhappy when he came to visit his friend.

Of the ten youth, seven spoke Swahili or French as a medium of communication at home. One of whom said that her parents wanted her to speak more English. The other three spoke English at home. When asked which South African language they speak, only one, mentioned English as a South African language. Zulu seemed to be the most spoken language as it has many similar words as their local language and it seemed to be the

closest language to their own. Seven said they spoke Zulu or were just able to communicate in Zulu while one understood it and the other one was learning.

Table 4: Interaction of Congolese Refugee Youth with South Africans

Respondent	SA Language	SA Friends	What do you do together?	When/Where there's Interaction?	Visit SA Homes
1	Zulu	Yes	Church Activities	Only at Church	For Church Activities
2	No	No	N/A	N/A	N/A
3	Zulu	Yes	Chatting	School, Church	Yes
4	Zulu	Yes	Chat, Home-works	School & Home	Regularly
5	Zulu	Yes	Home-works	School, Church	Once
6	Learning Zulu	Best Friend	Sport & Home-works	School, Sports, Church	Regularly
7	Understand Zulu	Yes	Sport, Entertainment	School, Sport, Home	Regularly (Katlehong)
8	English, Little Zulu	Yes	Playing, Chatting	Parks, School, Church	Sometimes
9	Zulu	Yes	Share together	School, Church	Yes
10	Little Zulu	Yes	Playing, Hanging around	School, Church	Yes

Half of the women only spoke English as a South African language. One of the five said she also spoke little Zulu, while another one wanted to learn Sesotho. Two spoke little Zulu while two others said they spoke no South African language. Only one said she spoke Zulu fluently. Seven of the women interviewed said they had South African friends. Two had acquaintances and only one had no South African friends. Four of those who had South African friends met them as neighbours and two also mentioned church. Two said they had made friends through their children's friends. One had made friends through her brother in-law, one had met them at work or as customers; one met them at a church prayer group.

All of the interviewed women were interacting with South Africans everyday. Although only two had mentioned meeting South African friends at church, there seem to be more interaction going on at church than anywhere else. Six of the interviewed women said they primarily interacted with South Africans at church. One mentioned shopping and visiting each other; one mentioned just greetings and talking as acquaintances; one was interacting with South Africans as neighbours and one just interacted with them on the streets. Other frequent interactions mentioned were customers, through children and relations. Five had been or were regularly going to South African social events like parties, weddings and funerals, while the other half had never been.

Table 5: Interaction of Congolese Refugee Women with South Africans

Respondent	**SA Language**	**SA Friends**	**How did you meet?**	**Frequent Interaction**	**Kinds of Interaction**	**Attendance of Social Events**
1	English, wants to learn Sotho	Yes	Husband's patients, children's school	Everyday	Shopping together, visiting each other	Birthday parties, Funerals
2	English	Yes	Neighbours, Church	Everyday	Chatting as neighbours, Church	No
3	English	Not Friends, acquaintance	Neighbours, Church	Everyday	Talking, Greetings	No
4	No	Yes	Prayer Group	Everyday	Customers, Church	No
5	English	Yes	In-Laws of brother	Everyday	Church, In-laws, Street	Sometimes
6	Little Zulu	Yes	Work, customers	Everyday	Customers (Designer), Church	Many times
7	English, Little Zulu	Yes	Neighbours	Everyday	Neighbours	Many funerals
8	Little Zulu	Yes	Family of son's friend	Everyday	Church, through their children	Many
9	Zulu	Acquaintances	Neighbours	Everyday	Chat, Church	Never been invited
10	No	No	N/A	Everyday	Street	No

Four of the male adults said they spoke little Zulu, one said he understood Zulu and Xhosa but could not speak any of them. Three mentioned English and only two said they could not speak any South African language. The majority of the male adults had South African friends, one had only acquaintances and two had no South African friends. Four of those who had South African friends had met their South African friends at their wok place, they had also met some as neighbours, through studies and one of them mentioned social events that he had attended. Two had met their South African friends at church. One had met them as neighbours and through studies and one met his South African friends while they were looking for employment.

Eight of the interviewees said they interacted with South Africans everyday. One said he often interacted with South Africans and one said he does not. Kinds of interactions varied, but five did mention interaction with South Africans at their churches. The other kinds of interaction included business, phoning each other, drinking together and visiting, studying, entertainment. One said he was living with a South African. Four said they often went to South African social events. Four had not been to any South African social event, one said he sometimes went and one only went to football matches.

Table 6: Interaction of Congolese Refugee Men with South Africans

Respondent	SA Language	SA Friends	How did you meet them	Frequent Interaction	Kinds of Interaction	Attendance of Social Events
1	Little Zulu	Yes	Work	Everyday	Work	Often
2	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	N/A	NO
3	Little Zulu	Yes	Seeking Employment	Everyday (Neighbours)	Phoning each other	NO
4	Little Zulu	NO	N/A	Everyday in the streets	Business, Church	Only for Football
5	English	Acquaintance	Church	Often	Church Activities	NO
6	Understand Zulu& Xhosa	Yes	Work, Neighbours	Everyday	Drinking, Visiting each other	Often
7	English	Yes	Neighbours, College	Everyday	Living with South African	NO
8	No	Yes	Work, Neighbours	Everyday	Church, Neighbours	Often
9	Little Zulu	Yes	Church	Everyday	Church Activities	Sometimes
10	English	Yes	University, Work, Social Events	Everyday	Studies, Work, Church, Go out together	Often

Although three of the four community leaders said they do not speak any South African language, in fact they spoke good English and all had South African friends that they met through their employment, church and as neighbours. However, they expressed the desire of learning an African language. One tells a story of a South African who would not buy from him because he did not speak Zulu. They interact everyday with South Africans on professional, private and church activities. Only one had just church interactions with South Africans. All three but one had been to several South African social events and one who is a Pastor does conduct some funerals for South Africans.

4.4 Attitudes Towards Government

The majority of the women think that South African leaders do not support integration. Only three seem to think that the South African leaders are supporting integration. Three

of the women think that South Africans know the problem of Congolese and why they are South Africa. Four thought they did not know and understand the Congolese problem; and three thought some do and some do not know or understand the Congolese situation. Five of the male adults thought that South African leaders were not promoting or supporting acceptance or integration. Three thought they were supporting while one thought it was not enough. Only one thought some were supporting and some were not. Six thought that South Africans knew and understood Congolese problems and their reasons for being in South Africa, three thought some did know but not all. Only one said they do not know.

Interestingly, four of the women had their refugee status granted in less than a year (one in three months, two in six months and one in nine months). Two waited for five years before receiving refugee status, and four had to wait for two years. Only two found the application process to be simple; three found it to be fine; one found it to be problematic; one found it to be fair; two found it to be difficult and one of the two said it was also long and only one found it to be easy. The majority of the women do not think that the refugee status is helpful for them to access services. Two think it is helpful only for hospitals and the ability to apply for an ID book or a Passport but it is not helpful because one cannot use it for bank accounts or has not changed their state of living. Two think their refugee status is helpful.

When asked if they found the DHA helpful, almost all said they definitely do not find DHA helpful. One said she found it helpful because after some time she got her status,

but at the same time it was not helpful because of the corruption (bribery). Nine do not think that the government and municipalities are helping refugees integrate into local communities. One said yes they do because she can exhibit and sell her art wherever. They further complained about corruption at Home Affairs, having to pay to get effective and fast service, the delays, and the prohibition to study and work while on an Asylum-seeker's permit (Section 22).

Table 7: Attitude of Congolese Refugee Women towards Government

Respondent	**Duration for refugee Status**	**Application Process**	**Refugee status Helpful**	**DHA Helpful**	**Government support for integration**	**Further comments**
1	2 yrs.	Simple	No	No	No	Corruption
2	5 yrs.	Long & Difficult	No	No	No	Stop Delays
3	2 yrs.	Difficult	No	No	No	Long
4	3 Months	Easy	Yes	No	No	Proper ID
5	2 yrs.	Fine	Yes/ No	No	No	Corruption
6	2 yrs.	Problematic	Yes	No	No	
7	6 Months	Fair	No	No	No	Changed
8	5 yrs.	Simple	Yes/ No	Yes/ No	Yes	-
9	9 Months	Fine	No	No	No	Section 22
10	6 Months	Fine	No	No	No	Corruption

Only two of the male adults managed to get their refugee status granted in less than a year (One month and six months respectively). Two were granted status in one year; one was granted in one year four months; two were granted in two years; one was granted in two and a half years; one in three years and one in six years. Four found the application process to be fair, but two also added complex and long. Two found the process to be easy and simple, respectively. Two found it to be difficult and complicated. One found it to be corrupt and one other found it to be easy. The majority of men do not find the refugee status to be helpful for accessing services, while one found it to be helpful

sometimes (only for access to hospitals and schools) and sometimes (other services) not. Only two found the status to be helpful for them.

Most of the male adults think that the DHA is not helpful and only two think that the promise of an ID book is helpful, even though they do not have IDs. However they find DHA not to be helpful because it has not kept its promise of issuing identity documents. Eight of the men did not perceive the government to be supporting integration, while one was not sure and one said the government was supporting integration. The men further complained about poor service that Home Affairs was rendering; the process was long, not clear for others and too corrupt; there is also a need to improve the conditions at Home Affairs.

Table 8: Attitude of Congolese Refugee Men toward the government

Respondent	**Duration for refugee Status**	**Application Process**	**Refugee Status Helpful**	**DHA Helpful**	**Government support for integration**	**Further Comments**
1	2 yrs.	Complicated & Slow	No	No	No	Slow Process
2	1 Month	Fair	Yes	No	No	Poor Service
3	2 yrs	Corrupt	No	No	No	Not Clear
4	1 yr.	Problematic	No	Yes/ No	No	Corruption
5	1 yr.	Difficult and long	No	No	No	Improve conditions
6	6 yrs	Fair & long	Yes	Yes/No	No	Process too long
7	3 yrs.	Fair	No	No	Yes	Corruption
8	2½ yrs.	Simple	No	No	No	Process Long & Slow
9	6 Months	Easy	No	No	Not Sure	Too much Corruption
10	16 months	Fair but complex	Yes & No	No	Not at all	Corruption, Delays

Two of the leaders had to wait for three years, one for two years and one for one year to be granted refugee status. They found the application process to be long, slow and problematic with a lot of corruption going on. The DHA was seen to be unfair in their

holding of telling people to leave the country a long time after they had already lived in South Africa and had developed some survival mechanisms. One said that the officials were unwilling to give information and there was no one available to ask for information. None of them found their refugee status helpful as they could not open bank accounts and many employers do not trust refugee status documentation as a form of identification. It is also a problem because employers do not know what to do when the status expires. They also did not find the DHA cooperative or helpful, since it had not issued the identity documents (ID) it had promised.

> "Most services require an ID which I do not have. So Home Affairs is not helpful because I do not have an ID. Even some police who do not know the refugee permit want an ID" Refugee leader.

One found the department's filing system to be poor and many people have had their files lost.

> "There is too much corruption. Home Affairs officials do not respect for people and they loose too many files. I wonder how much money does the state lose because of these lost files by the inefficiency of Home Affairs officials" Refugee leader.

One thought it would be helpful if the identity document could be issued at the same time as the refugee permit. Thus only one of three found the government to be supporting integration or helping refugees integrate into South Africa.

> "There are no activities for both refugees and citizens together. Only Flea Markets but the priority is money. Only NGOs but not government have tried"
> "Anything that involves the state is of no use. I tried to laise with the police to help when refugees are in trouble, but all in vain".

4.5 Xenophobia

Only three of the ten interviewed refugee youth had never been victimised or treated badly because they are not South Africans. The other seven had been, one by the Department of Home Affairs official and one had been arrested even when he had his valid refugee document.

Nine of these youth did not feel safe in Johannesburg. One of the nine felt unsafe because she did not live with her parents. The other eight, like any other South African, were living in fear because of the rampant crime in Johannesburg and not because they were not South Africans. The tenth said she did live in fear of xenophobic attacks or victimisation.

When asked again if they felt that South Africans have accepted refugees, six said some have and some have not. Two said yes they have and two said sometimes they do and sometimes they don't. This illustrated a certain change from the same question asked above (Attitude toward South Africans), where seven of the youth felt accepted by South Africans, one felt few South Africans had accepted refugees. The ninth one felt he was sometimes accepted and sometimes he felt unaccepted. The tenth felt that South Africans did not accept refugees.

On the question of bad treatment experienced from South Africans, one said that the lack of trust that she had experienced while looking for weekend or part time employment made her feel bad. Three felt bad when they are called "makwerekwere" (a derogatory

term used to refer to black African immigrants), while one could not stand being mocked as a foreigner. Three had experienced the general bad treatment that they did not specify. One mentioned being insulted and only one did not have any experience of bad treatment.

Table 9: Xenophobic Experiences of Congolese Refugee Youth

Respondent	Victimised/ Attacked	Live in Fear	Acceptance by South African	Bad Treatment
1	No	Crime	Some	Lack of trust
2	No	No Parents	Some	No
3	Yes	Crime	Sometimes	Insulted
4	Yes	Yes	Yes	Kwerekwere
5	Yes. DHA	Crime	Yes	Kwerekwere
6	Yes	Crime	Some	Mocked
7	Yes. Arrested	Crime	Some	Yes
8	Yes	Crime	Some	Yes
9	Yes	Crime	Sometimes	Yes
10	No	Crime	Some	Kwerekwere

Four of the women interviewed have been harassed or treated badly by the SAPS, three of which had also had bad experience with civilians, refused physiotherapy by officials in hospitals and maltreated by DHA officials. One was chased away and stopped from selling her goods because she is a “kwerekwere”. One also had bad treatment from DHA; one from civilians; one from criminals, one from DHA and only one had never experienced any xenophobic victimisation. Six said they live in fear of general crime, while one said she lives in fear and does not feel free from danger as a refugee. One said she fears the police, another one was scared to speak lest she be detected that she is not South African and only one feared nothing.

Four said they had had a bad experience with the Police; one found them rude and was harassed; three had no experience with the Police and two had a good experience with the Police. Four had bad experiences with civilians, two of whom were being called

Makwerekwere and the other one was with hawkers. Three thought civilians were fine; one had no experience with civilians one had good friends and only one said she feared civilians.

Table 10: Xenophobic Experiences of Congolese Refugee Women

Respondent	Victimised By	Live in Fear	Experience with Police	Experience with Civilians
1	Hospital & Hawkers	Yes	Good	Bad (Hawkers)
2	Police, DHA & Civilians	Yes. Crime	Bad	Kwerekwere
3	No	Crime	No	No
4	Criminals	Crime	Fine	Fear
5	Civilians	Crime	None	Friends
6	DHA	Police	Bad	Bad
7	DHA & Civilians	Nothing	No	Fine
8	Police & Civilians	Crime	Rude & Harassing	Kwerekwere
9	Hospital, Police	Crime	Bad	Fine
10	Police	To speak	Bad	Fine

Three of the men said they had been treated badly by the Police and one of the three had also had bad treatment from a hospital. Two had been treated badly at Home Affairs; one had been victimised by both Home Affairs officials and the Police; two had never had any bad treatment; one by both the Police and hospital and only one had not had any bad treatment. Four said they were living in fear and one included crime. Four said they only feared crime and one included the Police. One said he fears civilians and only one not have any fear.

Five of the men did not have any experience with the Police while four had a bad experience and one had a good experience with the Police. Five had a bad experience

with civilians and for two it included being called Kwerekwere. Three did not have any bad experience; one was robbed and one felt vulnerable.

Table 11: Xenophobic Experiences of Congolese Refugee Men

Respondent	Victimised by	Live in Fear	Experience with Police	Experience with Civilians
1	Hospital	Yes	No	Bad
2	No	Crime	No	No
3	Police	Crime & Police	Bad	Robbed
4	Civilian	Crime	No	Bad
5	Police	Police & Crime	Bad	Bad
6	Police & Hospital	Yes & Crime	Bad	Kwerekwere
7	DHA	No	No	No
8	DHA	Civilians	Good	Vulnerable
9	No	Yes	No	Kwerekwere
10	Yes	Yes	Bad	No

Of the four leaders, three had been victimised, treated badly or even intimidated by DHA officials. One of the three complained of having lost two opportunities of being involved in exchange programmes as a result of the attitude of DHA and its incompetence. All four have been treated badly by South African outside the administration.[23] Three of them live in fear of being victimised or attacked as non South Africans and only one did not share this fear.

> "I feel free and have no fear because I know my rights as a refugee" Refugee leader

Only one had had interaction with the police and thinks that the police are inefficient and slow, especially when dealing with refugee issues. On the whole their experience with South Africans has been bad as two respondents clearly expressed this, one respondent

[23] He had opportunities, on two different occasions, to go overseas for exchange programmes. Unfortunately he could not travel as he could not, on both occasions be granted a passport for travelling.

had been called “kwerekwere”; only one respondent did not have any experience of hostility.

> “Sometimes when you approach them (South Africans) and you do not speak any local language, they call you kwerekwere” Refugee leader.

All four thought they were in one way or the other involved in some form of anti-xenophobia campaign by teaching the values of human respect and interacting with South Africans, showing them their good and bad side like all human beings.

However, in working with refugees, it became clear that many refugees would not assist or cooperate in projects that were meant to assist them, unless there was immediate material gain. It is this kind of attitude that many refugees have that has hampered the initiatives of NGOs. It is understandable and true that there is a dire need for material support for refugees. However for some of them to ask for material remunerations each time for their participation in projects meant to plead their cause is not helpful and frustrates the efforts of those who are trying to help them. An example would be when they are asked to participate for events to celebrate the World Refugee Day. For NGOs organising these events, it has always been a problem to get maximum refugee cooperation. There is always a question of “how much are we going to be paid”. Consequently projects like raising awareness in South African communities become ineffective because of the lack of support of the refugees themselves. Their attitude may further enhance the perceptions that they are ‘milking’ South Africa.

4.6 INTEGRATION

On average the youth found South Africans to be good to them, especially their friends or those they interacted with. “They are good because they helped me, without them I would have suffered”. All ten of the youth interviewed found South Africans to be either “good”, “fine” or both or even “kind”. “They are not behaving violently like Nigerians, they are nice”. However, four of them found some South Africans to be either “violent” or “bad toward refugees”. Therefore perceiving them as a mixture of good and bad people.

Seven of the youth felt accepted by South Africans; one felt few South Africans had accepted refugees; the ninth felt he was sometimes accepted and sometimes he felt unaccepted. The tenth felt that South Africans did not accept refugees.

> “No, because they sometimes say something bad about our country and ask why are we here to take their jobs”.

One of the seven who felt accepted, she thought to be able to move around freely and have a permit was a sign of acceptance.

> “In some other countries they don’t give permits and here we are free to move around. They have accepted us in their country and if you have a passport you can travel”.

One felt that not all have and another one felt that he was only accepted by those he knows and the others did not.

> “Those I know do, but the ones I don’t know don’t”.

When asked if they had any good experiences from South Africans, only one did not answer the question and nine said yes they had good experiences. Three of them mentioned being accepted as a good experience while one thought that lack of violent experience for her was a positive experience. Two mentioned the help and support they get at school as a very good experience for them.

Half of these interviewed youth felt that education or opportunity to study would make them feel part of South Africa or saw this as a positive factor for integration. Of the five, one added employment and freedom of movement. Three thought having more South African friends and good relationships would help. One thought the Department of Home Affairs with the issuing of identity documents would be a positive factor and only one did not answer this question.

Most of the Congolese refugee youth want to integrate into the South African community. Nine of the ten interviewed expressed a desire to be integrated into the South African community. Only one did not want to integrate, he only wanted to get education and go back to Congo. Eight of the ten youth perceive education or schooling as a way of integrating into the South African community. Four of that eight also regarded employment as another way of integrating. One regarded the ability to communicate with locals as a way of integrating while the other one regarded the ability to participate in community activities as a way of integrating. When asked about their future residence, Two of the youth still wanted to go to America and London respectively; one did not want to be in Berea; two still wanted to go back to DRC, two did not know or were not

sure; one wanted to live in Pretoria; one in Cape Town or Durban and one was happy to live anywhere in Africa. When asked who is responsible for the integration of refugees, two did not know; three thought it was the Department of Home Affairs; two thought it was the government; one thought it was JRS and one thought it was UNHCR.

When asked if they wish to return to DRC or live somewhere else, two said they neither wanted to stay in Johannesburg nor return to DRC. In none of these places did they feel free or safe and therefore one was going to live in Europe or America and the other one was going to London. Two were sure that they were going to go back to DRC, but they just wanted to get education and then return home. Two were going to return to DRC only if there would be peace. The other one said he would return as soon as he finds his family that he thinks is in South Africa. One was not going to return to DRC and did not know where she will live in the future while the other one was just not going to return, as she has no family there. The last one was just not going to return to DRC. He is going to live somewhere, as long as it is not DRC.

When asked why did they choose to come to South Africa and not other countries, one said the reason was because parents were already in South Africa and just came to join them and the other one was to join the sister. One came because parents were killed in DRC and she decided to come to South Africa. Four came because parents or guardians decided to come and they therefore decided for them. One of those was mainly because the mother was sick and they could not get medication in DRC. One came because a truck- driver picked her in Zambia and offered to bring her to South Africa. One came to

look for his family that may be in South Africa. One came because he was told that South Africa is nice and you can get a chance to study.

Table 12: Perceptions of Integration: Congolese Refugee Youth

Respondent	Wish to Integrate	How	Future Residence	Who is responsible for Integration?
1	Yes	Schooling, Education	Not Berea	Don't Know
2	Yes	School	Don't Know	Don't know
3	Yes	School, Employment	London	DHA
4	Yes	Studies, Employment	Pretoria	JRS
5	Yes	School, Employment	Durban/ Cape Town	UNHCR
6	No	Only to get Education	DRC	Government
7	Yes	Partaking in Community	Anywhere in Africa	UNHCR
8	Yes	Ability to Communicate	Not Sure	Government
9	Government willing	School, Employment	America	DHA
10	Yes	Education	DRC	DHA

Three of the female adults interviewed had a positive feeling about South Africans. They thought South Africans are "kind", "fine" and "nice". Four others had mixed feelings about South Africans saying that only those they know or educated were kind or good and the others were not. Three others had a negative feeling about South Africans. Four thought that South Africans have accepted refugees, while one said they were legally obliged to. Three thought that South Africans had not accepted refugees and two said some have and some have not.

When asked why did they choose to come to South Africa and not other countries, one said it was because life is better and nice in South Africa; one came because she liked South Africa; three came to join their families; five came because of respect of human

rights, better security and peace in South Africa. Interestingly, when they were asked what were their plans when they arrived in South Africa, six of them said they just wanted to go back to DRC as soon as it is safe to return; two wanted to stay in South Africa; one wanted to resettle to Canada and one had no plans. When they were later asked if they wish to return to Congo or settle in South Africa, one said she would either go back to DRC or settle in South Africa, the other nine definitely wanted to go back to DRC as soon as there is peace and stability.

All of the interviewed women expressed their desire to be integrated into South African communities. Five of them think employment is a way of integrating, while others added, speaking local language, friendships, interactions, living together, sharing and doing business with South Africans. When asked about their future residence, four the women expressed a definite desire to return back to DRC when there is peace; two wanted to live in any safe place while each of the remaining three wanted to live in a peaceful place, Soweto and Canada respectively. One was not sure where she wanted to live.

Six of the women think that the government is responsible for integration of refugees. One thinks it is NGOs like JRS; one thinks it is UNHCR and JRS; one thinks it is government, refugees and local communities together and one thinks it is government and UNHCR. Eight believe that integration is a solution to refugee problems while one said it is not and one said only employment was the solution. Seven of the women found assistance from NGOs to be too little or not enough to help them integrate; two did not think it was helping them at all and one opted not to answer the question.

Table 13: Perceptions of Integration: Congolese Refugee Women

Respondent	Wish to integrate	How	Future Residence	Who is responsible for integration	Is integration a solution	NGO Assistance
1	Yes	Employment SA friends	Safe place	Government, UNHCR	Yes	Not enough
2	Yes	Employment	Safe Place	Government	Only with employment	Not enough
3	Yes	Employment, Interaction	Not Sure	Government, Refugees, Locals	Yes	
4	Yes	Employment, Community activities	Canada	UNHCR, JRS	Yes	Yes, Some of it
5	Yes	Local Language, not English	Peaceful Place	Government	Yes	Not enough
6	Yes	Business with SA	Soweto	Government	Yes	No
7	Yes	Employment	Congo	Government	No	No
8	Yes	Share skills	Congo	NGOs like JRS	Yes	Yes. Not enough
9	Yes	Share with SA	Congo	Government	Yes	Too little
10	Yes	Live together	Congo	Government	Yes	Little

Half of the male adults interviewed have mixed feelings about South Africans perceiving some to be good and some to be bad. Three had a positive perception saying that they are good, nice and kind. Only one said he feared South Africans and one was not sure of how he felt about South Africans. When asked about South African acceptance of refugees, five said South Africans have accepted refugees and three said no they have not. Two said some have and some have not.

When asked why did they choose to come to South Africa and not other countries, one said it was because of the freedom that refugees have and not being put in camps in South Africa; one came because South Africa is better for self- development; one came because the opportunities and the socio- economic situation in South Africa; one came because a

truck driver in Zambia promised to take him to a better place and brought him to South Africa ;one came because South Africa is far from DRC and has signed the UN Convention on Refugees ; five came because of respect of human rights and democracy, better security and peace in South Africa. Interestingly, when they were asked what were their plans when they arrived in South Africa, eight of them said they just wanted to go back to DRC as soon as there is peace and it is safe to return; one wanted to stay in South Africa; one wanted to return to DRC as soon as he finished his studies. When they were later asked if they wish to return to DRC or settle in South Africa, two said they wanted to settle in South Africa, one was not going to return to DRC; the other seven definitely wanted to go back to DRC as soon as there is peace, security and stability.

All Congolese men interviewed want to integrate into local communities. Two of them think employment is a way of integrating; two think being able to speak a local language; two mentioned citizenship; one mentioned education; one other mentioned participation in community activities one mentioned being able to do business with South Africans and lastly for one it was working with South Africans. Sharing skills, and safety were also mentioned as ways of integrating. Five want to definitely go back to DRC and one wanted to live either in Johannesburg if there is no peace in DRC or in DRC if there is peace. Two wanted to live anywhere safe; one does not want to live in DRC and one wants to live in Durban. Four of the men think that the government is responsible for integration of refugees; two think it is the government, refugees and locals; one think it is government, UNHCR, locals and refugees; one think it is government, UNHCR and NGOs; one think it is refugees and locals and one think it is South Africans.

Seven think local integration is a solution to refugee problems; one thinks it is a solution but a problem when one has to go back home. Therefore on the one hand it is a solution while on the other it is not. Two think that it is not a solution. Seven think that the assistance received from NGOs is not enough or very limited in helping them to integrate, and three said it does not.

Table 14: Perceptions of Integration: Congolese Refugee Men

Respondent	**Wish to integrate**	**How**	**Future Residence**	**Who is Responsible for integration**	**Is integration a solution**	**NGO assistance**
1	Yes	Citizen	Durban	Government, Locals, refugees	Yes	No
2	Yes	Share skills, language	Not Congo	Government	Yes	Not enough
3	Yes	Employment, Citizen	Congo	Government	No	No
4	Yes	Study, Business	JHB/ Congo	Government	Yes	Not enough
5	Yes	Working with SA	Anywhere safe	Locals, refugees & Government	Yes	Not enough
6	Yes	Employment	Anywhere safe	South Africans	Yes/No	Not enough
7	Yes	Business with SA	Congo	Government, UNHCR, Refugees, Locals	No	Not enough
8	Yes	Language, Live with SA	Congo	Government	Yes	Very limited
9	Yes	Feeling safe Language	Congo	Refugees & Locals	Yes	Not enough
10	Yes	Partake in Community	Congo	Government, UNHCR, NGO	Yes	No

The attitude toward South Africans is mixed as one found South African ladies not xenophobic and had a fear of males. Two said that some South Africans are “good” and some are “bad”. One finds good and bad South Africans. Only one found South Africans to be supportive. Two thought South Africans had accepted refugees while one did not

think so and the other one thought they were sometimes accepted and sometimes not. Two found South African leaders to be promoting acceptance and integration while one did not think so and one thought they did sometimes. On the question of South Africans knowing the problem of DRC, two said yes they know, while the other two said only intellectuals or those who are educated do know. One accused the media of denying South Africans the information about the African continent.

Three of the leaders came to South Africa because of the freedom in this country as opposed to being in a camp in other countries and the question of being safer than other countries, while the last one could not be in a camp because of security reasons that made him leave DRC. All four of them were planning to return back to DRC as soon as there is democracy and peace.

All four community leaders expressed a wish to integrate into the host community and mentioned social participation, community activities, living in dominantly South African areas as opposed to Congolese 'ghettos', doing business with South Africans and speaking at least one indigenous African language. One commented that he ought to feel at home because he is "in Africa". Two thought South African citizens and refugees were jointly responsible for integration; one thought the task lay with government, UNHCR, South Africans and refugees, while one thought it was the government that was solely responsible.

> "The government and municipalities as they are close to the people (South Africans) are responsible. The response of refugees is also important. We need to raise awareness by having cultural events from refugees and hosts".

Two thought local integration was the solution while two thought it was not. One thought the assistance offered by NGOs was not helping refugees integrate while the other three thought it was, but not enough.

> "JRS should have a clear criteria for assistance and everybody should know that. There should be a quota system of the numbers. There is a need for consultation. I would prefer a JRS clinic than to go to a government clinic where I will not be treated with respect. Consultation between refugees and NGOs on matters of assistance is essential. In that way it would address priorities of refugees. Imposing does not help".[24]

It seems as Mupedziswa & Makanya (1992) have asserted that there is "lack of common ground" and NGOs are seen to be imposing projects on the refugees (Mupedziswa & Makanya, 1992: 1).All four wanted to return to Congo once there is peace or democracy or both.

4.7 Religion

All of the Congolese refugee youth interviewed are practising Christians. Only one went to a church where they had no South Africans. The other had South African members at their churches. Five of the nine had only formal relationships (Church activities, choir practise, prayer groups, evangelisation, etc.) with South Africans at their churches. One had his best friends being South Africans from his church. Two had normal friendship relations with South Africans at their churches and only one of the nine had no

[24] JRS criteria for assistance gives priority to refugees who are 18 months or less in South Africa but assistance is also given to those who have been in South Africa longer than the 18 months period. From 2000 to then end of 2001 JRS ran a referral clinic in their office in Johannesburg. The reason was that many refugees had difficulties in accessing medical assistance in government hospitals. After an extensive advocacy work and lobbying the situation improved in some hospitals and there was a serious shortage of funds. Consequently the JRS clinic had to be closed.

relationship with South Africans at her church. Eight of the interviewed youth found religion to be helping them integrate. However one of the eight found religion to be only helping them integrate formally or in interacting only for the prescribed church activities but no friendships or other informal activities were carried out together. One of the ten did not know if religion was helping or not and the last one thought religion does not help.

Table 15: Information on Religion: Congolese Refugee Youth

Respondent	Type	Practicing	Any SA at your church?	Relationship with them (SA)	Help to Integrate
1	Christian	Yes	Yes	Friends	Yes
2	Christian	Yes	No	N/A	No
3	Christian	Yes	Yes	Formal	Only at church
4	Christian	Yes	Yes	No	Don't know
5	Christian	Yes	Yes	Formal	Yes. Formal
6	Christian	Yes	Yes	Formal	Yes
7	Christian	Yes	Yes	Best Friends	Yes
8	Christian	Yes	Yes	Visiting	Yes
9	Christian	Yes	Yes	Formal	Prayers
10	Christian	Yes	Yes	Formal	At church

All of Congolese refugee women are practising Christians who have South Africans at their place of worship. However, four percent had formal relationships with South Africans; another four had normal friendships, while two had no relationships with South Africans at their churches. Five of the women thought that religion is helping refugees integrate while two thought it is only helping them formally or with church activities. One was not sure while two thought religion was not helping at all.

Table 16: Information on Religion: Congolese Refugee Women

Respondent	Type	Practicing	Any SA at your church?	Relationship with them (SA)	Help to Integrate
1	Christian	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
2	Christian	Yes	Yes	Formal	Yes. Formal
3	Christian	Yes	Yes	Formal	Yes
4	Christian	Yes	Yes	Formal	Yes. Formal
5	Christian	Yes	Yes	No	Not sure
6	Christian	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
7	Christian	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
8	Christian	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
9	Christian	Yes	Yes	Formal	No
10	Christian	Yes	Yes	No	No

All Congolese refugee men interviewed are practicing Christians who had South Africans at their churches. Five of them had normal friendships with South Africans while four had only formal relationships. Only one had no relationship with South Africans at his church. Eight of them think that religion helps refugees to integrate while one thought it was only helping formally and one thought it was not helping.

Table 17: Information on Religion: Congolese Refugee Men

Respondent	Type	Practicing	Any SA at your church?	Relationship with them (SA)	Help to integrate
1	Christian	Yes	Yes	Formal	Yes
2	Christian	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
3	Christian	Yes	Yes	Formal	No
4	Christian	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
5	Christian	Yes	Yes	Formal	Yes
6	Christian	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
7	Christian	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
8	Christian	Yes	Yes	Yes	Church Activities
9	Christian	Yes	Yes	Formal	Yes
10	Christian	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

All four of the leaders were also practising Christians and had South Africans at their place of worship. One had an informal relationship with South Africans at their church while the others had formal relationships. They all thought religion was helping them integrate into the South African community as there are church programmes involve everyone, irrespective of their nationality.

> "Religion creates a platform where people can meet and practice the teachings".

Places of worship can be used to raise awareness between the refugees and host communities and subsequently promoting integration. One example is when the Bishops of the Catholic Church were lobbied to write a pastoral letter for the Refugee Day. In their statement for the World Refugee Day, entitled "Our responsibility towards refugees", the Southern African Bishop's Conference (SACBC) urged South Africans to support refugees by doing whatever they could or was in their capabilities to give this support. The Bishops gave concrete examples that people could do, like welcoming refugees into their homes and encouraging hospitality to refugees, helping refugees where they seek assistance, etc. (SACBC, 2001). This letter was distributed in all Catholic churches for everyone to read. In places like Hillbrow the most well attended social institutions are the churches and they also play an important role in creating social networks (Morris, 1999: 336).

5. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF STUDY FINDINGS: THE ROLE OF SERVICE PROVIDERS IN ACCESS TO SERVICE PROVISION.

5.1 Introduction to refugee Service Providers

The service providers[25], who were interviewed, were not speaking on behalf of their organisations or departments, but as members of service providers who have been dealing with refugees or specifically Congolese refugees. The word representative is not used in the official sense but in that the interviewee was available from the organisation or department represented. Their views do not necessarily represent those of their organisations or departments, but their experience in their work.

5.2 Perceptions Of Local Integration

Service providers seem to have varying opinions in their perception of local integration. For the Wits Law Clinic (WLC) Representative, local integration is not possible in South Africa because the South African legislation is not applied as set out in the Refugee Act and because of deliberate administrative actions to render integration unattainable. Beyond the Refugee Act, A found other legislation like legislation around socio-economic rights, do not take cognisance of the obligation that South Africa has under International Law. This matrix of barriers means that A would consider essential factors for integration as:

[25] See Chapter 2, Key Informants, above for information on service providers interviewed. Appendix A, below, gives a list of these service providers.

1. Proper identification documents
2. Right to work and study in the country
3. Access to health services and education
4. Permanent Residence

She perceives all of them to be not attainable at the moment and therefore integration being feasible for the tenacious and stubborn but not the vulnerable and traumatised. For reasons stated above, WLC Representative does not see local integration as possible durable solution.

For the Department of Home Affairs (DHA) Representative, local integration is a long-term process. There are various factors that influence or affect local integration, like culture, language, xenophobia and way of life of Congolese. South Africans are xenophobic, especially on the fallacy that refugees are here to take their jobs and women. Congolese are active, financially astute, socially and academically skilled and knowledgeable about travelling. That gives them an advantage, which is a problem for South Africans.

His comments clearly affirm the claims made that refugees and indeed other migrants are talented people who can make a positive economic contribution. Landau and Jacobsen (2004) report that migrants' presence could help fill the acute skills gap in Johannesburg as many had skills and experiences of running businesses, professional positions (doctors, lawyers, accountants etc.) and were even hiring South Africans to work for them (Landau & Jacobsen, 2004: 46).

He therefore thinks the solution is in the government doing something about the situation:

> "The government has to teach people and talk to them about refugees and immigration. Only after the teaching and talking to people, can local integration be a durable solution, only in the long run".

> "Lack of knowledge and experience about refugees is a problem for local communities. Those who know the issues and have been in contact with refugees have no problem with them and are willing. This works for both sides. Ignorance on both sides is a major factor. Refugees want to be self- reliant and provide for themselves. They may want to integrate but they fear rejection and xenophobia and of course there is a fear of the unknown", JRS representative.

Kuhlman argues that neglecting this, apart from the scientific criticism that could be raised against it, reinforces irritation in host countries about lack of concern among refugees about their interests (Kuhlman, 1991: 18). The DHA Representative therefore thinks that local integration is a possible durable solution, but in the long run and only if government gives attention to refugee issues and UNHCR carries out its mandate.

The Jesuit Refugee Service (JRS) representative mentions five points that are important for integration:

i) Being able to assist refugees to be self- sustaining.

ii) To be able to make contribution to life in South Africa.

iii) To be able to develop skills so that they can make a contribution and use those skills in their country when they return.

iv) To be able to mingle freely with South Africans.

v) Sharing of life culture as a form of mutual benefit.

She perceives local integration to be, to a large extent a feasible durable solution as the majority of Congolese refugees are young males willing to develop themselves further and to do any kind of work to be self- sustaining, willing to learn English as a language that can facilitate integration. However, she sees unemployment as a difficulty as it is also rife among young South Africans and therefore there is competition for limited resources. One interesting factor is that the JRS representative has noticed that as soon as they are equipped with skills they want to move to western countries, especially America. Many of them are even playing the Green Card Competitions.

> "Local integration is a possible durable solution as some refugees have skills that are under-utilised and can contribute to job creation if given an opportunity. They bring with them cultural and language enrichment and Johannesburg is a culturally diverse area. The economic level is still a difficulty however". JRS representative

According to the Johannesburg Diocese representative, before integration, there are basic needs that need to be met. Integration is not possible, unless refugees have accommodation, employment, food, education, and proper documentation. Therefore Johannesburg does not offer the conducive conditions for local integration, both legally and materially.

> "In order for people to integrate they need to reach the level of acquiring the knowledge or experience to be able to live or survive in a foreign country. In practical terms it means, until they find a job or are able to create their own job, refugees need to find a way to solve the major issues of food and shelter" UNHCR representative.

Lastly, the UNHCR representative thought that the question of integration is a generic one and it depends on which country they are coming from. If it is a country where the war has been ongoing for years or in which civil unrest is protracted, then local integration may be the right solution. For countries where there are sporadic outbursts of civil unrests or war and there is no constant threat on instability then local integration in the country of asylum may not be the right solution. It also depends very much on individual cases. He does not think that it is possible to make a general conclusion. For Congolese, he thinks that's given that the situation has been unstable for many years and that various peace initiatives, have not so far resulted in stabilisation or any massive returns of Congolese back to their own country. This is also dependent on which areas of the Congo they came from.

UNHCR representative believes that local integration should be a durable solution for refugees. But for him, it also depends on what is the absorption capacity of Johannesburg. Each area has its own critical capacity, how many of new jobs, and newcomers can one area take without putting pressure on the facilities and institutions. Johannesburg is a very cosmopolitan city and a huge city with quite a lot of needs. E believes that the integration of even several thousands of refugees should not be a problem. The problem can only be in getting the right idea, a workable idea and sorting out this issue regarding documents, permits, bank accounts and the issue of the general security.

5.3 Willingness To Facilitate Local Integration

Service providers, for different reasons, do not see any significant facilitation of local integration of Congolese refugees. The WLC representative, thinks there is no willingness on the part of the government or the local community. The major problem with government is the fear that by creating an atmosphere conducive to integration, they will open the floodgates of migrants into South Africa. In addition, at a bureaucratic level, there is so much corruption in government that it makes integration unattainable: if a person is truly integrated, this entails a move away from dependence on bureaucracy and this wouldn't facilitate corruption. Independence does not facilitate corruption.

Among many other problems or challenges facing integration, according to the DHA representative, the government is not willing to facilitate integration:

- Government has failed to force UNHCR to play its major role of creating awareness and subsequently creating a path for local integration.
- The Refugee Act was enacted with no budget.
- Government has failed to call upon South Africans who can speak Congolese languages to interpret for them.

On the other hand the DHA representative, thinks the problem also lies within factors like:

- UNHCR's failure to carry on its mandate to facilitate refugee integration into local communities, ever since 1994. "As UNHCR is opposed to the idea of

refugee camps, they should therefore make sure that there is acceptance among locals and refugees".

- The local community is less interested, ignorant and do not know what to do.
- NGOs are failing to solve the problem because of their lack of proper approach to the community and Congolese.
- NGOs protect refugees from interacting with locals, their reasons being that South Africans are rough and not receptive.
- Refugees are less interested and have a fear of the unknown, a belief that they cannot stay in Soweto or in the townships and lack trust in the security forces. They believe that the security force is xenophobic.
- Refugees leaving Congo know that they will stay with their friends in South Africa and consequently violate the by- laws of South Africa like overcrowding in their flats so that they can afford to pay the rent.

The problem for him is lack of information to local communities about refugees and refugees are not given information about the administration of South Africa.

The JRS representative sees the government to be generally unwilling to do much, but when challenged individually, certain government departments open up and accept refugees for as long as it is within legal parameters. Therefore only certain sectors of the government do accept refugees, not the government as a whole. She thinks the DHA does not accept refugees at all. "They have failed to provide the necessary documents (ID Books) to facilitate integration".

"Difficulties at Home Affairs make refugees feel that they are not wanted or accepted. On the other hand it is too early to judge the government as not willing as they are still struggling to provide services to South Africans". Catholic Diocesan representative.

For the UNHCR Representative, for good or for ills, South Africa as the only country in Africa that has no refugee camps, refugees are free to live wherever they want. From one point of view this is very good for local integration as it becomes an individual issue and it is much easier for an individual to integrate than a clearly defined refugee community. On the other hand, while there are no refugee camps there is no material provision for refugees organised by the government. Therefore he argues that with the limited funds that UNHCR has, it cannot reach all the persons who are in need and have therefore to limit to specific categories, which they do through their implementing partners. From this point of view there is a gap between the two opposites. There is a freedom of movement, of choice and on the other side there is no material assistance.

5.4 Acceptance Of Refugee Presence In South Africa

The WLC representative agrees that acceptance of refugees in South Africa is still rare because government is not active enough in promoting, publicising and defending their acceptance their acceptance, pre-emptively or reactively. Government is not creating any awareness among the local people about who refugees are. They are not addressing high levels of xenophobia. She thinks that the High level of xenophobia in South Africa is untenable.

The DHA representative thinks that there is acceptance by the authorities or the government, but it is deliberately slow, so as to frustrate the applicant into leaving the

country soon. He also asserts that it is due to lack of resources and personnel. He thinks that UNHCR is not carrying out its mandate; they see their role as to liase and 'direct' the government. He thinks UNHCR should be on the ground. NGOs cater for limited numbers of refugees and assistance is not reaching the people it is supposed to reach. He perceives the local community as less interested: they don't see the refugee problem as their problem. Therefore, UNHCR and government should both come up with a certain amount of money to restart the whole process. Otherwise assistance won't reach people.

The JRS representative agrees that acceptance of refugees is generally rare because there is still a lot of ignorance and while there is ignorance there will be fear and non-acceptance. Communities that know about refugees have accepted them. She thinks that because refugees have taken over certain urban areas, they are being perceived as not wanting to integrate. However, the Catholic Diocese Representative thinks that this rare acceptance of refugees is a problem of the legacy of Apartheid and the exclusion of South Africa from the rest of the African continent, as result government is faced with the problem of social education.

The UNHCR representative says that the issue of xenophobia is not particular to South Africa but is also common in many developed countries in Europe. He thinks that in South Africa it is the misunderstanding by the general public of the difference between migrants and refugees. Historically South Africa had millions of migrant workers from Mozambique, Zimbabwe, Lesotho and other countries. Thus it doesn't mean that those who have come here for the reasons of employment are refugees. He thinks that from the

misunderstanding or mixing of refugees and asylum seekers in the same category results in non- acceptance of refugees. He also emphases that the South African Constitution is a very good one, since it provides theoretically the same rights for refugees as for its own citizens. In that way it contains a very progressive acceptance of refugees. The issue may be one of lack of understanding of refugee rights and the role of refugees, who are usually assumed to be taking the jobs of nationals. Yet in many countries even in South Africa one can find good examples where refugees through their own work or knowledge and determination to succeed are able to generate income for themselves and for those who are living around them, including citizens of the host country. Whether in small communities or in big communities, they become employers, even and expand a community's knowledge. Two cultures move together and contribute to better understanding and more tolerance.

5.5 Attitude Of Schools Toward Refugee Children

The WLC representative thinks that in schools there is no high level of xenophobia in so far as refugee children are seen as a drain on financial resources. For her, this attitude does prevent children from accessing education. Schools could be forums where citizens learn about refugees. By creating barriers, schools are creating barriers to integration.

The DHA representative thinks schools are sidelining refugee children. Schools want money in cash, they don't address the question of language, and some principals have to be bribed for refugee children to be accepted. He asserts that there is an evaluation of standards and sometimes refugee children are taken back to lower classes than before

they arrived. For him, if children are rejected from accessing education, chances of integration are nil or non- existent, as friendships start in schools. However, the Catholic diocese representative thinks the attitude of schools toward refugees is getting better and there is some improvement.

The JRS representative perceives some schools to be sympathetic and some to be xenophobic. Where there are few refugee children, there is sympathy, but in schools where there are many refugee children, they are perceived as a burden and a problem. Where there were negative experiences of refugees, the principals are hostile because refugee parents are not participating fully in their children's education (One example cited is not signing homework books). Some schools have gone out of their way to address the problem of language for learners, just as they would with South Africans who have English problems. In some cases South African learners have not accepted refugees because of cultural and language differences. In some cases this attitude is influenced by teachers' attitudes in the classrooms. She thinks this reinforces the attitude of differences being conflictual rather than being enriching. Refugee children tend to bond together among themselves rather than mixing with others. It alienates refugee children's identity. On the other hand it forces them to take up South African identity so that they can be accepted. That, for her, it is not integration but assimilation.

The UNHCR representative believes that schools have lots of problems with space. The campaign to waiver school fees for refugees, led by the SAHRC together with LHR is achieving some small results. The schools in Durban did not have any problems with

receiving refugees but they later had budgetary constraints and pressure on school facilities. It would be good to have the waiver of the school fees extended to all refugees because in addition to fees there are other things like books and school uniform for which some of them may have problems accessing. He believes that education is very important for those who ask for asylum in South Africa but thinks that it also depends on various schools as they have different policies and different funding situations. Over the last three years, it has been getting better, however. He thinks refugee issues should also be seen in the context of the history of this country and be put it into perspective. We should understand that this country has a lot to do: aiding urban and rural poor and trying to correct lots of injustices done in the previous years. Taking over the responsibilities for some of the refugee issues in a more coherent and comprehensive way will be gradual. He thinks there is a will with the majority of people dealing with refugees but very often there are no resources.

5.6 Participation Of South African Politicians And Community Leaders

For WLC representative, politicians are not promoting acceptance and local integration. However, religious and faith-based community leaders like the South African Council of Churches (SACC) are doing something. She thinks they may be promoting acceptance but not local integration per se.

DHA representative does not think that South African politicians and community leaders are promoting acceptance and local integration. They are rather concerned about world

politics and their own internal matters. The issue of integrating refugees is seldom on their agenda.

The Catholic diocese representative thinks that South African politicians and community leaders are not really promoting acceptance and integration. There seem to be a fear of what would others say. It is not enough and there is no joint venture in addressing the integration of refugees.

In a Roll Back Xenophobia Campaign, South Africans who were in exile and were under UNHCR's assistance were approached and all of them were very positive in their written and oral comments. But for the UNHCR representative, some may have a different opinion and the UNHCR need to do a little bit more. Though doing a lot in promoting or giving more explanations on the refugee rights and issues. Quite a lot of senior members of the government were refugees and their response is sympathetic. Yet when it comes to action, there is little that is being done. For JRS representative, they talk a lot but their implementation is poor. It is more rhetoric than implementation.

5.7 The Role Of Religion In Integration

For WLC Representative religion promotes tolerance and a sense of charity and giving. But she does not think that charity and giving is equal to religion promoting the integration of refugees. She thinks that many religious organisations perceive refugees as transients and they are willing to offer help for as long as they perceive people as transients. If the perception changes to that of refugees as permanent people, then

religious communities see refugees as in competition with local people and start allocating charity to locals first. However the UNHCR representative thinks religion plays quite an important role in dealing with refugees. Quite a number of those people helping refugees are religion based and they are supporting refugees from their own internal belief and determination which is linked with their religion and that is in providing assistance. He thinks religion can also play a role of fighting xenophobia through religious channels.

The JRS representative thinks that religion is definitely helping refugees integrate. They have been able to find a place where they can express their faith and their culture. A sense of identity is allowed and expressed. However she thinks the question is that the churches are very culture-based, rooted in expression through language and symbols rather than focused on mixing with South Africans. There may be a small percentage of South Africans in churches where refugees have gathered. Often the common language spoken is Swahili or French. In terms of self- expression there is potential but at the cost of integration into the South African “mainstream”.

The Catholic diocese representative thinks churches do not have a general plan for dealing with refugees. The churches are scared and do not know what to do with refugees. She thinks leaders in the church are not doing enough. As a result for the DHA representative perceives the role of religion in local integration as absent. Only selected individuals have tried, not institutions. Thus one finds refugees creating their own religious groups.

5.8 Factors Promoting Or Inhibiting Integration

The WLC representative thinks social interaction is broad. It can include conflictual encounters, or buying something from someone as well as amicable encounters. Friendship and bonding does not necessarily always happen. Generally she thinks there is no sustained intimate bonding and creation of friends. Xenophobia, language, poverty (people see themselves in competition), culture, difference in religion, economics (trade) are all inhibiting factors. Religion, sport geography and location are promoting factors. However, for the DHA representative, there is no social interaction happening between the refugees and South Africans, only interaction at work or at a professional level. Fear, xenophobia, language, hostile environment and media perceptions are the factors that seem to be inhibiting the interaction.

The JRS representative thinks that there is not much interaction unless it is organised interaction like when refugees were taken to Soweto to celebrate International Human Rights Day. Refugees live in areas dominated by refugees. In places like Bertrams there is a good mix between the two groups. This however, is exceptional. Factors like geographical situation, language, fear of one another, mistrust and ignorance about the other group affect or inhibit interaction between the two communities. She says that Congolese have a culture of entitlement; they feel that as victims of war South Africans owe them something.

The Catholic diocese representative thinks there is some interaction as there are some refugees who got married to South Africans. At the same time she notes that language can inhibit and selfishness from South Africans who want everyone to speak their language.

For the UNHCR representative, the fact that refugees are not isolated and are allowed to live wherever they are, there is immediately interaction where they live. They may be received well but sometimes there may be problems, but it depends on individuals. He believes there is a good understanding between some of the communities in Cape Town and the refugees. It is a complex issue. He thinks there is a need to create the environment, that will facilitate this and it seems that this environment is improving every year. For him it is linked with the economic situation. If the economic situation improves, social interaction will also improve in South Africa and, with NEPAD, it will provide an opportunity for South Africans to understand. Once there is common understanding and common projects then interaction will be better. Possible obstacles for the UNHCR representative include, firstly the economy: when one is fighting for survival there isn't much time for interaction. Secondly, it is the concentration of refugees in the big cities, because of economic opportunities in the cities. Once the economic opportunities are spread to other areas, it will increase interaction. Municipalities where refugees are living should involve them in the activities of the town, invite them to meetings and involve them in the discussions of the issues.

5.9 Willingness Of Congolese To Integrate

The WLC representative does not know if Congolese want to integrate. However, she sees a lot of them asking to be resettled in other countries, even though the majority are not. Conversely for her, Congolese refugees are willing to integrate; they just need attention and assistance to help them integrate. South Africans are not embracing them. They need to be invited to feel at home and they have been trying to interact.

Other representatives share this division of opinion about this issue. The JRS representative thinks that on the whole, Congolese are not willing to integrate. Though there are some individuals who, through work have to interact with South Africans. Congolese tend to group more with each other than try to know South Africans. It is not a clear situation. There are individuals who make an effort to interact although language may be a factor. People are not confident to express themselves while some are afraid of xenophobia.

The Catholic diocese representative thinks not many Congolese want to integrate. She thinks that those who have overcome hassles of their basic needs do but the young people they want to go. They just want to empower themselves and after that go back and rebuild the Congo.

There is willingness for Congolese to integrate, but for the UNHCR representative, it is more of an impression than a scientific survey. The Congolese are still the largest refugee community in South Africa. He thinks that for the Congolese they go where they think

conditions are better, which is only natural. He finds the majority of them are quite well educated and seem to know what they want. He has an impression that their interaction and limited integration with the South African environment is more comprehensive.

5.10 Further Comments On Integration

For the WLC representative, local integration is not meeting the academic test i.e. Harrell-Bond and Jacobsen's definitions of integration. Implementing partners on the other hand feel that integration is not practically achieved. Why is the UNHCR sticking to integration as a durable solution when they can change to something else?

According to the DHA representative, local integration should be a joint effort of all stakeholders, not one individual or institution. Introduction of social activities like soccer matches between the refugees and locals can be one way of starting. Schools have to teach South African children about refugees and promote mutual respect. The police and immigration officials must be trained and sensitised into respecting refugees. The UNHCR and the government should arrange meetings and social interactions between local communities and refugees.

The JRS representative thinks there is a need for a better status determination process and documentation, which would enable refugees to be self- sustaining and reliant. They should be given opportunities to move out of refugee-dominated areas and help them mix with South Africans. She asserts that both legal and economic integration are important for social integration to be achieved. At the moment they are dependent on each other for

survival rather than thinking of moving or venturing outside geographical areas dominated by refugees. It's human that one moves to an area seemingly hostile, that they tend to one another. For her it is important that people feel accepted in order to move out of a laager mentality.

For the UNHCR rpresentative, local integration is the way that refugees become self-sufficient, meaning they can find paid work or create job for themselves. Since there are no camps like in South Africa they can have in theory decent shelter, meaning that they can share the same condition as South Africans. If they work harder they could be rewarded accordingly. Local integration is that one is not dependent on anybody in attaining physical existence in terms of shelter, food, education for children and paying the medical bills. In some cases that can be achieved easily, e.g. where a medical doctor comes to South Africa and is employed. Others however are working as street guards because their qualifications are not recognised or accepted. Recognising their qualifications, as well as helping them open bank accounts and post boxes are issues that have to be dealt with in making integration easier.

6. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 Host Community

It seems it will be extremely difficult or even impossible for local integration to be a durable solution for refugees as long as refugees are still perceived as a burden and a threat to the local community. Although it is not every South African that sees refugees as a threat or a burden to the already strained resources, those who are supportive or appreciate refugees are not in significant numbers to have the ability to persuade popular perception as presented by studies carried out on South Africans *vis- a- vis* migrants or even refugees.

As Mupedziswa (1993) and Jacobsen(2001) have argued, for local integration to take place successfully there is a need for coordination and collaboration between the host government, local community and refugees. This coupled with the NGOs' cooperation and a clear strategy or programme of action would help in bringing integration to be a durable solution. The study reveals that there is no such coordination or cooperation that is going on between these stakeholders. The government is not seen to be doing anything that suggests support for local integration or even social integration. Instead it is perceived to be part of the problem or obstacles toward any form of refugee integration. Refugees are not involved in community activities in areas where they live.

According to many refugees interviewed, the host community is assumed to know the problems that bring them to South Africa but the lack of interest and support seem to

suggest otherwise. Although it may be true, local community is said to be not caring about issues of refugees. As the DHA representative clearly mentioned that they do not see refugee problems as their problems. Part of the problem may be that integration has been perceived as a process only affecting refugees and not in terms of change in the host society.

6.2 Xenophobia

All but six of the refugees have been harassed, attacked or treated badly because they are not South Africans. Although the majority did not express living in fear of xenophobic attacks, they did mention fear of crime. According to a recent report by the Human Rights Committee, many refugees in Johannesburg expressed the fear that locals were going to kill them. (The Star, October 10 2002). In this study of DRC refugees, many seem to have experienced bad treatment from government officials and Police more than ordinary citizens. This phenomenon raises serious challenges because without proper and effective Police protection and other law enforcement officials, xenophobia threatens the rights of refugees, their livelihood, well being and undermines the refugee protection system (UNHCR 1999: 27).

6.3 Religion

All refugees interviewed are practising members of their different churches. All but four had some form of relationship with South Africans at their church. Therefore religion seems to be playing a major role, at least by bringing refugees together with South Africans. This can be seen as one area where NGOs could start proactively to advocate

and encourage integration and interaction between the two communities. Religion is a potential area that can facilitate acceptance and integration of refugees.

6.4 Refugees

There is a serious need for refugees to realise that their perception or belief that the African continent belongs to all of us who live in it and therefore are entitled to live anywhere in Africa where they want, is not shared by many and it is sometimes interpreted as arrogance. Yes, they may be from the continent of Africa but that does not mean that they are entitled to live anywhere they please in Africa. It is a naïve perception of the continent, one that disregards the concept of the sovereignty of all states that make-up this continent. As some of the interviewed refugees presented this attitude, it is crucial that it be addressed, as it may be a source of resentment on the part of the host community (whether the state or South Africans) and the reaction to this may create frustration and a feeling of rejection and non- acceptance on the part of refugees. Just as the DHA representative mentioned that South Africans do not care about refugee issues, there seem to be no similar sentiments about 'Africa belonging to all of us'. Rather, this attitude has sometimes been interpreted as one of entitlement.

6.5 Non-Governmental Organisations (NGO)

Given the limited resources that NGOs have, it is imperative for them to collaborate and cooperate so that their initiatives may have a meaningful and durable impact. Individual NGOs have on many occasions embarked individually on projects that could have had more impact had they involved one or two other likeminded organisations. It would be

even better for NGOs advocating refugee rights to start looking at possibilities of collaborating more with local NGOs and community organisations to have joint community activities that would involve both South Africans and refugees. In this way refugees will be able to participate more in community activities and integrate more fully into local social networks.

6.6 Government

The role of the government in integration cannot be over- emphasised. As it is the government that ratifies conventions and agreements to support and protect refugees, so it is the government that has to play a crucial role in helping them settle in local communities. The study shows that the government is to an extent aloof and often frustrating in the process of integration. Many refugees and service providers think the government is not willing to help refugees integrate, instead they think it is trying to frustrate them and consequently leaving them with no option but to leave the country. One of the refugees went to an extent of saying that anything that involves the state is of no use.

The Department of Home Affairs is generally perceived as more of a frustrating agent of the state than helpful or welcoming for refugees. Excuses for the Refugee Act been enacted without any budget, lack of personnel and equipment have been repeated many times before. South Africa has had at least three financial years since the implementation of the Act and surely if the Department was serious about implementing the Act properly, means could have been sought to get some budget for the Act. Moreover, refugees

complained about the delays and the horrible treatment they are getting from Home Affairs officials. A report in one of the newspapers reported that the Department of Home Affairs has furthermore been perceived to be having something rotten in its state of play. According to the editor of the Star newspaper, in addition to the inefficiency and uncaring attitudes, there is widespread corruption. Apparently officials at of the Braamfontein refugee reception office have at least on some occasions used chains and *sjamboks* to control the people who have come to seek help. (The Star 30 Oct. 2002). Surely there is no need for a budget to treat people with respect and dignity. The corruption under which the department is alleged to be operating needs serious action, as it is also see as a major problem for refugees.

The inefficiency and inability of the department to issue identity documents and passports to refugees has led to refugees being denied services, losing opportunities like employment, travel and not even be able to be legal guardians of some of the unaccompanied refugee minors. One refugee mentioned losing two opportunities of exchange programmes because he had no identity document and no passport to travel overseas. Employers have been said not to trust a piece of paper as a form of identification. On the other hand with so many fraudulent documents being allegedly produced, one would not totally blame employers who do not trust a piece of paper. Therefore an identity document would make things easier for refugees but unfortunately, this has not come through.

6.7 Root Causes

The unending wars, persecutions, intolerances and stalling peace processes mean that the refugee-producing trend will continue. With the problems that refugees face in host countries or local communities, it is imperative that a durable solution be found. Local integration may be a solution while in exile, but it does not seem to be totally a solution as many refugees still have a transient perception of their stay, whether they intend to go back to DRC when there is peace or resettle in another country. Therefore as many refugees have mentioned that integration is part of the solution and as the WLC representatives mentioned that local integration is not meeting the academic and the practical test, there is a dire need for a proper and effective durable solution.

Governments are not willing or are perceived not to be supporting local integration as the refugees interviewed together with the NGO representatives have argued that there is no support for integration in South Africa. Some governments have propagated intervention in the country of origin as a durable solution as well. A durable solution would therefore be for governments and the international community to find diplomatic solutions to conflicts and in the long term to secure peaceful coexistence (Westin, 1999: 31).

This study of Congolese refugees in Johannesburg suggests that they are faced with many challenges in their process of integration into the local community. This seems to be the comments of both refugees and service providers interviewed. Their problems in trying to integrate are caused by several factors among which it is the Department of Home Affairs. In trying to address the aims and specific objectives of this study, the results

seem to indicate that local integration in Johannesburg is at the moment under serious challenge and it is even more difficult to attain the level of integration described by Jacobsen.

However the study illustrates that the youth seem to be more socially integrated than the adults. It seems that friendships started particularly at schools do help them and some have even led to parents of both refugees and South African learners to start interacting at a social level and not only during parents meetings or events at schools. The majority of the youth spoke or understood Zulu. By no means easily, they seem to have been able to integrate, to a large extent. Refugee adults have not been as successful as the youth. Only close to half of the interviewed adults had been to South African social events and over half had not been. Their situation is totally different from that of South Africans in many ways. The level of social integration as described by Jacobsen, seem to be a far-fetched and too ideal form of integration in Johannesburg. Though not impossibility, it is still too early and there is still a lot of work to be done to reach that level in Johannesburg.

6.8 Recommendations

NGOs need to work together with refugees in planning programmes that will lead to more interactions between the host community and refugees. This strategy needs to involve local community organisations and local municipalities.

Possibilities of having programmes that will benefit both refugees and the host communities should be looked into. This will enable local communities and refugee communities to work together and have common community activities.

More than raising awareness, there is a need for more social activities to be organised for refugees to be given an opportunity to interact with the host community in a social forum. Sports events would one example and should not be done once a year but as frequent as possible.

In the campaigns to raise awareness in communities, employers or potential employers should be made aware of documents that entitle refugees to be in the country and the dynamics involved when the refugee status is due for renewal.

Advocacy NGOs including the UNHCR need to have a proactive strategy that will engage the media and journalists in refugee issues consequently helping them to give more positive and factual reporting about refugees.

With many refugees having interaction with South Africans through their religious institutions, it is important to have more awareness campaigns involving religious institutions and asking them to have their prominent personalities supporting the refugee cause.

Although Refugee Rights Workshops had been carried out before, there is still a need to continue the same workshops for the Police, Health Department Officials, Department of Home Affairs, Education Department and any other government department that may have to deal directly with refugees and asylum- seekers. There is need for more training about refugee rights to be given to government officials and the Police. The NGOs involved in advocacy they need to make sure that there are proactive activities that would also be preventative measures for maltreatment of refugees by state officials and the Police.

Refugees need to be informed of their rights and what actions could be taken if their rights are violated. Some of the refugees interviewed seem to be ignorant of their rights and therefore remain in fear.

The government need to look into the issue of corruption at Home Affairs and the SAPS. Together with NGOs and refugees they need to come up with a better system that will manifest the spirit of *Batho Pele* (People First). It seems the only method that will force Home Affairs to issue identity documents and passports is by litigation. Refugees cannot continue to loose opportunities and be denied services.

At an international level, UNHCR needs to secure more funding for integration programmes. Keeping in mind that there is a need to look at programmes that will start benefiting both refugees and local communities so that resentment can be avoided.

This study needs to be developed further or complemented by including perspectives of South Africans. It is therefore recommended that a further study on integration in Johannesburg be carried out looking at factors that include South Africans' perspectives.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bakewell, O. 2000. "Repatriation and Self-Settled Refugees in Zambia: Bringing Solutions to the Wrong Problems", in *Journal of Refugee Studies* Vol. 13, No. 4. pp. 356-373.

Bickman, L ; Rog, D. & Hedrick, T. 1998. "Applied Research Design" in Bickman, L. & Rog, J. *Handbook of Applied Social Research Methods*. London: Sage Publications, pp 1-37

Bulcha, M. 1988. *Flight and Integration Causes of Mass Exodus from Ethiopia and Problems of Integration in the Sudan*. Motala Grafiska: Sweden.

Burgess, R. G. , 1984. *In the Field: An Introduction to Field Research*. London: Allen & Unwin

Clark, J. & Causer, G. 1991. "Introduction: Research Strategies and Decisions", in Allan, G. & Skinner, C.(eds.) *Handbook for Research Students in Social Sciences*. London: The Falmer.

Community Agency For Social Enquiry (CASE). 2001. *Realising Rights: The development of health and welfare policies for asylum seekers and refugees in South Africa*. Braamfontein: CASE.

Community Agency For Social Enquiry (CASE). 2003. *National Refugee Baseline Survey: Final Report*. Braamfontein: CASE.

Crisp, J. 2000. "Africa's Refugees: Patterns, Problems and Policy Challenges", in *Journal of Contemporary African Studies*, Vol.18: 2

Crush, J (ed). 2001. *Immigration, Xenophobia and Human Rights in South Africa*. Cape Town: SAMP.

Crush, J. & Mcdonald, D. 2000. "Transnationalism, African Immigration, and New Migrant Spaces in South Africa: An Introduction", in *Canadian Journal of African Studies*. Vol. 34 (1) pp. 1- 19

Crush, J. & Williams, V. 2002 *Evaluating Refugee Protection in South Africa*. SAMP Migration Policy Brief No. 7

Danso, R. and McDonald, D. 2000. *Writing Xenophobia: Immigration And The Press In Post- Apartheid South Africa*, Cape Town: SAMP.

De La Hunt, L. 1998. "Refugees and Immigration Law in South Africa", in Crush J (ed) *Beyond Control: Immigration And Human Rights In A Democratic South Africa*. Cape Town: SAMP, pp. 123- 148

De La Hunt, L. 2002. *Tracking Progress: Initial Experiences With The Refugees Act, 130 Of 1998.* Unpublished Document, Researched For The National Consortium For Refugees Affairs.

Department of Home Affairs "Total Number of Applications at Braamfontein Refugee Office" 10 January 2002

Dona, G. and Berry, J. W. 1999. "Refugee acculturation and re- acculturation", in Ager, A. (ed) *Refugees Perspectives on the Experience of Forced Migration*. London: Cassell, pp. 169- 195

Electronic Mail & Guardian, 14 September 1998

European Council on Refugees and Exiles (ECRE). 1992. *Bridges and Fences: Refugee Perception of Integration in the European Union*. Unpublished Document.

Eyber, C. 2004. "Forced migrant children and youth in Johannesburg", in Landau, L. (ed.) *Forced Migrants in the New Johannesburg: Towards a Local Government Response*. Unpublished book of the Forced Migration Studies Programme, Wits University

Favell, A 2001. *Philosophies Of Integration: Immigration and the Idea of Citizenship In France and Britain*. New York: Palgrave.

Frank-Nachmias, C. & Nachmias, D. 1996. *Research Methods In The Social Sciences: Fifth Edition*. London: St. Martin Press.

Frelick, B. 2001. "Secure and Durable Asylum", in U.S. Committee for Refugees *World Refugee Survey 2001*. USA: Immigration and Refugee Services of America, pp. 42-55

Geddo, B. 2001. "Durable Solutions to the Refugee Problem: UNHCR's Regional Strategy in Southern Africa", in Handmaker, J et al. (eds) *Perspective on Refugee Protection in South Africa*. Pretoria: Lawyers for Human Rights, pp. 65- 72

Goodwin- Gill, G. 1998. *The Refugee In International Law* Second Edition. New York: Oxford University Press.

Gorman, R. 1987. *Coping with Africa's Refugee Burden: A Time for Solutions*. Netherlands: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.

Groot, F. 2004. "Challenges of the UNHCR's programme for urban refugees in South Africa", in Landau, L. (ed.) *Forced Migrants in the New Johannesburg: Towards a Local*

Government Response. Unpublished book of the Forced Migration Studies Programme, Wits University

Harrell-Bond, B. E. 1986. *Imposing Aid: Emergency Assistance to Refugees.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Harris, B. 2001. *A Foreign Experience Violence, Crime and Xenophobia during South Africa's transition*. Johannesburg: Kaye Falconer Dragonfly Design.

Hathaway, J. 2001. "Temporary Protection of Refugees: Threat or Solution?", in Handmaker, J. et al (eds.) *Perspectives on Refugee Protection In South Africa*. Pretoria: Lawyers for Human Rights. Pp. 41- 49

Henry, G. 1998. "Practical Sampling", in Bickman, L. & Rog, D. (eds) *Handbook of Applied Social Research Methods*. London: Sage Publications, pp. 101- 126

Hlobo, R. 2001. "Fighting Xenophobia", in *Servir* No. 23 - October 2001. Rome: Jesuit Refugee Service, pp. 10- 11

Holloway, I. 1997. *Basic Concepts for Qualitative Research*, Oxford: Blackwell Science ltd.

Homan, R. 1991. *The Ethics of Social Research*, New York: Longman Inc.

Honigmann, J.J., 1982, "Sampling in Ethnographic Fieldwork", in Burgess, R. *Field Research: A Source Book and Field Manual*, London: Allen & Unwin.

http//www.cia.gov/cia/publications/factbook/geos/cg.html

http//www.lcweb2.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query

Human Rights Committee (HRC). 2000. *Xenophobia- the new racism*, South Africa: HRC

Human Rights Committee. 2001. *HRC Quarterly Review*, Johannesburg: Printed Matter.

Human Rights Watch. 1998. "*Prohibited Persons" Abuse of Undocumented Migrants, Asylum Seekers, and Refugees in South Africa*, New York: Human Rights Watch.

Independent Online. 2001. "Du Noon residents demand refugees' departure" in http://www.iol.co.za

Jacobsen, K. 2001. *The forgotten solution: Local Integration for Refugees in Developing Countries,* Unpublished.

Korac, M. 2002. "The role of state in refugee integration and settlement: Italy and the Netherlands compared", in Coudley, M & Morris, T. *Forced Migration Review14*, Refugee Study Centre: Oxford. Pp. 30- 31.

Kuhlman, T. 1991. "The economic Integration of Refugees in Developing Countries: A Research Model", in *Journal of Refugee Studies* Vol. 4 No.1, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Landau, L. & Jacobsen, K. 2004. "Refugees in the new Johannesburg", in Coudley, M & Morris, T. *Forced Migration Review19*, Oxford: Refugee Study Centre. Pp. 44 - 46

Lewis, J. 2003. "Design Issues", in Ritchie, J. & Lewis, J. (eds.) *Qualitative Research Practice: A Guide for Social Science Students and Researchers*, London: Sage Publications Ltd, pp. 47 - 76

Lewis, J. & Ritchie, J. 2003. "Generalising from Qualitative Research", in Ritchie, J. & Lewis, J. (eds.) *Qualitative Research Practice: A Guide for Social Science Students and Researchers*, London: Sage Publications Ltd, pp. 263 - 286

Lewis, M. 2002. "Focus Group Interviews In Qualitative Research: A Review Of Literature", in **http://www.scu.edu.au/schools/**

MacDonald, F. 2001. "Why is Humanitarian Action Often a Substitute for a Lack of Political Will?", in *International Migration Review* Vol. 35, Spring 2001

Majodina, Z. and Peberdy, S. 2000. *Finding A New Home? A Report On The Lives of Somali Refugees In Johannesburg*. Unpublished.

Mathias, H. & Gale, T. 1991. "Understanding a Research Degree", in Allan, G. & Skinner, C. (eds.). *Handbook for Research Students in the Social Sciences*, London: The Falmer Press

Mattes, R; Taylor, DM; Mcdonald, DA; Poore, A and Richmond, W. 1999. *Still Waiting For The Barbarians: SA Attitudes To Immigrants and Immigration*, Cape Town: SAMP.

Maxwell, J., 1996. *Qualitative Research Design: An Interactive Approach*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Morris, A. 1996. *Inner City Transition: A Case Study of Hillbrow, Johannesburg*, Unpublished PHD Thesis, University of the Witwatersrand.

Morris, A. 1999. *Bleakness and Light: Inner- City Transition in Hillbrow, Johannesburg*, Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press.

Muller, T. 1998. "Immigration and Urban Areas: The United States Experience", in *Immigrants, integration and cities: exploring the links*, Paris: OECD.

Mupedziswa, R. 1993. *Uprooted: refugees and social work in Africa*, Harare: JSDA.

Mupedziswa, R. & Makanya, S. 1992. *Governments, non- governmental organizations and refugee assistance in Southern Africa: the case of Zimbabwe*, Unpublished Paper, School of Social Work, University of Zimbabwe, Harare.

Musalo, K; Moore, J & Boswell, R 1997. *Refugee Law and Policy Cases and Materials*, Carolina Academic Press: Durham.

Oyewole, D. 2000. "An Unhappy Experience" in Lee, R. (ed) *BBC Focus on Africa Magazine*, Oct. – Dec. 2000. Essex: BBC.

Preston, R. 1999. "Researching Repatriation and Reconstruction: Who is researching What and Why?", in Black, R. and Koser, K. (eds.) *The End of the Refugee Cycle? Refugee Repatriation and Reconstruction*, Oxford: Berghahm Book, pp. 18- 36

Rees, T. 1991. "Ethical Issues", in Allan, G. & Skinner, C.(eds.) *Handbook for Research Students in Social Sciences*, London: The Falmer.

Republic of South Africa. 1996. *The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa*, Pretoria: Government Printers.

Republic of South Africa 1998. *The Refugee Act of South Africa, Act 130*, Government Gazette: Cape Town.

Ritchie, J.; Lewis, J. & Elam, G. 2003. "Designing and Selecting Samples", in Ritchie, J. & Lewis, J. (eds.) *Qualitative Research Practice: A Guide for Social Science Students and Researchers*, London: Sage Publications Ltd, pp. 77- 108

Ritchie, J. 2003. "The Applications of Qualitative Methods to Social Research", in Ritchie, J. & Lewis, J. (eds.) *Qualitative Research Practice: A Guide for Social Science Students and Researchers,* London: Sage Publications Ltd, pp. 24 - 46

Rogerson, C. 1997. *International Migration, Immigration Entrepreneurs and South Africa's Small Enterprise Economy*, Migration Policy Series No. 3, Cape Town: Southern African Migration Project.

Rutinwa, B. 1996a. "The Tanzanian Government's Response to the Rwandan Emergency", in *Journal of Refugee Studies* Vol. 9, No. 3. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 291- 302

Rutinwa, B. 1996b. "Beyond Durable Solutions: An Appraisal of the New Proposals for Prevention and Solution of the Refugee Crisis in the Great Lakes Region", in *Journal of Refugee Studies* Vol. 9, No. 3. Oxford: Oxford University Press: pp 312- 325

Sieber, J. E. 1998. " Planning Ethically Responsible Research", in Bickman, L. and Rog, D. J. (eds.) *Handbook Of Applied Social Research Methods*, London: Sage Publications Inc., pp. 127 –156

Singleton, R.; Straits, B. & Straits, M. 1993. *Approaches to Social Research 2nd Edition,* New York: Oxford University Press, Inc.

Slater, Frances. 1988. *Societies, Choices and Environments: Issues and Enquiries*, Unpublished Paper.

Smith, T. R 2003. *The Making of the 1998 Refugee Act: Consultation, Compromise and Controversy*. Unpublished MA Thesis, University of the Witwatersrand.

Snape, D. & Spencer, L. 2003. "The foundations of Qualitative Research", in Ritchie, J. & Lewis, J. (eds.) *Qualitative Research Practice: A Guide for Social Science Students and Researchers*. London: Sage Publications Ltd, pp. 1 - 24

Sommers, M. 2001. *Fear in Bongoland: Burundi Refugees in Urban Tanzania*, Oxford: Bergham Books.

Southern African Catholic Bishop's Conference (SACBC). 2001. *Our Responsibility Towards Refugees*, Unpublished paper, SACBC.

Stein, B. (1986). "Durable Solutions for Developing Country Refugees", in *International Migration Review* Vol. 2 No. 2

The Star, 14 March 2001

The Star, 2 May 2001

The Star, 9 April 2002

The Star, 10 October 2002

Timngum, D. 2001. *Socio- Economic Experiences of Francophone and Anglophone Refugees in South Africa: A Case Study of Cameroonian Urban Refugees in Johannesburg*, Unpublished MA Thesis, University of the Witwatersrand.

UNHCR 1950. *Statute of The Office of The United Nations High Commissioner For Refugees*. Geneva: UNHCR.

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

UNHCR 1969. *OAU Convention Governing the Specific Aspects of Refugee Problems in Africa*. Geneva: UNHCR.

UNHCR 1999. "Xenophobia on the rise", in *Refugees* Vol. 2 No. 115. Geneva: UNHCR.

UNHCR 2000. *Global Report 2000 Achievements and Impact*, Geneva: UNHCR.

UNHCR et al. *Protecting Refugees A Field-Guide For NGOs*, Geneva: UNHCR.

UNHCR Regional Directorate for Southern Africa 2001, "Summary of Refugee Numbers as at 30 April 2001" Unpublished paper, UNHCR.

UNHCR. 2002a. "Africa Fact Sheet", May 2002.

UNHCR. 2002b. Global Consultations on Protection 4th Meeting "Local Integration", UNHCR Unpublished paper.

UNHCR. 2003. *Framework for Durable Solutions for Refugees and Persons of Concern* Unpublished paper of the Core Group on Durable Solutions, May 2003

U.S. Committee for Refugees 2000. *World Refugee Survey 2000*, USA: Immigration and Refugee Services of America.

Valtonen, K. 1994. "The adaptation of Vietnamese Refugees in Finland", in *Journal of Refugee Studies*, Vol.7, No.1. pp. 63- 78

Westin, C. 1999. "Regional analysis of refugee movements: origins and responses", in Ager, A. (ed) *Refugee perspectives on the Experience of Forced Migration*, London: Cassell, pp. 24 – 25

Yousif, T. 2001. "Integration or alienation?", in eds. Couldrey, M. and Morris, T. *Forced Migration Review 10*, Oxford: Refugee Study Centre.

Zetter, R. 1999. "International perspectives on refugee assistance", in Ager, A. (ed) *Refugee perspectives on the Experience of Forced Migration*, London: Casssell, pp. 46 - 82

APPENDICES

Appendix A

LIST OF INTERVIEWED SERVICE PROVIDERS

Ms. Abeda Bhamjee	Wits University Law Clinic
Sr. Ameli	Catholic Diocese of Johannesburg
Mr. Tarick Muftic	UNHCR
Sr. Cathy Murugan	Jesuit Refugee Service (Johannesburg Office)
Mr. Nkululeko Ntaka	DHA (Johannesburg Refugee Reception Centre)

Appendix B

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR REFUGEE YOUTH

1. Demographics

1.1 Sex: Male/ Female
1.2 Age
1.3 Where were you living in Congo and before you came to South Africa? (Urban/ Rural)
1.4 How long have you been in South Africa?
1.5 Why did you choose South Africa?
1.6 Where are you living in Johannesburg?
1.7 With whom are you living here in Johannesburg?
1.8 Do you go to school? If yes, where?
1.9 Do you wish to return to Congo or to live anywhere else? Why?

2. Interaction with South Africans

2.1 Who are your friends at school and at home? (Congolese, South African or Other)
2.2 Why did you choose them as your friends?
2.3 Do you have any South African friends? Why not? If no.
2.4 How did you meet them?
2.5 When do you interact or socialise with them and where?
2.6 What sort of activities do you do with them?
2.7 Do you visit their homes and do they visit your home? What is the parents' attitude and does it affect you?
2.8 What languages do you speak at home and is there any pressure from parents to speak certain languages?
2.9 Do you speak any of the South African languages? Why?

3. Attitude towards South Africans

3.1 What do you think of South Africans?
3.2 Do you feel accepted by South Africans? Why?
3.3 Do you have any good experiences from South Africans?
3.4 What could make you feel as a part of this country?

4. Xenophobia

4.1 Do you ever feel that you are treated badly because you are a refugee or not a South African?

4.2 Do you feel that you are safe in Johannesburg? Why? Why not?
4.3 Do you think South Africans accept refugees? Why? Why not?
4.4 Do you sometimes feel you are treated badly because you are not South African? How?
4.5 Anything else you would like to say about your experiences in South Africa and interacting with South Africans?

5. Integration

5.1 Do you want to integrate into, or become part of the South African community?
5.2 How do you want to integrate into this community?
5.3 In what ways do you want to integrate?
5.4 How far do you want to integrate?
5.5 Where do you want to live in the future?
5.6 Who do you think is responsible for the integration of refugees?

6. Religion

6.1 Are you practicing any religion?
6.2 Do you have South Africans at your place of worship?
6.3 Do you have any relationship (Formal and Informal) with them? Elaborate.
6.4 What role, if any, does your religion play in helping you become part of local community?

Appendix C

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR REFUGEE ADULTS

1. Demographics

1.1 Sex and Age?
1.2 Marital status?
1.3 Where were you living in Congo and what was the Population? Urban/ Rural?
1.4 Were you employed or self- employed and what was your job?
1.5 Are you employed in Johannesburg? If yes, what is your job?
1.6 Which level of education did you achieve in Congo?
1.7 Did you live anywhere else before coming to South Africa?
1.8 Why did you choose South Africa?
1.9 What were your plans when you arrived in South Africa?

i) To stay
ii) To resettle
iii) To remain until it is safe to return to Congo

1.10 When did you arrive in: i) South Africa?
ii) Johannesburg?

1.11 Where are you living in Johannesburg? Why there?
1.12 Would you like to live anywhere else in Johannesburg? Why?
1.13 Do you wish or planning to return back to Congo or to settle in South Africa? Why?

2. Interaction with South Africans

2.1 How often do you interact with South Africans?
2.2 Do you have South African friends?
2.3 How did you become friends or start interacting?
2.4 In what ways do you interact with South Africans?
2.5 How often do you go to South African social events like weddings, funerals etc.? Why?
2.6 Do you speak any of the South African languages? Why?

3. Attitude towards South Africans

3.1 What do you think of South Africans in general?
3.2 Do you think South Africans have accepted the presence of refugees in Johannesburg? Why?
3.3 Do you perceive South African politicians and community leaders to be promoting acceptance and local integration of refugees?
3.4 Do you think the South African community knows and understand why Congolese refugees are in South Africa?

4. Attitude towards the government

4.1 How long did it take you to be granted refugee status?
4.2 Was the process of applying fair and simple or were there problems?
4.3 Do you have any comments about the application process?
4.4 Is your refugee status helpful in terms of having access to services? Which Services, if any?
4.5 Do you think the Department of Home Affairs is helpful in trying to facilitate refugee integration by issuing the necessary documents?
4.6 Do you think the government, including municipalities, is helping refugees integrate into local communities?

5. Xenophobia

5.1 AGENTS OF THE STATE
5.1.1 Do you think the Police or government officials have treated you badly or unfairly because you are not South African? Why?
5.1.2 Do you feel that in Johannesburg you are free from danger and victimization, either by the Police and other government officials?
5.1.3 Have you ever had any interaction with the Police or any government official?
5.1.4 How do you see the role of the Police in protecting refugees?
5.1.5 Have you ever been attacked or abused because you are not a South African?

5.2 PUBLIC
5.2.1 Do you think civilians have treated you unfairly because you are not a South African?
5.2.2 Do you feel free from danger and victimization from civilians?
5.2.3 Have you ever felt victimized or been attacked by civilians? How did it make you feel?
5.2.4 What has been you contribution in trying to combat xenophobia in your community?

6. Integration

6.1 Do you want to integrate into the South African community?
6.2 How do you want to integrate into this community?
6.3 In what ways do you want to integrate?
6.4 How far do you want to integrate?
6.5 Where do you want to live in the future?
6.6 Who do you think is responsible for the integration of refugees?
6.7 What do you see as the advantages and disadvantages of integration?

7. Perception of Integration

7.1 Do you see local integration as a solution to refugee problems? How?
7.2 What do you think would help refugees integrate easily in South Africa and in Johannesburg?
7.3 Is there anything that you think should be done to help refugees integrate into local communities?

i) What is it?
ii) Who should do it?
iii) Anything that refugees could do?
iv) Anything that South Africans could do?

7.4 Do you think the assistance you get from NGOs help you to be able to integrate?
7.5 How do you think NGO's could help you to integrate?

8. Religion

8.1 Are you practicing any religion?
8.2 Do you have South Africans at your place of worship?
8.3 Do you have any relationship (Formal and Informal) with them? Elaborate.
8.4 What role, if any, does your religion play in helping you become part of local community?

Appendix D

QUESTINNAIRE FOR SERVICE PROVIDERS

1. How do you perceive local integration as a durable solution for refugees in South Africa? Why? Is it feasible for Congolese refugees in Johannesburg?
2. Is there willingness or acceptance by the government, local community and refugees to facilitate local integration? If so what is happening? If not, where is the problem?
3. In their 2000 Global Report, the UNHCR asserted that acceptance of refugee presence in South Africa is still rare.
    a. Would you agree with this assertion? Why? Why not?
    b. What is your impression of the situation? Why?
4. a. What is the attitude of schools on refugee children?
   b. How does this attitude affect, if it does affect, local integration?
5. Do you perceive South African politicians and community leaders to be promoting acceptance and local integration of refugees?
6. Do you as a service provider see local integration as a possible durable solution for refugees in Johannesburg? Why?
7. What do you perceive as the role of religion in helping refugees integrate? Is religion helping refugees integrate?
8. Is there any form of social interaction between the local community and refugees? What are the factors that promote or inhibit the interaction between the two communities?
9. Do you think Congolese refugees are willing or trying to integrate into the community?
10. Any other comments that you may have about local integration in South Africa and Johannesburg, specifically?

Appendix E

UNIVERSITY OF THE WITWATERSRAND, JOHANNESBURG

GRADUATE SCHOOL FOR HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

FORCED MIGRATION STUDIES PROGRAMME

INFORMED CONSENT FORM: REFUGEES

This document is to confirm my voluntary participation in the Masters research of Mr. Rampeoane Hlobo entitled **" Local integration as a durable solution: the study of Congolese refugees in Johannesburg."**

It is my understanding that the objective of the study is to examine the social interaction of Congolese refugees in Johannesburg and their willingness to integrate in the local community, how secure do they feel and their participation in local community activities. The Research is being supervised by Dr. Sally Peberdy, a doctor of Geography and Professor Roderick Mupedziswa, a professor of forced Migration Studies at the University of Witwatersrand.

My participation in this research is voluntary and at my own convenience. It is a narration of my experiences as a refugee and answering of questions that I feel comfortable to answer. I understand that I am not obliged to answer any question and I can stop participating in the research at any time I feel like doing so. I understand and agree that the interview be recorded. I also agree and understand that the results of the research may be published.

The above agreement have been clearly explained to me by Mr. Hlobo, I have read and understood what is being asked of me and I agree to participate in the research.

Participant's signature: _____

Researcher's signature: _____

Date: _____

Appendix F

UNIVERSITY OF THE WITWATERSRAND, JOHANNESBURG

GRADUATE SCHOOL FOR HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

FORCED MIGRATION STUDIES PROGRAMME

INFORMED CONSENT FORM: SERVICE PROVIDERS

This document is to confirm my voluntary participation in the Masters research of Mr. Rampeoane Hlobo entitled **" Local integration as a durable solution: the study of Congolese refugees in Johannesburg."**

It is my understanding that the objective of the study is to examine the social interaction of Congolese refugees in Johannesburg and their willingness to integrate in the local community, how secure do they feel and their participation in local community activities. The Research is being supervised by Dr. Sally Peberdy, a doctor of Geography and Professor Roderick Mupedziswa, a professor of forced Migration Studies at the University of Witwatersrand.

My participation in this research is voluntary and at my own convenience. It is a narration of my experiences as a Service Provider and answering of questions that I feel comfortable to answer. I understand that I am not obliged to answer any question and I can stop participating in the research at any time I feel like doing so. I understand and agree that the interview be recorded. I also agree and understand that the results of the research may be published.

The above agreement have been clearly explained to me by Mr. Hlobo, I have read and understood what is being asked of me and I agree to participate in the research.

Participant's signature: _____

Researcher's signature: _____

Date: _____

Appendix G

UNIVERSITY OF THE WITWATERSRAND, JOHANNESBURG

GRADUATE SCHOOL FOR HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

FORCED MIGRATION STUDIES PROGRAMME

TAPE- RECORDING CONSENT FORM

I grant Mr. Rampeoane Hlobo who is conducting a research on Congolese refugees as part of the requirements for his Masters of Arts degree in Forced Migration Studies, under the supervision of Dr. Sally Perberdy and Prof. Roderick Mupedziswa of the University of the Witwatersrand, permission to tape record my participation in this interview.

Participant's signature:_____

Researcher's signature:_____

Date: _____