A home away from home?

An exploration of the humanitarian ideas inherent in Uganda's Refugee Policy.

Master Thesis, International Development Studies

Roskilde University

Lasse Juhl Morthorst, 56546 & Julie Marit Hinze Nielsen, 46283

Supervisor: Jacob Rasmussen

Submission date: 02/01 - 2018

Characters: 239.996

Abstract

This thesis explores the contested concept of humanitarianism, along with the manifestation of the humanitarian ideas, in the context of contemporary global refugee responses. As a result of the insufficient solutions to the prevailing European refugee crisis, characterised by protracted encampment, policy makers have, turned their inspirational glance towards the exceptional Ugandan policy framework - The Refugees Act 2006. Based on three empirical pillars; the Refugees Act 2006, the praising narrative created by Western media, and fieldwork conducted in Uganda in October 2017, this thesis investigates what humanitarian ideas the Act exemplifies, and how these are manifested in the midst of contemporary refugee crisis. By moving between the conceptual framework and the three empirical pillars, a nuanced analysis is unfolded, emphasising how the empowering ideas of the Refugees Act 2006, are paradoxically balancing on the conceptual lines between limitations and possibilities. The study reveals how the exceptionality of the policy framework is questionable, but is closer to obliging the acclaimed universality of the 1951 Geneva Convention, than Western humanitarian responses. The proximity of the complex humanitarian manifestations, are echoing global tendencies, which is affecting humanitarianism, into a fragmented plural phenomenon, influencing and influenced by, local responses to present crises.

Resúme

Specialet udforsker humanitarismebegrebet som polemisk koncept, sideløbende med manifestationerne af de humanitære idéer, inden for præsent global flygtningepolitik. Som følge af utilstrækkelige europæiske løsningsmodeller, på den aktuelle langvarige flygtningekrise, har politikere og meningsdannere vendt blikket mod globale alternativer, hvor Ugandas politiske idégrundlag er kommet i søgelyset – the Refugees Act 2006. Med udgangspunkt i tre empiriske søjler; the Refugees Act 2006, det roste narrativ, skabt af den vestlige presse og feltarbejde udført i Uganda i oktober 2017, vil specialet undersøge hvilke humanitære idéer Akten eksemplificere, og hvordan disse er manifesteret, set i lyset af den igangværende globale flygtningekrise. Ved at bevæge sig imellem de konceptuelle rammer, og de tre nævnt empiriske søjler, vil specialet udfolde en nuanceret analyse, der understreger hvordan selvhjælpsidéerne fra Akten, paradoksalt balancerer på de konceptuelle linjer imellem

begrænsninger og muligheder. Studiet viser, hvordan validiteten af den exceptionelle ugandiske flygtningepolitik, hviler på et tvivlsomt grundlag, men er tættere på at overholde det universalistiske konventionelle retsgrundlag fra Genevekonventionen, end andre vestlige humanitære aktioner. Proksimiteten af de komplekse humanitære manifestationer afspejler globale tendenser, hvilke påvirker og omdanner humanitarisme til et fragmenteret og flertydigt fænomen, der i sidste ende influerer og er influeret af, lokale tilgange til krisesituationer.

Acknowledgements

Our brothers are coming home.
(Appendix 8, 82)

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

2017 marked the sixth year of the Syrian refugee crisis that along with the migration caused by the beginning of the Second Civil War in Libya in 2014, are mayor struggles for the European Union and for many Middle Eastern countries, which are still trying to find durable solutions to the continuous influx of refugees (UNHCR 2014a; Bajekal 2015; Pinella 2017). These solutions have so far been characterised by insufficient, individually developed, national deterrence policies, and local containment (Lemberg-Pedersen 2016). Simultaneously, East Africa has been exposed to increasing regional conflict. Of these, the Second Civil War in South Sudan has resulted in an enormous amount of displacement, with people seeking refuge, by trying to make their way across the Southern border, to the Republic of Uganda (Uganda). The vast influx, and the handling hereof by the Ugandan authorities, has been portrayed internationally as extraordinary and humane.

1.1 Contextualising the crisis

The language and narrative of humanitarianism have been in the centre of media, political, and academic debates, regarding the large amount of migrants, attempting to reach the European borders. In the summer of 2014, the situation officially reached the designation of a refugee- or humanitarian crisis[1], after several migrants had drowned in their attempt to cross the Mediterranean Sea (Fleming 2015). When the notorious refugee camp in Calais in France, *the Jungle*, was dismantled in October 2016[2], it can be said, to mark the serious failure of the humanitarian response to refugee- and migrant policies of EU. The dismantlement brought forward, the contemporary omnipotent rhetoric regarding the global refugee crisis.

The European refugee crisis critically places humanitarianism in the midst of politics and regulations (Ticktin 2014: 274). These politics and regulations are shaped by the fact that *every historical turn has had its effect on humanitarianism* (Barnett 2011: 227). The specific historical turn, relevant to this thesis, began in 2011, when Syrian migrants fled from the outbreak of the civil war, towards Europe (Miliband 2015: 60).

---

[1] Both Antonio Guterres (UN High Commissioner for Refugees) and David Miliband (President for the International Rescue Committee), emphasised this designation. Edwards (2014): Miliband and Albright (2015)

[2] Elisabeth Weisswange in Huffington Post (2016), "How the Dismantling of the Jungle in Calais Became a Sad Example of Fortress Europe - Observations From a Volunteer"

By 2016, the European Union made a historic decision, about containing refugees in Turkey and Greece, with the help of NATO's naval capabilities (NATO 2016). A political decision linked to the European policy of migration management, which, as professor Martin Lemberg-Pedersen argues, turns into an international mirror-image, where the responsibility of receiving refugees, is aimed to be passed on to other states (Lemberg-Pedersen 2016). The European refugee approach, can to a large extent, be characterised as a *protracted refugee situation* (UNHCR 2001: 1), which according to the UN Refugee Agency's (UNHCR) Global Consultations Protection in 2001, is a refugee situation where:

[...] over time, there have been considerable changes in refugees' needs, which neither UNHCR nor the host country have been able to address in a meaningful manner, thus leaving refugees in a state of material dependency and often without adequate access to basic rights (e.g. employment, freedom of movement and education) even after many years spent in the host country (ibid.: 2).

This type of situation, is closely coined to refugee- deterrence, containment, or 'warehousing', which historian and editor for the World Refugee Survey (2004), Merril Smith, is calling *the fourth de facto and all-too-durable refugee solution*[3] (Smith 2004: 38). Encampment can be seen as a *dispositif* (Turner 2015: 144), – a political device or instrument, which breaks with the neutrality inherent in the universalistic humanitarian principles. It is further an instrument, which clarifies the double-sided humanitarian identity, creating a narrative, and a paradigmatic humanitarian crisis, anchored in a complex combination of a humanitarian strive for universality, and an interest-filled organisational fragmentation, which is dominating contemporary global governance, and the refugee crisis (Ticktin 2014: 279; Agier 2010: 31-32).

This development is depicting the need for new solutions, in order to respond to one of the most widespread and fastest growing humanitarian crises, in recent history. The crisis in South Sudan has resulted in more than one million people crossing the border into Uganda (Robinson 2017; UNHCR 2017d). The response to this influx can, contextually, be depicted as diametrical from Western tendencies, regarding its openness and solidarity. Since the contemporary European refugee crises are on the lips of everyone - politicians, the media,

---

[3] UNHCR promotes three durable solutions for refugees as part of its core mandate: voluntary repatriation, local integration, and resettlement (UNHCR 2016c: 186).

academia, and publicly - the Ugandan example, seems to represent an individually developed story of humanitarian success.

1.1.1 The phenomenon of Humanitarianism

The phenomenon of humanitarianism is fluid, highly polemic, and has been vastly debated, as the concept has gone through a definitional, practical, and paradigmatic evolution, according to the changing historical and societal global landscape. This, from ancient history, through the initial universal definitions of International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), neutrality and impartiality, the following laws implemented in the Geneva Convention (1951), and the establishment of the UNHCR in 1951, to the complex and fragmented globalised body of multiple ideas, interests, and actors of today. Different historical conflicts have demanded different solutions, and the definitional debates about humanitarianism's changeable size, have been affected by, and suffered from, this evolution. The principles of the ICRC were seriously challenged under the Biafran War in Nigeria, which along with the international humanitarian inactivity during the genocide in Rwanda, paved the way for a politicised post-Cold War critical questioning, of the universal principles (Davies 2012; Barnett: 2011; Ticktin 2014). Humanitarianism has become a complex fragmented 'project', where it is hard to distinguish the doing good from doing bad. The literature on historicist, theoretical, and philosophical notions, regarding humanitarianism, emphasise how the inherent debates are revolving around sharp tensions and differences, between universality and particularity, inclusion and exclusion, the global and the local. In other words, there is a strong relation between equality and inequality, manifested in the frictions between humanitarian implementation and manifestations, and the universal equality, regarding the principles of humanitarianism.

The international humanitarian society and politicians, are standing at a crossroads - a humanitarian paradigm crisis, shaped by a dysfunctional and ineffective humanitarian sector – through the historical exemplifications, and regarding the contemporary European refugee crisis (Hoffmann 2016: 1). What seems necessary is a re-imagination of humanitarianism, as one of the central changes in the humanitarian paradigm is, the historical evolutionary development, from humanitarianism striving to be neutral and apolitical, into the vastly political and fragmented landscape of interests, actors, and politics today.

1.1.2 Humanitarianism – a paradigm crisis?

Humanitarianism has changed, from the neutral inactivity during the Biafran War and the Genocide in Rwanda, to the present politicised contemporary emergency responses, where humanitarian seems to *subordinate needs-based humanitarianism to strategic, political and military objectives and eroded the ability to provide impartial assistance* (Millis 2011: 161-183 in Gordon and Donini 2016: 86). Contemporary humanitarianism holds a double-sided identity, representing universalistic solidarity of a common humanitarian operationalisation on one side, and a politico-economic instrumentalist agenda, on the other (Agier 2010: 31). The friction between the two directions, arise from an increasing incompatibility between the offered responses by the international humanitarian community, and the experienced growing problematic manifestations. The crisis stems from an increasing critique of actual humanitarian performances, which challenges the core ICRC principles, and the need for a 'reformation' of the paradigm (Hoffmann 2016: 1; Donini and Gordon 2016: 88). This needed reformation should build its foundation, on a combination of responses to immediate emergency needs, and a more developmental and long-term oriented strengthening - the 'Humanitarian-Development Nexus'[4]. The aim is to strengthen local structures and personal empowerment, inclusion and enforcement of specific population's capacities, protection, promotion of human rights, and gender issues (ibid.; Act 2006; New York Declaration 2016; Ticktin 2014: 62; Malkki 1995). In other words, the promise of a 'new paradigm', is striving to move beyond the 'short-term life saving actions', into empowerment, and thereby mitigate emergency relief and long-term development.

1.1.3 The New York Declaration - A new global approach?

On September the 19th. 2016, 193 member states of the United Nations, gathered at the UN Summit for Refugees and Migrants, to discuss a better international response to the mass influx' of refugees (UN 2017a). During this Summit, the Member States agreed, by

---

[4] *The initiative builds on growing recognition that humanitarian, development, and peacebuilding efforts are complementary and need to reinforce each other, to respond to volatile situations around the world. Although humanitarian crises demand urgent response, the international community has called on development institutions like the World Bank Group (WBG) to provide longer-term, socio-economic solutions, engaging earlier to prevent violent conflict and reduce humanitarian need. This initiative is a priority for the WBG as a way to tackle the challenge of fragility and forced displacement through collective action* (World Bank 2017c).

consensus, on a global approach, the New York Declaration for Refugees and Migrants, expressing political will to save lives, protect human rights, and the share of responsibility on a global scale (UN 2017b). It is acknowledged how the response to the rampant displacements of people has been inadequate, and as a result the New York Declaration opt for a more predictable and comprehensive response to the crisis, known as the Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework (CRRF). The Self-Reliance Strategy (SRS) developed by UNHCR since the 1960s, is the ground stone for this recent, more liberal, and progressive CRRF refugee initiative. The European Commissioner for Humanitarian Aid and Crisis Management, Christos Stylianides, expressed in a speech at the follow-up Solidarity Summit in Kampala, in June this year:

I stand here before you today, in humble admiration. You have received refugees like friends and neighbours from 13 countries in the region. We are here today to reaffirm our solidarity with a nation that keeps its doors open for those seeking sanctuary from violence, hatred and hunger. We applaud you for being inspired by your past. Only a few decades ago, it was Ugandans who sought refuge across the world from violence and fear. You have not forgotten. Your Excellencies, The EU stands firmly behind the goals set in New York last September. We are actively supporting the development of the new CRRF for Uganda and pledges to support its implementation. Solidarity requires action. The European Union is Uganda's most generous development partner, with current combined commitments over the 2014 – 2020 period standing at over eight hundred 800 million euro (Solidarity Summit 2017).

In order to find durable solutions to the present refugee crisis, and the challenges inherent in the humanitarian paradigm crisis, the international institutions have 'been forced' to turn their inspirational glance away from the ineffective Western-centric responses to humanitarian action, which have been insufficient. An increasing Western interests in the SRS initiatives, has resulted in Western politics and media are turning their gaze towards the Ugandan policy framework - the Refugees Act 2006 (the Act).

1.1.4 The policy framework and the Ugandan way.

Approximately 65,6 million people globally have been forced to escape their homes, close to 22,5 million are refugees, and displacement situations will continuously increase (UNHCR

2017a). Since global displacement has grown, mass migrations dominate the political sphere on a global scale, and the development of the New York declaration is accordingly trying to respond to this displacement, by mitigating the Humanitarian-Development Nexus. This Nexus manifest a new approach on refugees, aiming at bridging universal and political humanitarianism, focusing on collective outcomes (World Bank 2017c). Africa is one of the continents experiencing the highest number of refugees, and is currently hosting more than 5.6 million, Uganda is currently hosting and helping refugees from across the continent (UNHCR 2016a: 1). Refugee settlements are scattered between nine Ugandan host districts, helping the refugee protection, and according to UNHCR, the refugee influx from South Sudan, has exceeded 1 million people, with refugees mainly settled in the northern regions of Uganda (Robinson 2017; UNHCR 2017d). These settlements are highly impacted by the humanitarian crisis in South Sudan, along with continuous inflows of refugees from Congo, Burundi, Somalia, Rwanda, Eritrea and Ethiopia, making Uganda the African country, hosting the largest number of refugees (Refugee and hope 2017).

In 2006 the Ugandan government passed the current refugee policy, the Act, based on the SRS[5] allowing refugees the right to pursue employment[6], freedom of movement[7], same social services as the local population (health care and education), to start their own business, and to

---

[5] The Self-Reliance Strategy (SRS) was officially inaugurated between 1998 and 1999, as a partnership project between the Government of Uganda and UNHCR, with a main focus on Northern Uganda (Meyer 2006). The idea of the strategy was to make it possible for refugees to become self-reliant, and to enhance regional development, in order to improve the general conditions for the populations in the region (ibid.).

[6] According to the Act, all refugees have the right to engage in agriculture, industry, handicrafts, and commerce and establish commercial and industrial companies in accordance with the applicable laws and regulations in force in Uganda (Act 2006: 5(29 (e(iv))), the right to practice the profession of the refugee who holds qualifications recognised by the competent authorities in Uganda and who wishes to practise that profession (ibid.(v)), and the right to have access to employment opportunities and engage in gainful employment (ibid. (vi)).

[7] In Uganda, refugees are granted freedom of movement, but they are though subject to, what are termed, reasonable restrictions, according to national security and public order (Act 2006: 5(30(2))). Freedom to movement is mainly coined to refugees whom are settled in urban areas. Refugees who wish to reside to other settlements, most grant an administrative permission to leave (ibid. 5(44(2))). It is however the Head of Security, Immigration, and Refugee Affairs Authority that designates what areas and places refugees will settle in (Act 2006: 4(21)).

settle and cultivate crops[8] on their own exclusive land. Refugees are considered as economic actors, concurrent in creating a future, rather than being merely victims and beneficiaries of humanitarian aid (World Bank, 2016a).

Contextualising the refugee crisis in the contemporary global world nuances the understanding of how humanitarianism is continuously negotiated and renegotiated. The international institutional community seems eager to find durable solutions to the present devastating humanitarian crisis, why alternatives and new approaches have made the way to the powerful international negotiations. One of these approaches is manifested in Uganda, with the development of the Ugandan Self-reliance strategy, and the implementation of the Act. From afar, this seems like an economic and humanitarian possibility to optimise the insufficient and costly, present approach.

1.2 Problem statement

This thesis aims at examining the humanitarian ideas inherent in the Ugandan approach, and how it differs from contemporary Western refugee responses. In order to clarify the elements of the Ugandan Policy Framework, an exploration of humanitarian ideas, and a wider understanding of humanitarianism, will be unfolded and elaborated on. The Western institutions are praising the progressive humanitarian exceptionality of the Act, and the humanitarian ideas it exemplifies. In order to explore these humanitarian positions, a problem statement has been developed:

How does the progressive/innovative Refugees Act 2006 manifest itself as a humanitarian project, as an idea and practically?

To answer the research question, this thesis elaborates on several issues, in reaching the final conclusion, and to narrow the scope, two sub-questions have been developed. The contemporary refugee crisis is explored to situate the Act in a global and contemporary

---

[8] The Act is providing refugees with the right own and lease movable property and land (Act 2006). The 2010 Regulations are elaborating on this, by stating that refugees also have the right to reside to *designated settlements* or *refugee areas* (Refugee Regulations 2010: 65, (1-2)).

context, comprehending the Western inspirational glance towards the Ugandan way of managing refugees.

1. *How can contemporary humanitarianism, and humanitarian tendencies, be understood?*

In order to understand the manifestations of the humanitarian ideas, the thesis will explore the phenomenon of humanitarianism, as well as different tendencies within the perception of refugees, and the refugee camp.

2. *How is the perception of humanitarianism manifested within the humanitarian space of a refugee camp, and how does this affect the common understandings of a refugee?*

After examining both the global context, as well as the responses to managing refugees in a universal humanitarian way, a more practical exploration of the refugees and the camp is elaborated on. These sub questions helps gradually narrowing the scope of the study, aiming towards deducing the problem statement.

1.2.1 Aim of research

This study is delving into the refugee crisis, by exploring the humanitarian tendencies exemplified in the Act. As unfolded, humanitarianism has changed, and is no longer positioned as a neutral or apolitical tool, to help those in need. Contemporary humanitarianism is multifaceted and ambiguous, representing a friction between the ideas of a universal common humanitarian operationalisation, while also being an instrument for political and economic agendas. Thus, by placing the Act in the centre of global refugee issues, it is lauded for being progressive, humane, as well as economically beneficial. Different theoretical concepts will be explored, to achieve a wide knowledge of humanitarianism and the perception of refugees, along with how the Ugandan refugee settlements are continuously linked to this. Within tensions between humanitarianism, refugees, and the refugee camp, a gap has been exposed. This thesis seeks to fulfil this gap, by answering the research question, regarding humanitarian manifestations, analysed across a set of different concepts. The Act, is globally praised and inscribed in a global political context, but a question of its conceptual and practical progressivity, arises. The case has been carefully selected, to explore and debunk its humanitarian ideas. By combining the Act with

patterns of specific manifestations, as well as the media-created narrative, the goal is to produce a general argument of humanitarian ideas, and shed light on the manifestations hereof. This thesis aims towards closing the research gap, by answering the question, along with studying the humanitarian tendencies closely linked to the practical manifestations. By connecting these two distinct areas of study, it is evident how the one is closely related to the other.

1.3 Delimitation and critical reflections

The study of the research question is based on three pillars; the Act, articles enhancing the praising narrative of the policy, and field studies conducted in Uganda. The thesis is not aiming to demonstrate or repudiate the veracity of the praising narrative, but rather explore the interpretations, representations, and manifestations of the Act, as being exceptionally humane.

Besides praising the Act, international media is questioning whether the policy is reaching a breaking point, due to the high refugee influx from South Sudan. This thesis is exploring humanitarian tendencies and not isolated events, why it is delimited from responding to the contemporary refugee crisis of this increasing influx, despite it being acknowledged and taken into consideration.

As this thesis aims towards gaining a wide understanding of the humanitarian core ideas that have formed the basis for the Act, it is delimited from unfolding a policy analysis, but rather study the tendencies, the phenomenon of humanitarianism, and the practical manifestations of these. The settlements are presented as an exceptionally humanitarian space, and humanitarianism is continuously discussed in relation to this space. Many different aspects of this can be studied, since the refugees, among other things, are allowed to travel freely across national borders. Certain humanitarian issues arise, when people cross borders as refugees, and cannot be protected by the regulations of the nation state. Simultaneously they are recognised refugees, as well as personas non grata. Positions like these are not analytically uncovered.

Different rhetorical positions are recognised, both within the perceptions of the refugee camp, as well as in relation to refugees. This thesis will not elaborate on a greater discursive

analysis, but are instead exploring how the rhetorical position affects the space and lives of the refugees.

1.4 Research design

This chapter presents an overview of the following content, to introduce the different chapters, chronologically ordered, structured with nine chapters, and appertaining subsections. Chapter one has been contextualising the thesis as well as presenting the problem statement and appertaining sub questions. To elaborate on how the empirical data is located and collected, chapter two is touching upon different methodological approaches, in order to assure the quality and limitations of the data. By employing readings and analysis of different textual material, along with field observations, it is allowing the study to approach both ideas and manifestations. Chapter three elaborates on the position of the Act in a historical context of Uganda, as well as the development of the policy. The historical overview, is presenting a number of significant periodic incidents, which have been part of creating both formal legislation, and normative perceptions, relevant for the case. The chapter is as well emphasising the emergence of the ideas of Self-Reliance Strategy, which evidently is taken up by the Ugandan government, as creating the foundation for the Act.

Exploring diverse positions of humanitarianism, refugees, and the camp, is creating a heuristic framework presented in chapter four. These concepts are shedding light on the phenomenon of humanitarianism, which help to clarify how humanitarianism is manifested. Chapter five is moving between different empirical sets of data, to explore the problem statement, focusing on enlightening inherent paradoxes and complexities that are manifested between ideas and practices. The humanitarian phenomenon has moulded, and has as a result of global fragmented interests, been positioned in a present existential paradigmatic crisis. These specific findings are discussed in chapter six, in a wider global context, to shed light on the position of the Act, manifesting its relevance. The seventh chapter is answering the research question along with unifying the analytical findings. Lastly, remarks and suggestions for further research relating to the findings of the thesis, is presented, emphasising how the conceptual understandings keeps developing and remains relevant.

2. Considerations of methodology

This chapter explores the methodological considerations that have been utilised, when studying the manifestations of the humanitarian ideas within the Refugees Act 2006.

The present European refugee crisis is continuously presented in the international media and political debates, as a result of the increasing influx across the European borders. The heated debate is criticising the treatment of migrants, who seem to be met by fear and prejudice, while living under severe conditions. When delving into this controversy, exploring different standpoints and articles, the Ugandan policy framework is praised for doing the opposite - keeping the door open, and welcoming the refugees (WFP 2017). An interest for the case of Uganda originated from this narrative, which resulted in an explorative reading of the Act, along with creating the foundation for the research question. To obtain a nuanced understanding of the context, the humanitarian tendencies, and to be able to study the practical manifestations of the humanitarian ideas, field studies were conducted in Uganda, in October 2017. In order to answer the research question, the case is illuminated and analytically based on the three fundamental pillars; the Refugees Act 2006, articles portraying a praising narrative, and the collected data from Uganda. These three pillars are forming the empirical objects, which helps elaborating on different humanitarian manifestations of the Act, as well as validating the analysed arguments. The exploration of the Act, is providing a thorough understanding of the legislative framework, the ideas and concepts inherent within, and is contextually positioning the case in regards to the contemporary refugee policies. The narrative, created by the international media, is illuminating the Act, and the exceptional perception from a third party perspective, contributing with insights into the contemporary global refugee challenges. The narrative is depicting the Ugandan example, in relation to global present tendencies. Field observations are exposing the practical manifestations, which lay the foundation for a more nuanced exploration and analysis of the problem statement - from political ideas and into the field. By analytically moving back and forth between the different representations of the positioned empirical data, an analytical prism is created, shedding light on, and constructing a thorough understanding of the ambiguous and polemic tendencies of humanitarianism. By cross-referencing the chosen pillars of empirical data, this thesis aims towards exploring the Act relating to contemporary society. These three pillars form the case, and have been carried out as a qualitative study. The case study is beneficial within the complex structures of the refugee crisis, which influenced by historical and social

dynamics, changes over time. This approach is appropriate for the exploring complex social scenarios, as it is allowing for different elements, dynamics and variables to emerge.

Based on the collected data, former approaches and opinions were explored. This formed the basis of the forthcoming section of humanitarianism, refugee- and camp studies, since ideas and earlier conducted research, can form the basis for intakes on *how to approach the world* (Lund 2014: 230). These explored notions, formed a heuristic framework, from which the empirical data is explored, and the framework constitutes a set of conceptual tools that question and interrogates the empirical phenomenon of humanitarianism (ibid.: 228). By moving through the conceptual framework, between specific, and general tendencies, a thorough comprehension of the multiple elements of the case is possible (ibid.: 231), This rendered it possible to equate the empirical data, exploring similarities and diversities across the data, resulting in a more thorough discussion and conclusion. The study of humanitarianism is ambiguous and abstract, and the case study aims at tracking and explaining the movement, back and forth between concrete manifestations and the abstract phenomena, explicitly operationalising the concept (ibid.: 225- 228).

The qualitative methods have its origin in humanities, and is based on a holistic understanding of the complex processes within the respective field of study, shedding light on the humanitarian ideas, which is helpful in capturing different local perspectives, as well as elucidating underlying significances, unexpected- and sensitive issues (Mayoux 2006: 117, 120). The study is investigating the phenomenon of humanitarianism and the appertaining manifestations. Professor Christian Lund is underscoring, how a case is not a natural and objectively observed phenomenon, but rather an analytical construct aiming to organise knowledge about reality in a certain way (Lund 2014: 224). It is not possible to free oneself from pre-understandings, since the researcher experience reality as it is lived. Lund draws on Kant's work, when underscoring how experience is interpreted through the lens of *a priori* concepts (ibid.: 226). To achieve a more generalised understanding of the phenomenon, and the appertaining research question, the iterative process of hermeneutics is useful, since observations become part of new experiences, which is creating a different understanding of *[...] a never-ending, iterative approximation between a priori concepts, cognition of "the world", and the formation of renewed a prioris* (ibid.). Due to the scope of this thesis, an abductive reading is utilised, grounding the theoretical understanding of the social worlds, and the context and participants, in the meanings and perspectives of the participants and their social worlds (Bryman 2012: 401). The study is affected by a priori, that is iteratively

developed, studying the worldview of the involved informants, as well as humanitarian manifestations.

The research is drawing on a range of phenomenological tendencies of studying phenomenons and subjective experiences (Zahavi 2012: 128). This philosophy is concerning participant's common sense, as well as interpretations of their social world, adding meaning, and acting on the basis of these interpretations (Bryman 2012: 30). This study is exploring these interpretations within a contextualised, and conceptual frame of concepts. Reflecting on this approach, three levels of interpretation are appearing, as the participants' interpretations of the social world is interpreted by the researcher, whom is interpreting these interpretations in relations to the employed concepts (Brymann 2012: 31).

Informal conversations and interviews with international consultants, researchers, journalists, and employees at non-governmental institutions, have assisted in gaining a wide understanding of the social worlds, the field, culture, contemporary crisis, and the policy. The case is to be understood as *an edited chunk of empirical reality where certain features are marked out, emphasized, and privileged while others recede into the background* (Lund 2014: 224).

2.1 Locating the articles used as empirical data

The prevailing European refugee crisis has resulted in the media praising the Act, as offering refugees a *Home Away From Home* (World Bank 2016a), invoking a curiosity for this case. The narrative of the policy as being exceptional, durable, and more humane than the Western treatment of refugees, has gained grounds after attracting the attention of Western media. Relating analytically to this narrative, a selection, based on ideas regarding impact, type, and topicality has been executed. The choice of articles, published by the World Bank and UNHCR, is primarily based on their large global impact within refugee matters. The World Bank is a vital source of financial and technical assistance to developing countries worldwide (World Bank 2017a), and UNHCR is both apparent within the settlements in Uganda, and as a global organisation, dedicated to save lives, protecting rights, and building a better future for the refugees (UNCHR 2017d). Both institutions are internationally established, and are relating positively to the Act, as well as having authority within refugee matters, which inevitably affects how the humanitarian ideas are manifested. The narrative and the perception created by these actors, are therefore of vital importance to take into account in the forthcoming analysis.

Guiding themes from these articles were located, to maintain direction according to the research question. These themes emerged: Humanitarian, Policy, Refugees, and Settlement. It rapidly became clear, how the narrative of the Act as especially progressive, is occupying the media in the West. Besides articles from the World Bank and UNHCR, articles from the Independent (Withnall 2017, Betts 2017), the Washington Post (Hattem 2017), Huffington Post (Woldemariam 2017), the Guardian (Patton 2016) Der Spiegel (Titz et al. 2017), and World Economic Forum (Kende-Robb 2017), are portraying a broad tendency in praising the Act, and the management of refugees in Uganda. These articles are representing one of the three pillars, taken into consideration, when analytically exploring the problem statement.

2.2 Studying the humanitarian ideas of the Refugees Act 2006

As presented, the interest for the Act arose in the light of an exploration of how the International media is focusing on the current European refugee crisis. The policy has been praised by internationally acclaimed organisations - the UNHCR (Hosseini 2017a, 2017b), and The World Bank (World Bank 2016a, 2016b), whom are highly involved in the practical constitution of the Act. Further, international commercial media, is focusing on the high influx of refugees, and the progressive approach for managing these, in Uganda. The Refugees Act 2006, is based on the SRS initiatives in Uganda, and can be found as the primary manifestation of the praised refugee treatment, setting precedent for studying the manifestations of the humanitarian ideas.

2.3 Field studies in Uganda

The field study took place in the Rwamwanja settlement in South-West Uganda, and to situate the geographic and historical arena of the forthcoming study, a descriptive presentation of the settlement is necessary. This thesis aims at studying the humanitarian tendencies as well as the manifestations of the very same, why some of the collected data from the field, was collected during a visit in the settlement.

2.3.1 Rwamwanja settlement

The Rwamwanja settlement was initially established to host Tutsi refugees, fleeing from Rwanda in 1964 (Betts et al. 2016: 3). Due to later mass repatriation of the same Tutsi population, the settlement closed in 1995, but re-opened again in 2012 to host Congolese refugees fleeing the fight between the M23 militia, and the government of the Democratic Republic of Congo (ibid.: 3-4).

[9]

The settlement is located in the South-western part of Uganda, more specifically in the Kamwenge district, 320 kilometres from Kampala. A long bus-drive on diverse, unpaved bumpy roads, takes you no further than Fort Portal - the nearest city to the Rwamwanja settlement. From here, it is only possible to reach the settlement by vehicles. The road leading the way is curvy, going through the lush green national park, Kibale. Monkeys are playing along the road, and windows are fogging due to the high air humidity. Turning left, down a small red-gravel road, the bumps gets bigger, forcing the vehicle to slow down. Another hour, or hour and a half of driving, and the settlement is reached. The Rwamwanja

---

[9] All photos are taken during the field trip to Uganda by Lasse and Julie. All rights reserved Lasse Juhl Morthorst and Julie Hinze Nielsen

settlement is 127,2 km^2, dividing about 65.000 housing refugees into 13 zones, with 46 villages, separating the respective ethnicities (Appendix 5, 91-93; UNHCR 2014b). When arriving to the settlement, 'the base' is located at the entrance, comprising an administrative zone, hosting mostly Office of Prime Minister (OPM) and UNHCR offices, along with non-governmental institutions, such as ICRC (Appendix 1; Betts et al. 2016: 4). A hilly landscape, and a mixture of vigorous green trees and crops, defines the topography of the settlement. When gazing over the landscape from a small hill, the settlement stretches as far as the eye can see, covering large green acres, villages scattered throughout the scenery, with a mixture of farming, residential and small businesses (Appendix 1; Betts et al. 2016: 4).

2.3.2 Conducting field studies

The refugee policy has undergone societal and historical changes, and the field study helps studying the tendencies about how the Act, and the humanitarian ideas are contemporarily manifested. The Act, and the field observations are analytical, and empirical objects and manifestations of humanitarian ideas. These objects are implemented and put into play between the local community, the refugees, and the established authority, which represent these manifestations. In accordance to Berth Danermark et al., the qualitative research is benefitting from studying a case in its natural environment, by understanding its particular signification (Danermark et al 2001: 158).

A range of semi-structured interviews, observations, along with informal conversations, is creating the foundation of the empirical data collected on the field trip. To detect underlying and unexpected meanings, the data collection was maintained open-ended, open to contours, and not restricted by, biased understandings before meeting the field, making it possible to let the theoretical concepts emerge out of the data (Bryman 2012: 12).

The aim was to gain insight into an understanding of the settlement, the management, and the lives of the refugees, but also of the cultures in Uganda, including the perception of refugees, the government and the field, of which the research takes its point of departure. The field trip was placed in the early phase of the study, and informal meetings and conversations, created an important entry as it helped in gathering information and ideas that directed the research. The foundation of the field research, is leaning towards an ethnographic study, which is originally associated with the investigation and confrontation of different cultures, emerging out of European tradition (Kees van Donge 2006: 179). When the unfolding of social life, is

studied, the ideal is not to be noticed, but accepted as a member of the social life (ibid.). Due to the limiting time period, such ideal was impossible to reach, but observations analytically put into play, along with the Act and the narrative, is helping shedding light on the tendencies of the humanitarian ideas. In order to understand the manifestation of the settlement and the exploration of the humanitarian ideas, a range of semi-structured interviews and conversations were completed with nationals, NGOs, local government officials, internationally involved employees, and refugees.

The thesis is not only an exploration of the Act, but as well an investigation of how the policy is implemented, manifested, and perceived by those it implicates. Observations were conducted among the people, in their own natural surroundings, which bring a dimension of experience to the thesis (Szulevicz in Brinkman et al. (2015): 83).

It was challenging not to attract attention, and gaining access to the settlements, created difficulties. To conduct research in Uganda, and to get permission to enter a refugee settlement, applications must be submitted to Office of the Prime Minister's in Kampala. Further an ethical clearance from the Uganda National Council for Science and Technology is needed. These difficulties are articulated by Bryman, who underscores how one of the most difficult steps, is gaining access to a social setting (Bryman 2012: 433). These bureaucratic processes, along with the limitations of the restricted period of time, made it almost unachievable, nearly ending the research before it began. By reaching out through social networks, a contact was established to the local NGO, Paul, in Fort Portal whom was willing to help. When visiting the Rwamwanja settlement together with Paul, he presented the research as being particular interested in the implementation of the policy. Paul acted as the sponsor, and it was possible to obtain permission, to talk to the Assistant Commander at the OPM, the ICRC, the Community Empowerment Agency Kamwenge-Ceaka, and a few refugees. Further, it was possible to take on an observant role, asking questions, and conducting interviews relating to the research question. Being accompanied by Paul, though restrained the activity and freedom to manoeuvre in the settlement, but it helped to gain insights into the processes, perceptions and implementations of the refugee policy. When visiting the Rwamwanja refugee settlement, it was possible to observe, do semi-structured interviews, and having informal conversations, resulting in the role being non-participating observers with interaction (Bryman 2012: 444). It is vital, to stay aware of the general role as a researcher, as co-constituting the reality of the research, why the empirical data is an edited chunk, enhancing certain features, while leaving others behind (Lund 2014: 224).

The field study resulted in five semi-structured interviews, along with five informal conversations with the Establishment in the settlement, refugees, and locals. Through interviews and informal conversations insights into life situations, opinions, point of views, and experiences, were attained.

2.3.3 Observations

Experiencing Uganda, writing notes, and observing, created a fundamental understanding and insights, into the culture, and practical part of the implementation of the Act, that in other ways would not have been possible to discover. During the observations, brief notes were taken, and they were expanded upon at the end of the day. These notes helped specifying key dimension and reflexive explanations of the observed settings (Bryman 2012: 447). Some of these are brought in to play in the forthcoming analysis, as it helps drawing out experiences of the spatial dimension, and allows the study of established perceptions of refugees and the settlement. Engaging with people within the settlement, when playing with the refugee kids at the school in Rwamwanja settlement, travelling with local transportation like boda boda motorcycles, or mini-bus taxis, was valuable and beneficial to the field of research. Observations also formed the basis for some questions asked during the informal conversations, to determine the validity of the observed reality. The observations had the purpose of understanding the informants' worlds, and studying the manifestations of the phenomenon of humanitarianism. By gaining insights into the everyday life in the settlement, and the perception of refugees, it was possible to investigate the manifestations.

2.3.4 Semi-structured interviews

The semi-structured interviews, took place both within the Rwamwanja settlement, and at Gulu University. A semi-structured interview is not a free conversation, but is following certain themes. Brinkmann is stressing, how interviews cannot be characterised as a neutral way of obtaining unaffected answers from the informant, but is a social and active interaction between interviewee and that researcher that consequently creates contextualised answers (Brinkmann et al. 2015: 30). The interview is a social practise, situated in a specific historical and cultural context and this method is distinctive, since it offers practical insights into the implementation of the Act. It is important to ask *what* the questions are aiming towards answering, prior to asking, how to obtain this knowledge - doing the actual interview (ibid.:

37). As the research question is based on an interest for the praising narrative of the Ugandan policy framework and what humanitarian ideas the Act exemplifies, *what* was asked prior to meeting the field. Different themes emerged out of the located articles, which created a fundament for further research in the field, and maintaining monotony in the research. The research is based on the hermeneutic method, and by addressing the Act, along with the articles beforehand, the fundamental knowledge was enough to have a prior understanding, without being affected by former conducted research. Before doing the semi-structured interviews, a interview guide was developed, making it possible to manage the interviews, and pursue certain points, of particular importance for the study (Appendix 12). The guide was based on the prior understanding attained by the explorative reading of the Act, and the articles, which was divided into themes, research based questions, and interview questions (ibid.) The research-based question hovers at a more abstract level, whereas the interview questions are more straightforward and idiomatic (Brinkmann et al. 2015: 40).

2.3.5 Informal conversations

The outlined themes helped maintaining direction and monotony, when engaging in informal conversations, without rigorous rules, made it possible staying open to unforeseen happenings. These conversations were beneficial, since it was possible both to observe and interact with the field and informants. As a result of this, it was possible to adapt to the flow of conversation, keeping questions relevant and the informants interested, which proved useful, when talking to locals in Uganda, along with meeting the refugees in the settlement (Bryman 2012: 517).

2.3.6 Informants

The first group of informants involved local NGOs (Ben, Paul, Evelyn, Sam, Elisabeth & Janet), from both outside and inside the Rwamwanja settlement. These local NGOs are working with engaging vulnerable children and premature girls, offering courses with the purpose of helping them towards self-reliance. Ben, Paul, Evelyn, Sam, Elisabeth, and Janet were, according to the organisational value statements, working towards eliminating poverty by empowerment. These statements focussed on working to overcome poverty, challenges of corrupt governance, and injustice, focusing on sustainable community development, and promoting skill based training (Appendix 4). This group of informants are working within the

settlement on a daily basis, engaging with issues related to sustainable development and local integration of the refugees. Within this group, different employees were interviewed, which helped accumulating knowledge of the daily life in the settlement, along with the management, and perceptions of refugees. The second group of interviewees consisted of people who were daily involved with the implementation of the refugee policy, and the governance. This group consisted of government officials, influencing- and implementing partners[10]. For these interviews, the sponsor, Paul, helped gaining access.

The first group of informants imparted new knowledge of the work relating to refugee issues, and how this is managed and conducted, and the second group helped in understanding the governance of refugees, implementation, and processes of the policy. Both groups of informants, helped in gaining insights into the perceptions of refugees, along with an understanding of the cultural sense of self, and how the spatial dimensions affect the settlements. Lastly a group of people, who have been involved with the refugee issues, either by research or other official authorities, were interviewed or took part in informal conversations, contributing with insights into the contextualisation of the refugee issues, as well as giving a global perspective.

2.4 Ethical considerations, limitations and other remarks

Before leaving for Uganda, conversations revolved around dressing culturally appropriate, in order to meet, and act respectively according to the culture. A researcher, who had been conducting field research in a Pygmy village in Kabale, Uganda, explained the importance of dressing culturally appropriate, when conducting field research. Doing good research not only requires the ability to ask the right questions, but as well understanding, and respecting cultural codes of the involved environment (Bryman 2012: 497). By covering knees and shoulders, it was possible to oblige to the cultural expectation of dressing appropriately on equal terms with the employees in the settlement. When visiting the University in Gulu, dressing appropriately was also considered. To show gratitude to the Professors, who took their time to meeting and engaging in interviews, the dressing was formal.

---

[10] Implementing Partners are government agencies and NGOs that helps implementing the policy (UNHCR 2012)

The aim is not to conclude policy recommendations for non-governmental organisations, the UN, or national governments, but rather to expand on the knowledge regarding humanitarian actions, contributing to the recent refugee debate. For this thesis, research is defined as an activity concerning the collection of data and knowledge with people in situations of displacement (Clark-Kazak 2017: 11). When conducting social science research in conflict and crisis situations, involving human beings, ethical challenges occur and good practice should be considered (Mackenzie et al. 2007: 299; Clark-Kazak 2017: 11). Mackenzie et al. underscores, how qualitative research often contain ethical complexities, when studying refugees, in politically complex, difficult and dangerous setting (Mackenzie et al. 2007: 299). Empirical studies are a central part of refugee research, and scholars have been discussing diverse principles and ethical concerns within this field (Krause 2017). Different ethical guidelines and principles have been developed for research procedures, on what considerations that is necessary, when studying people in situations of forced migration and doing refugee research (Clark-Kazak 2017; Mackenzie et al. 2007; Krause, 2017;).

When inducing with this field of research, it is vital to keep in mind, how vast polemic refugee issues have been debated in recent times. Diverging political and public agendas and perceptions about 'the refugee', has been sought diminished. Studying the phenomenon of the humanitarian ideas, this research, since focused on tendencies, is not directly involving the refugees. Though, refugees as well as employees at Rwamwanja settlement, participated in interviews and conversations, some ethical considerations has been necessary to stay precautious about and guiding principles by Professor Christina Clark-Kazak has been taken into account (Clark-Kazak 2017).

With the help of a sponsor, participating voluntarily, it was possible to visit the Rwamwanja refugee settlement. To meet ethical considerations and the guiding principles, of staying open, being competent and obtain voluntary informed consent before engaging with people, it was important to firstly present ourselves, providing the participants with accurate information of the research and their rights (Clark-Kazak 2017: 12). Before engaging in conversations the implemented parties were presented with the different themes, and ensured voluntary participation, anonymity, and asked whether the conversations could be recorded. This resulted in some conversation not being recorded, but only referred to in field notes. An informed consent form was developed, but evidently, oral consent from each research participant was relied on, as the sponsor Paul helped presenting our interests. Clark-Kazak emphasise how displaced people who have had negative interactions with authorities, may be suspicious of written consent forms like this, why oral consent forms consequently was found

more appropriate in this field of study (ibid.). Confidentiality has been kept throughout this thesis, why the name used, are aliases and informants are kept anonymous (ibid.: 13). According to this process of sampling, it is further worth noting, how the informants to a large extent have been chosen on the basis of accessibility, and the sampling is inevitably based on the inherent social network around the engaging participants and sponsor. This relatively small numbers of interviews might cause a biased presentation and understanding, of elements addressed. It must be explicated that the informants are not necessarily representative for the whole community in the settlement, but are representing tendencies and ideas relevant for the case (Jacobsen 2003: 6-7).

A limitation when conducting research in Uganda was the language barrier, as emphasised by Professor Karen Jacobsen (ibid.: 9). Though most people are communicating in English, some linguistic challenges were met, especially when engaging in conversations about politics, and humanitarianism. By rephrasing the sentence this issue was often eluded, but sometimes the point was lost in the translation.

The study took place in Uganda, October the 10th to October the 26th, and time was a limiting, factor for the amounts of collected data. Refugee settlements are not static installations, but progress over time, why the data collection did not take the form of a full ethnographic study. Nevertheless, the field study draws on ethnographic ideas and the result of the data collection is valid merely for the period mentioned. Conducting a full-scale ethnographic study, obtaining the permissions to research, along with acceptance from OPM, can elude this limitation of time, to understand how political and historical changes affect the settlements, shape the perception of refugees, and the manifestation of humanitarianism. The tendencies studied in this thesis, might though be present before, during and after the data were collected.

3. Historical overview

The historical overview is an exploration of the Ugandan refugee history, along with the evolution of the concepts inherent in the policy framework. This is done to contextually nuancing the understanding of the subject matter, before delving into the establishment and approval, of the Refugees Act 2006.

3.1 Refugee history

Professor Claire*: One thing is…given our historical conflicts, at one time we were also refugees. And given that experience, we know exactly what it means to be a refugee. When a group arise as refugees, you fast reflect on your own life in exile. That makes you develop empathy for them. We have also been hosted as refuges…then the part that our peace in Uganda is volatile. The peace is fragile. Any time, anything can happen. If you mistreat refugees, what will you expect in any case of breakdown in the political stability?* (Appendix 8, 57-62)

3.1.1 War-torn Europe in Uganda

Uganda has a long and complex history for hosting refugees – a history that dates back to before the nation, by 1962, gained its independence (Mujuzi 2008: 401). The period pre- and during Second World War (WWII), from 1930 to 1944, was characterised by general global political challenges and disputes, and approximately 7000 European and Arab refugees were received by Uganda. They were settled in the camps of Nyabyeya in the Masindi district, Kojja in the Mukono district, and Arapai in the Soroti district (ibid.: 400).

The aftermath of the War, marked the beginning of new multifaceted problems, why the British colonial administration of Uganda, besides offering shelter for persecuted Jews to the Zionist leaders, allowed refuge to many nationals from Poland, Germany, Italy, Austria Romania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, France, and Malta. The main part of these European refugees, later resettled in Britain, Canada, and Australia (Jallow et. al. 2004: 1; GoU 2017).

3.1.2 Uganda's regional refugee involvement – an overview

One pivotal moment for regional patterns of mass movement, either for opportunities or refuge, in the Ugandan context, came as a result of the *Boundary Agreement of 1914*, where the British Protectorate of Uganda, and the Anglo Egyptian Condominium of Sudan, for the first time officially restricted, what they termed *cross-border movement* (Hovil 2010: 5).

The Ugandan official rigorous involvement regarding refugees began after the UN 1951 Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees, and it was acceded by the British protectorate,

to apply to all British colonies, including Uganda[11] (Mulumba 2014: 1). Because of Uganda's spatial position, in the midst of the historically unstable East African region, the nation has been hosting an average of 161.000 refugees per annum, since the 1950s. In 1955, officially 78.000 South Sudanese people fled into Uganda[12], as a result of the collapse of the Anglo-Egyptian condominium, and the following First Sudanese Civil War[13] (World Bank 2016c: 5). The placements of the refugees seemed rather spontaneous, mainly in the Northern region of Uganda, though some people moved further South, to Jinja and Kampala, which already hosted Sudanese Nubian communities. The Addis Ababa Agreement of 1972, made most of the Sudanese refugees repatriate back to Sudan (ibid.).

The next major refugee influx came as a result of the aftermath of the multiple disputes regarding post-colonial independence in Uganda's neighbouring countries. Among these, were the *Mau Mau Struggle* in British ruled Kenya from 1952 to 1960, the 1959 Civil War in the Belgian UN mandate territory of Rwanda, and the disputed aftermath of Patrice Lumumba's assassination in Congo, in 1961 (Refugee Law Project 2001). Uganda further received refugees from Ethiopia and Somalia during this period of time, along with 80.000 people from Rwanda and 33.000 from Congo, whom were accommodated in the first established gazetted refugee settlement in Oruchinga in South-Western Uganda (World Bank 2016c, Mujuzi 2008, Watera et al. 2017: 4).

The continuous refugee influx into Uganda proceeded after the country gained its independence in 1962 – primarily from the recent independent nations of the Democratic Republic of Congo and Rwanda. This resulted in the establishment of more gazetted refugee settlements, in Kyaka and Nakivale (World Bank 2016c). From this time onwards, Uganda has been playing a mayor host to thousands of refugees from: Burundi, Congo, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Somalia, Sudan, Sierra Leone, Senegal, Mozambique, South Africa and Zimbabwe – with a majority of refugees represented from the neighbouring countries of Rwanda, Congo, Sudan, and Kenya (Mulumba 2005: 30).

When Yoweri Museveni came to power in 1986, Uganda was recognised as one out of seven nations, which represented a primary destination for displaced people. Already in 1995,

---

[11] The Convention was later ratified by the Ugandan state in 1987.

[12] 178.000 according to A. Kiapi 1997 (Kiapi 1997).

[13] The Anyanya rebellion

Uganda hosted more than 300.000 refugees, primary with people arriving from Southern Sudan, accounting for more than 500 refugees crossing the border, per day (IOM 2013: 1).

The large voluntary repatriations in Uganda, during the 1990s and 2000s, led to a general transitional reduction in the influx of refugees (World Bank 2016c). As peace returned to Rwanda by the victory of the Rwandan Patriotic Army (RPA), after the genocide in 1994, and with the Comprehensive Peace Agreement in Sudan in 2005, the refugee situation in Uganda was marked by enormous repatriation of Rwandan and Sudanese refugees, who voluntarily returned to their respective countries (ibid.). Despite these large-scale repatriation movements, the on-going refugee influx has continued in Uganda. Hutu refugees from Rwanda - whom replaced their Tutsi country men, Congolese – as a result of the Civil War in the Eastern part of the country, South Sudanese - whom were forced back to Uganda, after the break out of the conflict in December 2013, and refugees from Burundi, have kept the number increasing (ibid.: Watera et al. 2017: 27). Today more than one million refugees from South Sudan have crossed the borders of Uganda, and the influx continues (UNHCR 2017d).

3.2 Understanding Uganda's Refugee Policy, is understanding the context

It must, for a more nuanced overview, be clarified that in the same historical period as Uganda experienced these returning influxes of refugees, there were critical simultaneous situations of unrest within Uganda itself, and *[…] migratory patterns in Uganda have existed within diverse social, political and economic contexts, and have been driven by political factors, poverty, rapid population growth and the porosity of the international borders* (IOM 2013: 1).

The patterns of emigration in Uganda can be separated into three waves. The first occurred during the presidency of Idi Amin Dada (1971-1979) and later Milton Obote (1980-1985), where approximately 80.000 people, with South Asian origin, were expelled (IOM 2013: 10). The second wave was created by internal political instability and armed conflict, between 1971 and 1986. A third migratory period, is caused by globalisation's prevailing push and pull factors, primarily as a result of diasporadic Ugandan ties and cross-border labour mobility (ibid.).

Under the rule of Idi Amin, Uganda was generating a vast amount of refugees itself, whom fled to different regional neighbour countries - among others to Kenya, Sudan, and Tanzania (Refugee Law Project 2001). In 1972 Amin decided to expel Ugandan citizens whom had South Asian origin – also the political and academic intelligentsia (Mulumba 2005: 94). The population within the regions of Madi and West Nile were further forced in exile by 1980, and people from different regional parts of the North and North-Eastern regions of Uganda, whom were not aloud to cross international borders, became internally displaced (IDPs) (ibid.: 2). These IDPs and international refugees, represented seven percent of Uganda's population by 1985 (Pirouet 1988: 158-174). A year later, in 1986, clashes between independent local fractions in the Northern regions, and the Uganda National Resistance Army/Movement (NRA/M), resulted in more forced ethnic Ugandan emigration (ibid.).

Scholar in Forced Migration Studies, Tania Kaiser, is arguing that the Ugandan refugee discourse is shaped by a language of *solidarity and brotherhood* (Kaiser 2000: 8). Professor Sarah Meyer is, along similar lines, in a research paper for UNHCR (2006), emphasising how the Ugandan refugee discourse to a large extent is affected by reciprocity from officials of the Government of Uganda, and the public's collective memory of previous exile experiences (Meyer 2006: 7). Meyer is pointing out how:

[…] the GoU Commissioner for Refugees stated [...] the refugee policy has been informed by…our own population going into exile in Amin's time […] so we have that culture, we have been refugees ourselves and we are hospitable […] we reciprocate the gesture shown by our hosts (ibid.).

And further: *Prime Minister Moses Ali also maintained that the overall policy was "because of historical background, because of our relationship…and also because it appears that tomorrow you can also become a refugee, so why not be kind to your fellow brothers, who are your relatives* (ibid.).

In this sense, the refugee policy in Uganda can be seen as a historic contextual reciprocal discourse, based on kinship and solidarity.

3.2.1 The development of a new policy framework

As emphasised Uganda started hosting refugees even as early as in the 1930s, from many of the neighbouring countries. The continuous refugee influx resulted in the Ugandan government passing their first law dealing with refugees in 1955 (Mujuzi 2008: 399). This regulation was later superseded by the Control of Alien Refugees Act, which was commenced in July 1960 (CARA) (ibid; Refugee Law Project 2006: 2). CARA was criticised for the lack of guidelines and fundamental flaws, as it was not thoroughly considering international requirements of rights and freedoms (ibid.: 402; Macchiavello 2003: 11). Fundamental issues concerning women and children's refugee rights, a description of the term refugee and requirements on how to obtain refugee status was nowhere to be found. CARA did neither include instructions on whether it was allowable for refugees to gain employment in urban settings, if a work permit was needed, or if refugees were allowed to set up businesses (Macchiavello 2003: 11). As a result of CARA, when refugee status was obtained, the refugees were placed in rural refugee camps, and it was considered a breach to violations, to leave these camps without an authorisation from the camp authorities (Refugee Law Project 2006: 2). Professor Abraham Kiapi notes, how CARA *[...] appears to make refugees intruders who are not readily welcome and who, therefore, have to be strictly confined to remote settlements* (Sharpe 2012: 564). CARA was a law that sought to control refugees, rather than protect them, and it was deficient in regards to the human rights standards, as well as being unconstitutional towards Uganda's 1995 constitution (Refugee Law Project 2006: 2) CARA was found both out-dated, inadequate, offensive, in contradiction and unconstitutional, in regards to the international obligations (Mujuzi 2008: 403).

As Uganda gained independence from the British Protectorate, the Uganda government reached out to UNHCR for assistance in the management of refugees. Where the government provided land for the refugee settlements, the international donor-community helped with the basic facilities (UNHCR, 1964). Uganda further became a State Party to the 1951 Refugee Convention and its 1967 protocol in 1976[14], as well as to the 1969 Organisation of African Unity (OAU) Convention Governing the Specific Aspects of Refugee Problems in Africa (Refworld 1969):

---

[14] State Parties to the 1951 Convention relating to the Status of Refugees and the 1967 Protocol

These two basic international instruments provide for who a refugee is, who is excluded from international protection, when refugee status ceases, the rights of refugees, their obligations and administrative matters. They set the standards of international protection for refugees internationally and regionally in Africa. (Refugee Law Project 2006: 1).

Uganda began, according to the evolution of contemporary refugee responses, developing their own domestic version of the Self-Reliance Strategy, a strategy, which the UNHCR sought to define internationally, already in the 1960s.

3.2.2 Self-Reliance Strategy – An UNHCR definition

The UNHCR, has since the 1960s, been developing the Self-Reliance Strategy, as a durable solution, in order to circumvent protracted refugee situations, and to increase *social and economic links with the local communities* (UNHCR 2005a: 1). The foundation of the, not so novel strategy, is a strive for establishing refugee settlements, based on small-scale agricultural production, which will allow refugees to become self-sufficient over time (ibid.) The concept is exploring individual refugee's abilities to provide for themselves, and thereby promote local economic participation, and enhance livelihoods, in order to create sustainable long-term solutions, which focus on human dignity (ibid).

According to The UNHCR Handbook for Self-Reliance (2005), self-reliance is defined as:

[…] the social and economic ability of an individual, a household or a community to meet essential needs (including protection, food, water, shelter, personal safety, health and education) in a sustainable manner and with dignity and *[…] reducing their vulnerability and long-term reliance on humanitarian/external assistance* (ibid.: 1).

UNHCR is though emphasising, how SRS is not promoted as an end itself, but more precisely, promoted to achieve other financial goals, such as expense reduction. SRS is:

[…] comprehensive strategies which encompass the promotion of a combination of durable solutions and *[…] actions and responses that seek to effectively and constructively manage the time spent by refugees in exile, are therefore essential. They need to be situation-specific, multidimensional and timely in order to prevent refugee situations from becoming protracted*

and to prevent lives and natural and financial resources from being wasted (UNHCR 2005a: 2).

SRS is limited in its scope, despite intentions, since it can *[…] however, only be achieved if there is an enabling environment. This includes a viable economic situation, availability of affordable housing or access to land, as well as receptive attitudes within the host community* (ibid.: 3). The strategy is therefore only compatible with refugee contexts, which are implementing refugee rights, such as freedom of movement, and recognition of economic activities, and further practical environmental conditions, as sufficient land fertility.

From the 1980's, insufficient UNHCR involvement in several international refugee emergency situations resulted in a debate among the general international refugee regime, about UNHCR's *[...] lack of engagement with the issue of livelihoods* (De Vriese 2006: 5). This lead to an immediate response from UNHCR, NGOs, donors and host countries, to launch new programmes and initiatives, focused on medium and long-term care and maintenance, instead of just emergency relief (Crisp 2003: 4). These initiatives however, did nothing to enhance and promote self-reliance for refugees, or to shape positive relations between refugees and local populations (ibid.). As protracted refugee situations and the number of refugees increased, it became more and more normative. The international donor community grew increasingly dissatisfied with the waste and expenses of these long-term situations (Kaiser 2005: 355).

Local durable responses to long-term protracted care and maintenance situations were desperately sought, and it resulted in the UNHCR and the Government of Uganda, reaching an agreement, on a new and more development-oriented refugee strategy. The strategy was formulated to relieve the two main issues regarding protracted refugee situations in Uganda – aid dependency, and financial burden (ibid.).

In 1998 the official development of a new refugee approach began in Uganda, and in 2003, a new proposal for a refugee policy, the Refugees bill, was presented to the parliament, and published in the Uganda Gazette on 21st of November 2013 (Mujuzi 2008: 403; Sharpe 2012: 564) The Refugees Bill was debated, agreed on, and made into the Act before it was endorsed the 24th of may 2005, by the President of Uganda, Yoweri Museveni.

3.2.3 SRS in Uganda

Uganda, which for decades had been working on SRS-like initiatives, officially launched the new policy between 1998 and 1999, in collaboration with the UNHCR. Initially it was sought implemented as a settlement strategy, with a main focus on Northern Uganda, mainly the West Nile districts, Mojo, Adjumani and Arua, which primarily, and still, host Sudanese refugees (Meyer 2006: 19; World Bank 2016c: 20). The aim was to increase and improve self-sufficiency regarding food, and to enhance refugees' and host communities' use of social services, along with improvement and support for local governments to generally deliver better to refugees and host communities (World Bank 2016c: 20). The overall goals and objectives for the SRS in Uganda, were:

·to empower refugees and nationals in the area to the extent that they will be able to support themselves; and
·to establish mechanisms that will ensure integration of services for the refugees with those of the nationals (UNHCR 2003a: 3).

In order to adequately promote and implement the policy, services to both host communities and refugees, were developed simultaneously (World Bank 2016c: 20). This double integration was at the core of the SRS, since it delivered an equal level of services, and promoted efforts for coexistence (ibid.). SRS did, in this sense, benefit both refugees and host populations, while at the same time strengthening the delivery of local services – a rewarding situation for UNHCR, and for the Government of Uganda (ibid).

Practically, the SRS is functioning by the means of utilising agricultural subsistence, via the allocation of small plots of land, to refugees. Land where they can cultivate for personal and family related consumption (UNHCR 2003a). Food rations for refugees are, in connection with the SRS responsibility, decreased according to how much time the individual refugee has spent in the settlement. The ideal goal is, to make the refugees support themselves, and to relieve the financial burdens for aid-providers (ibid.).

Policymakers and scholars have, since the launch of the strategy, been documenting the positive effects of the SRS in Uganda. Despite draughts and environmental vulnerability, UNHCR claims that food self-sufficiency has been achieved by the main part of refugees, and that the policy has been fruitful, regarding transforming refugees into agents for individual welfare, thereby potentials for development (ibid.: 3-4). Despite many

international positive appraisals of the ideas within the Self-Reliance Strategy, the implementation and structure leaves a lot still to be achieved (ibid.; Kaiser 2005; Dryden-Petersen and Hovil 2004; Meyer 2006).

3.2.4 The Refugees Act 2006

The Act was developed based on the initial SRS characteristics, in Uganda, and it was published in the Uganda *Gazette,* No. 47, Volume XCVIX, the 4th of August 2006 (Refworld 2006). The policy recognises the rights of Uganda's more than, at that time, 140.000 refugees, to seek employment, have the freedom to move, and to settle within a no-encampment policy (Akello 2009). As stated in within the framework, the date of assent was the 4th of may 2006, while the date of commencement was not yet determined:

(2) This Act shall come into force on a day to be appointed by the Minister by statutory instrument, and different days may be appointed for the commencement of different provisions (Act 2006: 1(2))

In an article by Vanessa Akello for the UNHCR, on the 22nd of June 2009, she points out how the government and parliamentarians in Uganda were required to pass a range of bylaws, before implementing the Act (Akello 2009). The Prime Minister Apolo Nsibambi formally launched the Act in June 2009, to mark the World Refugee Day (ibid.) and a UNHCR representative in Kampala noted that *[...] Asylum seekers have been accorded a very good law, which embodies some of the best regional tenets on refugee law* (ibid.). The Act is focusing on the criticised aspects of Uganda's out-dated refugee policy of 1964, and epitomises substantial developments on the previous policy. Guidelines on how to operationalise it, were finalised and passed in 2010, integrating international requirements into domestic laws (Refugee Regulations, 2010; Sharpe 2012: 561, 564).

The framework is divided into six parts, each explaining an area of refugee rights, starting out with a preliminary explanation of interpretations, and a description of the grant of refugee status, as a humanitarian action (Act 2006: 1(1-3)). The first paragraph, section 3 emphasises how: *the granting of refugee status does not imply judgment [...] towards, the country of origin [...] must be regarded as a peaceful and humanitarian act* (Act 2006, 3(1)), and is aiming for neutrality and impartiality, towards the crisis from which the person is fleeing. The Refugee Law Project stresses, how the new title of the policy is cited as the *Refugees*

Act, hereby not reflecting or emphasising any negative subjects, like the previous legislation the *Control of Alien Refugee Act* (Refugee Law Project 2006: 3)*.*

Paragraph 2, describes the *Determination of Refugee Status* (Act 2006: 2), including the definition based on the Geneva and the OAU Conventions, focusing on determining, if a person is qualified to be granted asylum[15], qualifications, disqualifications, and cessation of refugee status. This part concerns well-founded qualifications, like fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, sex, religion, nationality, or political opinion (ibid.: 4(a)), and also: *owing to a well-founded fear of persecution for failing to conform to gender discriminating practices* (ibid.: 2(4(d)). Further, this paragraph is drawing out what circumstances that are disqualifying a person for the refugee status, involving the commitment of crime against peace, non-political crime, and possessing more than one nationality (ibid.: 2(5)). The section of *Cessation of refugee status*, is describing how a person may cease to be a refugee, by, among other things, pre-availing from the protection and re-establishing of oneself to the country, surrendering refugee status, and by refusing to return to the country of residence (ibid.).

The Act continues with an *Administrative set up for refugee matters* in paragraph 3 (Act 2006: 3). This paragraph delves into the importance of establishing an Office of Refugees, the Refugee Eligibility Committee (REC), and the Appeals Board, and further it describes the functions and powers under which these operates (Act 2006: 3(7-18)). The Office of Refugees is responsible for all administrative tasks relating refugees in Uganda, and by serving as the public office of commissioner, appointed by the president, it is working in liaison with UNHCR on implementing refugee programs as well as being the Secretariat of the Eligibility Committee (Act 2006: 3(7-8)).

Paragraph 4 of the Act, addresses refugee status determination via the *Application for Refugee Status and Related Matters,* and starts out by underlining that, to be granted refugee status in Uganda, a person has thirty days after the date of entry, to hand in a written application to the Eligibility Committee (Act 2006: 4(19(1))). This part of the legislation, outlines how the application is handled, the deadlines, and who is involved in the process. Further, it deals with family members of a recognised refugee, and eventual re-uniting of these (ibid.: 4(26-27)).

---

[15] The right to seek and obtain asylum, and non-refoulement, gives the refugee rights to be covered by all laws of the Act. Non-refoulement is corresponding to the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights 1948 The rule is prohibiting deportation, or by other means of force, returning refugees to the places from where they in fear have fled. A principle, which the Ugandan official border controls, in accordance with their obligation to the Convention, is maintaining.

Within the 5th paragraph, the scope is narrowed, and concentrates on the specific *Rights and Obligations of Refugees* (ibid.: 5). It begins by recognising how *[…] every refugee is entitled to the rights and shall be subject to obligations provided for or specified in – (a) the Geneva Convention; (b) the OAU Convention; and (c) any other convention or instrument relating to the rights and obligations of refugees to which Uganda is a party* (ibid.: 5(28)), referring to the regional human rights, the human rights legislation, and the rights of recognised refugees in Uganda. This paragraph delves into human rights themes, such as *Freedom of Movement, Right to obtain travel documents, Rights of refugee children, Rights of Women, Personal Status, Duties and obligations of refugee* and *Rights of family member refugee* (ibid.: (5)). It is evident how this is an increase of the scope of the refugee policy, compared to the earlier and criticised refugee legislations, CARA.

Paragraph 6 expands on the *Miscellaneous* that has not already been touched upon in the earlier paragraphs. This paragraph underlines how *[…] the Eligibility Committee and the Appeals Board shall be guided by the principles laid down in relevant or applicable international conventions or instruments* (ibid.: 6(37)). The Committee is not bound by the principles, leaving room for interpretations, resulting in different regional readings. Further, it elaborates on a range of procedures relating to refugee status, among others including procedures of withdrawal of refugee status, expulsion, extradition, and naturalisation of recognised refugees (ibid.: 6 (39-45)).

The Act, adds a line of new provisions to the Ugandan legislation, concerning the refugees that flee to the country. These paragraphs are explicitly relating to the 1951 Convention, the 1969 OAU convention, along with international obligations regarding protection of refugees. Further the Act abolishes CARA and oblige to the criticism of the very same. With the Act, the Ugandan Government tries to reflect national, regional, and international requirements and obligations that the government is assigned to, by above-mentioned conventions.

The Act is applauded as one of the most liberal and progressive refugee regulations in the world. It rests on four fundamental pillars: 1. Any refugee, regardless of nationality or ethnicity, can obtain asylum. 2. Refugees can seek employment, and is granted relative freedom of movement. 3. Refugees can be provided with so-called *prima facie asylum* - an asylum recognition, based on the assumption, that the reasons for certain nationalities' displacement incitements are well-known, why individual examination is not necessary. 4. All refugees are, as a part of the SRS initiative, given a plot of land, primarily for agricultural use (Act 2006). These regulations are all corresponding to, and as an official framework,

deriving directly from the regulations from the 1951 Convention. These are, despite of the possibility of minor regional changes, enforced by the respective local government entities (World Bank 2016c: 9).

The previous chapter has been exploring the legislative foundations and political ideology behind the Act, in a historic context. The historical overview gives insights into how Uganda, as a post-conflictual country, has been subject to continuous displacement issues. Particularly, Self-Reliance has been an inherent part of the Ugandan refugee approach, which resulted in the development of the Act. This foregoing elaboration is creating a fundament for further investigation, by dissecting pivotal historical events and policy developments, in order to examine elements of conceptual understandings.

4. Conceptual understandings

To study the humanitarian ideas inherent in the Refugees Act 2006, it is necessary to explore the conceptual, and historical evolution of the term. The following chapter unfolds a contextualised understanding of humanitarianism, according to previous studies on the matter. To answer the research question, the scope is further narrowed to explore notions of the refugee camp, from the modern time establishment of the concentration camps during WWII, to contemporary global tendencies. This exploration also sets a precedent and contributes to a conceptual framework, shedding light on, and aiming to, answer the overall research question.

4.1 From exploring universal humanitarianism, to the characteristics of refugee camps.

Over the years, the ideas of humanitarianism have changed. The contemporary European refugee crisis, is calling for developing durable long-term solutions, bridging emergency relief and development. This places humanitarianism in the midst of a global and political context, as relying on humanitarian action to accommodate the contemporary refugee crisis. Europe is seen increasing their interest in the Ugandan example, applauding the humanitarian handling of refugees, inspired by a memory of past crises, violence, and fear. SRS initiatives, the foundation of the Act, has emerged as a durable and humane solution, as a result of the

necessity to re-imagine humanitarian action. Humanitarianism is rooted in the initial ICRC ideas of neutrality, impartiality, and apoliticallity, but the ideas of humanitarianism have changed over time.

There is no general definition of humanitarianism, but the phenomenon is closely related to emergency relief within times of crisis. Scholar Michael Barnett (2011) underscores how every historical turn has affected humanitarianism, and how the phenomenon has gained morality, as well as becoming a political venture. Politics and capitalism have grown into humanitarianism, which has resulted in a world of humanitarianism as a plural concept, since humanitarian practices are manifested through dependence of power and capital. The study of humanitarianism has formed the fundament, of which the research question is explored, and the inherent ideas are found to be concurrently universal and conditional, with diverse meanings, principles, and responsibilities. Humanitarianism is placed within a global political context, and the research is based on the three empirical pillars, a study of humanitarianism regarding refugee issues has as well been explored. To understand the practical manifestations of the phenomenon, a conceptual comprehension of the camp, and the concept of the refugee, is contributing to allocating the research gap, which this study will uncover. Relations and connections between humanitarianism and the refugee camp are uncovered, and the notions brought into function, will further help abstracting data from the studied field. These key concepts are forming the basis of the study, while the forthcoming analysis is tracking the abstract phenomenon of humanitarianism within the concrete manifestations of the Act. As described by Lund, the movement back and forth, between the abstract and concrete, in the advanced guesstimate of both, helps defining empirically phenomenons, and describe them conceptually (Lund 2014: 228). These forthcoming theoretical approaches forms the basis for a set of conceptual tools, helping to study the abstract phenomenons of humanitarianism, in historical relation to the Act, forming a heuristic framework (ibid.: 224).

4.1.1 Humanitarianism - World we want?

In 2016, the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Assistance (OCHA) announced, that 97 million people were in need of humanitarian assistance, of which 65 million people were displaced, living in *protracted refugee situations* (Hoffmann 2016: 1). The contemporary world is experiencing a vast increase in wars, forced migration, general violence, and issues related to drastic climate change along with environmental disasters.

According to Professor Peter J. Hoffmann, the phenomenon of humanitarianism is finding itself placed in a situation of complicity, shaped by a historical past of continuous debates, regarding uncertainty about the core values of the concept – *neutrality and impartiality* (ICRC 2014, van Mierop 2016: 296) – which has led to dysfunctionality and an ineffective humanitarian sector (Hoffmann 2016: 1). What is needed, according to UNHCR and other humanitarian organisations, is a re-imagination of humanitarianism, which is problematically affected by a present paradigmatic crisis (Gordon and Donini 2016), and to reformulate the mantra, *world we want 2030,* of the campaign to reform development practices (ibid.: 1). Maybe this mantra is what the Ugandan government has managed to change, regarding their internationally praised progressive refugee policy, which is encapsulated in the Act, in the midst of the on-going European *refugee crisis* (UNHCR 2017). A *humanitarian mantra* that, far from the contemporary Western isolationist agenda, takes the welcoming name: *The Open Door Policy* (World Bank 2016a). In order to understand Uganda's refugee policy, and the humanitarian ideas it exemplifies, it is necessary to look into a historical, conceptual, and contextual account of the phenomenon of humanitarianism, and the changing surrounding societal landscape. Where does the term originate from? And how can history help us to understand the plural notions of the *humanitarianisms* of today (Barnett 2011: 10)? In order to understand the paradigmatic crisis in relation to the field of research, humanitarianism is, according to Donini and Gordon (2016), Barnett (2011), Fassin (2012), Haskell (1985), Davies (2012), and Agier (2010), by far anchored in Western hegemonic moral values, with a belief in a *global humanitarian community* (Gordon and Donini 2016: 100). Many global examples, including the Ugandan, are though pointing at vast geographical and cultural divergences in perception and implementation of humanitarian related actions. These notions emphasise, that it is hard to speak of a common humanitarian community, and that it is necessary to acknowledge the emergence, of *pluriversality* (ibid.: 101), and what Barnett is terming *multiple humanitarianisms* (Barnett 2011: 24).

Lecturer in sociology Katherine Davies examines the evolving meaning of the term humanitarian, and pinpoints several historical aspects that have affected contemporary humanitarianism (Davies 2012). From early Christianity, through the creation of the ICRC, non-political humanitarian activities, and the establishment of the UNHCR in 1951, to humanitarianism after the cold war, and the politicisation of the term, in the late twentieth century (ibid.: 1). Davies unfolds, how humanitarianism can be traced back to Christianity in relation to the term 'humanitarian', and how this idea is emphasising the human nature of

Christ. She stresses, how many scholars have demonstrated the ambiguity of the term humanitarianism, since:

[...] there is no general definition of humanitarianism'; there is not one humanitarianism but 'multiple humanitarianisms'; and, crucially, 'humanitarian' is complicated by the suffix '-ism', signifying 'an ideology, a profession, a movement, a set of institutions, and a business and industry (ibid.).

4.1.2 Historicist and conceptual clarifications

Scholars have described the creation and philosophy of the ICRC in 1863 as path breaking within contemporary humanitarianism (Davies 2012; Barnett 2011; Mitoma & Bystrom 2013; Ticktin 2014: 275). Davies points out, how no International Humanitarian Law has given the ICRC the obligation to define humanitarianism, but that it serves as an attractive version of the humanitarian story, *[...] because it expresses how they have embodied expectations and assumptions about the term 'humanitarian', reinforcing their image as the arbiter of humanitarianism.* (Davies 2012: 7; Barnett 2011). In action, this path-breaking philosophy, has been acting as a guide for the generated movement of *classical humanitarianism* (Krause 2014: 104). From the famous *Battle of Solferino* (1859), to the World Wars of the twentieth century, and the Biafran War in Nigeria (1967 - 1971), humanitarianism has sought to act as the principles of apolitical and neutral life saving actions (ibid.).

During World War One (WWI), the ICRC provided both medical relief and helped prisoners of war. WWII also led to a surge within the humanitarian community, and relief organisations, as Save the Children (Davies 2012, 7; Barnett 2011: 2). In 1929, humanitarianism took its position within politics, as it enrolled in *the Convention Amelioration of the Condition of the Wounded and Sick in Armies in the Field*, and the humanitarian activities did not treat civilians, until 1949 (Davies 2012: 7). During WWII, the humanitarian communities worked, according to the ICRC principles, impartially, neutrally and apolitically.

The UNHCR was created in the aftermath of WWII, to help millions of Europeans who fled their homes during the war (UNHCR 2017e). Davies draws on Barnett, when she describes how emergency relief slowly began developing, from the WWI, through WWII, to accelerate

during the Cold War, culminating at the end of the twentieth century, in a debate between different humanitarian directions (Davies 2012: 11, Barnett 2011). Inherent in the debate, humanitarianism had to undergo changes, and the term had to broaden (Leader 1998 in Davies 2012: 11).

Professor Miriam Ticktin addresses the aforementioned period, within which she finds that humanitarianism gained morality and became a political project. She states that it is important to note how humanitarian responses to suffering and crisis, are organised as a combination of medical and legal interventions — not as mere political events, and that the humanitarian community ought to remain impartial and apolitical (Ticktin 2014: 274). She also highlights, how the studies of international refugees and displaced people, helped the field of law to become concerned with the category of humanity, which limited the effects of armed conflict on civilians, and gained renewed attention (Ticktin 2014: 275; Davies 2012: 7).

Barnett and Davies points out, how a dramatic increase in humanitarian aid occurred, in the aftermath of the Cold War. Combined with historical humanitarian inactivity, this resulted in a questioning of the established principles of neutrality, impartiality and the notions of being apolitical (Davies 2012: 17; Barnett 2011). Barnett stresses, drawing on the experiences from the Biafran War and the Genocide in Rwanda, how the principles that were designed to save lives, contextually looked like inactive excuses (Barnett 2011: 4). The idea of the suffering body formed the basis of humanitarianism, and was perceived as a more trustworthy justification of experience (Fassin 2001 in Ticktin 2014: 276). Historian Thomas L. Haskell articulates interdependence between the starving individual, the suffering victim, whose life can be saved, and the saviour, which creates a causality of moral responsibility (Haskell 1985: 357).

Humanitarianism is tortuous, paradoxical and ambiguous, and the phenomenon has been studied through different historical eras, and with diverse philosophical meanings. The word 'humanitarian' has encapsulated a variety of meanings throughout the nineteenth century, why it is impossible to extract a simple narrative of the origins of the term (Davies 2012: 3). The Scholars Steven Gordon and Antonio Donini (2016) are tracing the basic ideas of humanitarianism, as a socially constructed phenomenon of politics of compassion, back to the European Enlightenment, with the ideas of the emergence of multiple individual freedoms (Gordon and Donini 201). They argue how:

[...] there has been an evolving domain in which a particular politics of compassion has regulated the boundaries and content of humanitarian action as well as the forms of suffering its institutions have been configured to address (ibid. 81).

Scholars Tom Weiss and Michael Barnett are along similar lines, stressing how humanitarianism always has been representing *a work in progress,* and how the continuous evolution of the inherent practices and meanings have changed over time, and will continue to do so (Weiss and Barnett 2011: 105). This, despite of the polemic physical structural measures and written laws that has ensured a somewhat universal conceptual definition, which will prevail. This has, in many ways, been anchored in the laws from the Geneva Conventions, and it is distinct that governments and organisations of today, are striving to pursuit these humanitarian objectives (though not always successfully).

Humanitarianism might contain ancient inherent ideas of helping structures, to people in need – as in the examples of the preliminary ICRC, and Médecin Sans Frontiérs (MSF) (1971). This raises some questions, about whether it is possible to understand humanitarianism, as a flexible phenomenon, despite the claimed universality of laws and conventions – and how this is manifested in the Ugandan context? Further, how does the Act differ from other global contemporary ideas of humanitarianism and what trajectory makes it unique in a global context?

4.1.3 Profit of the suffering

Haskell conveys the ideas of humanitarianism and a moral responsibility, as he stresses that the rise of capitalism shaped the constellation of attitudes entitled within humanitarianism (Haskell 1985: 345). He does not take position towards the discursive practice of the starving stranger, but it must be acknowledged how rhetoric is affecting the humanitarian understanding, since the notions of victim and saviour, is dichotomic. The moral responsibility is inevitably influenced by the society and hegemonic discourses of its age.

For Barnett, capitalism also plays a role in humanitarianism. He points out how humanitarians must be *[...] attentive to the marketplace, because good thoughts do not save lives, and they must even "profit" from the misery of others because people donate only when they are gripped by haunting images* (Barnett 2011: 6). He turns his studies to treat

humanitarianism as a creature of the world it strives to civilise, and finds that global governance affects humanitarianism, since it has become increasingly public, hierarchical, and institutionalised (ibid.: 8-9).

This institutionalisation is also touched upon by Davies, who positions humanitarianism in a global context, creating tangible understandings of the concept rather than an abstract epitome that unfolds parallel to war, chaos, and violence (Davies 2012). Humanitarianism manifests itself through power relations, since it is a combination of care and control. She points out, that to create a better world, power is needed, and the lines between the governmental and the non-governmental organisations of today's humanitarian world are blurred. According to Barnett, humanitarianism is defined by the paradox of emancipation and domination, due to the fact that humanitarianism operates with emancipatory ethics, through various interventions that are also acts of control (Barnett 2011: 11-12).

He continues down the same capitalistic road as Haskell, in a presentation of how humanitarian organisations has taken over state-like purposes, offering public goods, and aiding as de facto government ministries (ibid.: 222). Aid organisations have evolved into businesses and, *[...] as humanitarian governance has grown, it has become more centralized, more distant from those it wants to help* (ibid.). Whereas Ticktin acknowledges the suffering as part of the dominant perception of humanitarianism, Barnett recognises that all humanitarians share a wish to mitigate unnecessary suffering, but stresses how all uniformity ends here (ibid.: 221). He states how: *We live in a world of humanitarianisms, not humanitarianism* (ibid.: 10). Suffering cannot be a solid base for creating a shared humanity, but can in fact create differences, as the world is created by multiple and diverse communities, and is undoubtedly also containing diverse humanitarianisms (ibid.: 223). The perception is a recurrent aspect of humanitarianism, and how it is manifested. The concept of multiple humanitarianisms is of vast importance regarding the field of research, in order to understand what humanitarian processes, tendencies and encounters lie behind the Ugandan refugee policy.

Barnett finds that every historical turn has had its input on humanitarianism, as both politics and self-serving interests, have and are, affecting the concept, and points out how humanity in fact is necrotic and involves memory. He draws on history, to underscore that history shapes how people seek to restore humanity - *It was not Ralph Lemkin's invention of a new category called genocide that produced the Genocide Convention but rather the six million Jews who perished in the Holocaust* (ibid.: 227). According to Barnett, it is evident how

history is an important factor in understanding humanitarianism, since societies of memory are enforced to become societies of caring (ibid.). Humanitarianism then manifests itself through responsibility to both history and humanity. This has even greater effect to those who are of the same kin - religion, culture and national identities influence who gets the attention. *When humanitarians dream of changing the world, they do so in their own language* (ibid.: 231). It seems unlikely, from the scope of the empirical material that Uganda has an initial plan of changing the world – maybe Uganda has a plan of changing how humans perceive their world? The later analysis will explore the different cultural, political and strategic measures, inherent in the landscape around the Ugandan context, in order to shed light on the exceptionality of the policy framework.

A reflection of suffering, affects how help is given, and humanitarians who are culturally closest to a community, may be ablest to help the very same (ibid.: 230). Humanitarian practices are manifested through the dependence of power, capital, and the interdependent relation between the suffering and the saviour, and Barnett stresses how:

Liberal peacebuilding [referring to humanitarianism and security] is a highly invasive project; the expanded list of factors associated with a stable peace means that nearly all of the features of state and society have become objects of intervention (ibid.: 164).

The phenomenon is thus manifesting itself as obliging the needs of others, but also accommodating one's own desires (ibid.: 14). Humanitarianism is both simultaneously universal and circumstantial and, as shown, a plural concept, with diverse meanings, principles, and responsibilities.

4.1.4 The controversial politics of humanitarianism, and humanitarian (non)intervention

Humanitarian intervention has been controversial both when it happens, and when it has failed to happen (Evans 2001: 1). Humanitarian inactivity in Rwanda in the 1990s, created a humane horror story, where members of the ethnic Hutu majority murdered close to 800.000 people (Davies 2012: 17, Barnett 2011: 4). Of the many scholars who have explored humanitarianism, and the humanitarian ideas, many have delved into the world of humanitarian interventions. Humanitarian interventions, have played a role since the

establishment of the ICRC, was breaching borders for humanitarian action and *[...] directing efforts specifically towards 'distant strangers'* (Barnett 2011 in Davies 2012: 5).

4.1.4.1 Who is responsible?

Whereas Barnett explores the political history and humanitarianism, Sociologist Didier Fassins approach is a study of the power and knowledge, which are hidden within humanitarian responsibility to protect (R2P) (Reid-Henry 2013: 753). The Ugandan government and the World Food Programme (WFP) are in these days, asking for economic help regarding the present refugee crisis, why the EU has offered to help funding relief operations (Biryabarema 2017). But, in the light of R2P, the question arise, of whether this help is only offered due to moral qualms? Fassin explores the ambivalence between the moral and political worlds, by looking into the deployment of humanitarian reason, in contemporary public space, and how moral sentiments have reconfigured politics (Fassin 2012: 5). He stresses how moral feelings, the emotions that direct our attention to the suffering, have become a fundamental influence in contemporary politics:

[...] they nourish its discourses and legitimize its practices, particularly where these discourses and practices are focused on the disadvantaged and the dominated, whether at home (the poor, the immigrants, the homeless) or farther away (the victims of famine, epidemics, or war). By "moral sentiments" are meant the emotions that direct our attention to the suffering of others and make us want to remedy them. (ibid.: 1).

The humanitarian ideal reinforces the discourse of the suffering, and helps to legitimise the practices of governments to regulate and manage precarious lives (ibid.: 4). With this in mind, Fassin brings out the relation of inequality. Humanitarian governance brings the victims into existence by protection, and compassion for the suffering, which hereby creates a hierarchy of strong and weak. He stresses that when compassion is exercised, it is always directed from above – from the more powerful to the weak. Humanitarian government is, according to Fassin, *[...] indeed a politics of precarious lives* (ibid.).

His study is rooted in nine different sceneries, covering a time period spanning from the mid-1990s, through the middle of the first decade of this century, to the globalised world. Fassin explores how a new moral economy of suffering, has emerged, and how humanitarian action has become a vast modality and a mode of governing for Western politics (ibid.: 223). Rooted in an example of the Secretary of State for Humanitarian Action in France, and the Overseas Development Administration in the United Kingdom, he stresses, how

humanitarianism has become a policy instituted at state level, implementing their actions within their own domain (ibid.: 223).

Whereas Fassin's approach to the responsibility to protect, is situated in hidden relations of power and knowledge, Gareth Evans, President of International Crisis Group, approaches the heated debate, about the right to intervene, related to human suffering. He finds that R2P represents a change within humanitarianism, in the early twenty-first century. Throughout the 1990s, this debate prevailed, among those who argued for *the right to intervene* on one side (MSF), and *[...] the priority and continued resonance of the concept of national sovereignty, seen as a complete inhibitor to any such coercive intervention [...]* on the other (Evans 2006: 706). Evans argues, how the essence of R2P, should not be seen as control, but a responsibility. This concept of R2P, aimed to enable the competing principles of the 'right to intervene' and 'state sovereignty', which concentrate the responsibility of preventing and emphasising the protection of victims, on the host states'.

4.1.5 Humanitarianism and its aspirations – from principles and agendas, to manifestations

As the previous sections have emphasised, humanitarianism should be the catalyst of human protection and welfare improvement – from when it initially became a part of the international system. Humanitarian action, has since been working from an agenda, which can be summed up as consisting of; humanitarian action by provision of assistance and relief to victims in need, humanitarian intervention in order to secure relevant safe conditions, international humanitarian law that regulates the possibilities of war (jus ad bellum), the conduct of warfare (jus in bello), and the international refugee law (1951) governing and protecting displaced people (Hoffmann 2016: 1).

Humanitarianism 1.0 (Gordon and Donini 2016: 105), was marked by the heroic ICRC principles; humanity, impartiality, and neutrality (ibid.) - characteristics that were present (unpresent) during the Biafran War and the Genocide in Rwanda. The end of the Cold War, and the entry to the so-called globalised world, affected humanitarianism in the sense of professionalisation and institutionalisation, along with increased instrumentalisation of governance (ibid.). The birth of *[...] humanitarianism 2.0, the new humanitarianism, was*

based on the sometimes competing "three C's" of compassion, change and containment, as well as the "two C's" of capitalism and coloniality (ibid. 206).

Hoffmann is arguing, that the largest obsession, regarding contemporary humanitarian aspirations, have to do with climate changes and fragile states. War and displaced people from the Middle East and Africa, after socio-political eruptions and changes, have further led to the European Refugee Crisis. The size, perception, and attention of this crisis is surpassing displacement effects of both WWI and WWII, where people from Libya, Somalia Iraq, Syria, and Afghanistan, have fled to the Southern borders of Europe. Hoffmann states:

In the last two years, in contrast, perhaps as many as 1.8 million refugees have arrived in Europe, which presently has a population of over 742 million—while others host far more; Turkey, for example, with a population of 74 million, harbors over 2.5 million refugees. This crisis prompted aid agencies, governments, and publics to re-examine humanitarian aspirations, and the WHS [World Humanitarian Summit] *was a largely unsuccessful attempt to do just that* (ibid. 2).

There has, as touched upon, been a polemic practical evolution of the above-mentioned humanitarian aspirations, and like Barnett argues – every historical turn has had its input on humanitarianism. The Biafran War in Nigeria and the Rwandan genocide, are examples of vast politicisation of humanitarian actions, where ICRC, because of its core principles, accepted the respective governments refuse of granting international access to the countries. This was also what triggered the process, of the creation of MSF, who wanted to act, regardless of state interests (Hoffmann 2016: 1). How is the politicisation of humanitarian actions manifested in the Ugandan context? Can this be the reason for the international praise of the Act? This thesis aims at examining and contextually analyse these reasons, along with the humanitarian principles. In order to clarify the contextualisation of the field of research, and to put forward the point of focus:

Uganda now has around a million refugees. To put this in perspective, the East African country is the physical size of the UK and yet hosts more refugees than arrived in all 28 EU member states in 2015, the peak of the European refugee "crisis" (Betts 2017)

Throughout this exposition, the main points within the humanitarian ideas, tendencies and humanitarianism in theory have been explored. Many of the studies are based in a historical overview, but to gain richer understanding, it is essential to look at humanitarianism more

practically. The refugee camp can be perceived as the ultimate place to investigate humanitarian principles, and refugees as humanitarian objects. The next section will, in order to grasp the processes and practicalities behind the Act, and why it is perceived as a particular interesting case, focus on historical and conceptual understandings of refugee and camp.

4.2 Conceptual ideas of the Refugee

Humanitarianism has been placed in the centre of global politics, and in recent times, the vast global proliferation of refugee camps, along with the so-called European 'migration crisis', have drawn increasing public and scholarly attention. A refugee camp can be characterised as a quintessential humanitarian space, but the conceptual understandings of the refugee camp varies, and are both complex and paradoxical (Ticktin 2014: 278). Camps are found as humanitarian spaces that are set apart from ordinary life, and tend to operate in definitional grey zones - between the formal and informal, the mobile and immobile, regarding spatiality and within discussions of temporality (Diken 2004: 83; Agier & Bouchet-Saulnier 2004 in Ticktin 2014: 278). As the refugee camp is a humanitarian space, and humanitarianism is ambivalently positioned between universality and interests, the camp is positioned within this space as well. The Act is globally praised, but how are the refugee camps unfolding in Uganda as being exceptionally humane? As the empirical knowledge reveals, the Act has no mention of the refugee camp, but it is focusing on local refugee settlements, for the purpose of accommodating and integrating refugees (Act 2006: 6(44)). Questions arise from this, since settlements may be creating a different space, both rhetorically and humanitarian, than ideas of the camp. How does the settlements in Uganda relate to the complex, paradoxical, and humanitarian understanding of a camp?

The ambivalent perception of refugees, provoking fundamental indefinability, is emphasised by Sociologist Bulent Diken (2004). He underscores, how society is incapable of deciding whether refugees can be characterised as purely subjects to human rights, or simply as thieves that threatens order (Diken 2004: 83-84). Refugees are restricted and regulated by law, but excluded from political participation. Diken deduce how *[...] the refugee is excluded from the domain of the law but remains subject to it* (ibid.: 84), and is highly inspired by Philosopher Giorgio Agamben (1998), when focusing on the refugee as an instantiation of the ideas of *[...] homo sacer*: *The refugee is included while being excluded and excluded while being included* (Agamben 1998: 8; Diken 2004: 84). The refugee camp is understood as an

exceptional space that exists in the periphery and margins of a given society, but it is also practically defined, with measures such as confinement and authoritarian control (Diken 2004: 84). In contrast, the camp is by Turner (2005), Malkki (1992, 1996) and Jansen (2015), perceived as a place where identity and social structures are created and remoulded, and where resistance is flourishing, and empowerment is enforced.

There is rich scholarly literature, approaching, and seeking to contextualise these paradoxical notions of the exceptionality of the camp (Agamben 1995, 1998, 2005; Turner 2005, 2015; Redfield 2005; Diken and Laustsen 2010), the way it forms and negotiate identities (Malkki: 1992, 1996), as decidedly hospitality (Ramadan 2008), concerning violence and security (Loescher and Milner 2004) political economic relations (De Montclos 2000), and as a political governmental measure (Hyndman 2000). The Act has transformed the ideational definitions of a camp, into settlements, by making the camp absent from the rhetoric of the policy. This re-definition is particularly relevant in the forthcoming analysis of the Ugandan settlements and the manifestation of the humanitarian ideas. Is this an attempt to change the humanitarian space in the Ugandan refugee settlements?

Scholars agree on the exceptional, temporal, and spatial characteristics of the camp, but ideas are differing regarding the life in the camp, and the exploring of refugees as *bare life* (Agamben 1998), or social agents, (Jansen 2015). Refugee camps, has been approached as merely *warehousing of the undesirables* (Agier 2011 in Turner 2016: 144), with the function of keeping people stored, kept out of the society, or as empowering constellations growing into cities (Jansen 2015: 163). Anthropologist Michel Agier (2010) has conducted research in the refugee camp Tobanda in Sierra Leone in 2003(Agier 2010: 29). He studied the overlap between humanitarianism and politics, and found that humanitarian actors have created a network of organisations, budgets, employees, which combines the discourse of saving, comprising the suffering body, in a controlling and continuing apparatus (ibid.: 30). How is this overlap manifested in the Ugandan settlements, and is it manifested at all?

Agier finds that humanitarianism possesses a double-sided identity and stresses that the humanitarian world mirrors the universal message of humanity. He defines this identity as: *"equality"*: - *'an equality whose opposite is not inequality [...] but the suffering of silent victims, whom the humanitarian world designates as its true beneficiaries'* (ibid.: 32). Is the Ugandan humanitarian world, perceiving refugees as silent suffering victims, or is the post-colonial reciprocal idea most prominent? This relates to Haskell's idea of causality and responsibility, as both Agier and Haskell stresses, how this is an essential part of humanity and humanitarianism.

Professor Liisa Malkki has made influential studies of refugee camps, humanitarian interventions, and the rooting of people (Malkki 1992, 1995, 1996). She stresses how *[...] "the refugee" as a specific social category and legal problem of global dimension did not exist in its full modern form before this period [WWII]* (Malkki 1995: 497-498). Malkki, whom underscores the danger of the term being westernised, studies the origin of the term refugee, and stresses how the term relates to the WWII. During WWII, procedures of managing displacement of people became standardised, and a generalised technology of power, as the phenomenon of concentration camps emerged (Malkki 1995: 497-498). The camp was a tool of power, which segregated nationalities as the spatial concentration of people created a form of control (Malkki 1995: 497).

Her study delves into, how massive displacements of people created a narrative *[...] of refugees as a miserable sea of humanity* (Malkki 1996: 377). In Malkki's studies of Hutu's in Tanzania, she found that international humanitarian organisations, conceptualised refugees into living in the shadow of the law (ibid.: 378). This conceptualisation caused a depoliticisation of refugees and constructed a depoliticised space with the refugee as a universal humanitarian subject (ibid.) Aligning with Fassins idea of how the suffering body is forming the basis of humanitarianism, her studies exemplifies how refugees' severe physical appearance, was found more reliable, than when refugees told their own stories. The general tendency showed, how the administrators of the camp, tended to perceive that refugees were exaggerating their histories, being dishonest, and unreliable (ibid.: 384). The ideal construct of a refugee *[...] was imagined as a particular kind of person: a victim whose judgment and reason had been compromised by his or her experiences* (ibid.). The wounds of the suffering body, created the objective and trustworthy information of experience, rather than the descriptions made by the person whose body was wounded (ibid.). Constituting suffering as the base of knowledge, humanitarians are causally involved, by focussing merely on the suffering body as the bearer of a reliable narrative, and not recognising the complex impacts of the crises from which they have fled. Despite the idea of reciprocity and pre-colonial brotherhood, it is essential to ask whether this scepticism is present in the Ugandan refugee settlements?

Agier finds that this causality is constructed around the narrative of humanity, combining universalism and globalisation:

On the one hand, it operates on the basis of a universalistic type of thinking: it deals with humanity as unique, and in particular with its extreme embodiment in the problem raised by

the unmediated, nameless victim, who is not an ''other'' recognized through her own voice but the very same humanity who is abused and whose human qualities are diminished, incomplete, or Unexpressed (Agier 2010: 32).

His theoretical intake demonstrates, how humanitarianism originates from totalitarian fiction, both in the conformity of humanity as an identity, and as transparency amid ideological universalism, and organisational globalisation (ibid.). From this point of view, humanitarian assistance dominates and manifests itself into everyday life. This consequently has created a representation of the refugee, as singular, standardised, and universal, with a certain kind of *helplessness* to it (Malkki 1996: 386-388). Malkki has explored the discourse on development of refugees and displaced persons, stressing how:

[...] the development discourse on refugees has sometimes facilitated the continued depoliticization of refugee movements; for instead of foregrounding the political, historical processes that generated a given group of refugees, and that reach far beyond the country of asylum and the refugee camp, development projects tend to see a whole world in a refugee camp (Malkki 1995: 507).

Rhetorically, refugees can popularly be understood as innocent biological victims of war, violence, and ethnic conflict, which invites to international humanitarianism (Feldman and Ticktin 2010). If this humanitarian compassion loses its effect, for instance as a result of the end of a present emergency that caused a given crisis, the situation might change, and the compassion from the international, and local society, might be reduced, or even become negative (Agier 2010). This position, along with the perception of refugees as bare life that needs humanitarian assistance, is discussed in relation to the camp.

4.3 The Camp

Campus stems from Latin, meaning '*level space,* which is referring to *Campus Martius* in ancient Rome - a physical space, with many different purposes, as military practices and athletics: *defined spatially as a field that is set apart from other space* (Turner 2015: 141). Agamben explores the phenomenon, and enhances the debate between historians, of whether the original camp originated with the *campos de concentrations*, created by the Spaniards in Cuba in 1896, or if it was the concentrations camps, where the English gathered the Boers at the early twentieth century (Agamben 1996: 38). The phenomenon of concentration camps,

under the Nazi German regime, was an attempt to grant the unlocalisable a permanent and visible location (ibid.: 16,7). Agamben notes that *[...] the camp is a piece of territory that is placed outside the normal juridical order [...] however it is not simply an external space* (ibid: 40). Today's refugee camps are far from the evil notions of the aforementioned, but according to Agamben, the camp is a paradigm of biopolitics and a space, where homo sacer is indistinguishable from the citizen (ibid.: 40.1).

4.3.1 A short historical account

The camp as a humanitarian space, is by Agier considered as:

[...] exceptional treatment of a human "waste" that has no voice and no place in this world, a way of managing the undesirable in which humanitarian government operates, as it were, as a "subsidiary" form of the "government of the world" (Agier 2010; 42-43).

Agier is drawing on Zygmunt Baumann (2004), when referring to refugees as *human waste,* since the refugees are being placed in camps with no political impact on life. Agier emphasises this point, and argues how some want to protect the refugees, while others want to be protected against refugees (Agier 319 in Malkki 2002: 351). This is leaning towards Diken's idea about the including/excluding issues of refugees, as apolitical within the humanitarian apparatus, and merely a threat to the order. The refugee camp is a space of social dissolution, exclusion, and temporality, where life is put on hold for a longer or shorter period of time (Agier, 2014 in Turner 2015: 142).

Due to the scope of research, it is crucial to explore how modernity has affected the Act. Whether the Ugandan settlements falls within this understanding of the singular humanitarian space, or if this space has shaped, developed by, or is positioned within, what Barnett categorises as, plural humanitarianisms?

4.3.2 Bare life and refugee camps

Exploring the refugees in the camp is Agamben's understanding of bare life as *state of exception* (the spatial exception), where law is suspended and therefore absent (Agamben 1995: 55). The state of exception is causing an obvious split between biological existence,

zoē, being bare life - meaning animal life, and, *bios,* being political life - legitimised, social life, and life in society. This split of life is creating what Agamben has termed bare life (or naked life)[16]. The foundation of this notion is *homo sacer[17],* which can be exposed to iniquity and violence and is thereby excluded from having political influence (ibid.: 48; 1996: 4.5). The sacer is signifying homo sacer's position, being placed outside normal society, and the decision of whether homo sacer is to be killed, relies only on the sovereign power. As zoē is excluded from political spheres, it is a part of the state of exception*,* between the sovereign power and the bare life, as zoē is being included solely by the virtue of being excluded (Agamben, 1996: preface, 1995: 9)*.* The State of exception is simply constituted, when the sovereign, acts beyond the law (Soro 2014). Whereas Agamben's study is based on a philosophical approach, the point of depoliticisation, along with dehistorisation of refugees, are articulated by the practical studies in the field by Malkki and Agier.

Agamben explores the camp as a paradigm in itself, being a political space where politics become biopolitics, and where homo sacer is indistinct from the nationals (Agamben 1996: 40.1). The term, bio-politics, is inspired by Foucault[18], but Agamben finds that the Foucauldian view on bio-politics is insufficient, and he is re-establishing the term, since he sees biopolitics as the original activity of sovereign power (ibid.: 7). Agamben is stating, how biopolitics continuously has been involved into sovereign power, by the inclusive exclusion

---

[16] In ancient Greece every person was considered by these two separate qualities. The political life as expressed by the presence in society and the bare life given by god, and perceived as an animal who needed to oblige to basic needs as sleeping, eating etc. (Agamben 1996: 138) The women, children and senile was within the *zoē* life, as the had no political life, hereby no *bios* (Soro 2014). Biology is the emergence of modernity and is rooted in the way society measures life and reduces people to their animal qualities and because it introduces the concept of the norm, thus the anomaly (Soro 2014) By measuring life, people are reduced to objects, *zoē,* but the state defines citizens as political subjects, *bios,* entangling *bios* and *zoē* (ibid). Within modern nation states, the subject is defined as an object of the system, meaning bare life with political rights (*zoē* with the rights of *bios*) (ibid).

[17] Homo sacer was found as someone who was in exile, excluded from society and expelled from the world of men, hereby allowing the killing of this (ibid). Homo sacer is removed from bios, left only with *zoē.* Agamben hereby states that politics is distinct by the inclusive exclusion of the natural life, *zoē* (Agamben 1996: 34.1-34.3). Homo sacer is someone who has been forcibly reduced to bare life (ibid).

[18] Foucault has developed the term bio-politics, since it instigate life in the centre of political order (Agamben 1995: 5). Bio-power has emerged out of modernity, as natural life begins to be integrated in the apparatuses and calculations of State power, why politics turns into biopolitics (ibid.). He hereby acknowledges the significance of the complex relation between life, power and politics.

of zoē. He argues that sovereignty is a manifestation of political power based on dissociation of what is to be considered as being bare life, and the exclusion of the very same (Agamben 1995: 7). Regulations are removed from the person who is politically excluded, having no legal status, and is changed into being considered as bare life without rights (Agamben 1996: 4,5). Bare life being included in the exclusion, steps into a juridico-political phenomenon, and Agamben suggests, how bare life is shaped and sustained, by sovereign power (Agamben 1995: 56). Exception is placed in the centre of biopolitics, and Agamben enhances, how the institutionalisation of law is inextricably connected with the exposure of bare life (Agamben 1996: 112,3). This exception is creating a space deprived of juridical safety, where the state of exception is the rule, wherein bare life is captured, and where the political life is the consequence of a 'ban' (ibid.). Are refugees in Uganda deprived juridical safety, being just bare life, or are the ideas of the SRS empowering refugees to more?

The refugee camp can be characterised as the place, where bare life and politics are interlaced, which is creating a juridico-political community, as an outcome of sovereign power. The space is sustained, when the political system is maintained, and established via the relation between locality (space), the order of the state, and the governing entities (rules and laws). This is, according to Agamben, where the camp structure, consisting of an inherent state of exception, like the absence of law, becomes permanently realised and the camp becomes the norm (Agamben 1996: 5).

Agamben's theoretical approach is a useful apparatus, but it must be acknowledged, that there are obvious differences between the German concentration camps under WWII, and refugee camps and settlements from the contemporary world, which is the subject of this conceptual exploration and the thesis. The approach is also limiting in the sense, that it becomes too static and state-centred, why it can be criticised for lacking nuance when dealing with actors beyond the state. Inevitably the state of exception raises questions within the Ugandan context of settlements, and whether these falls within the scope of the paradigm of the camp as containing political life being included by exclusion? Further how does this relate to refugees being humanitarian projects and the camp being a humanitarian space as argued by Agier?

Professor Simon Turner stresses, how the perception of refugee as bare life, makes the camp controversial, due to the presence of international protection, in the form of humanitarian projects. This enforces the processes, in which the camp maintains control, and removes 'impurity', making refugees invisible. Refugees are despite highly visible, due to the placement in camps, as objects of humanitarian projects (Turner 2015: 144). Turner also

emphasises, how refugee camps are ambiguous, by reducing life, biologically, and temporally, while also creating possibilities for new identities to form (ibid.: 143). He is drawing on both Diken and Agier, in his exploration of the limits and effects of the refugee camp, and he is presenting Agier's three distinctions of a camp: *extraterritoriality, exception and exclusion* (Agier 2014: 20). These definitions are based on a spatial dimension, political exception, and social exclusion, defining camps, seen in the light of their exceptional, temporal and spatial character (Turner 2015: 141). The camps are representing a result of social conditions, shaped by humanitarian action, which seclude the refugees from what is perceived as a 'normal' political and social life. The complexity of the camp space, is allowing it to evolve - from being a response to basic human needs, into settlements, or even a small city, inhabited by thousands (Agier 2014 in Turner 2015: 143). In line with this, Turner is drawing on Agier who refers to refugee camps with the Foucauldian idea of *dispositif* – a device (Agier 2014: 21-23 in Turner 2015: 144). The camp is understood as a device, humanitarianising refugees, decreasing the desire of leaving the camp, reducing them to passive and inactive victims of war (Jansen 2015). This is what Turner is expressing as the dependency syndrome, which expands the humanitarian governance to areas outside the demarcated boundaries of the camp (Turner 2005: 320). In this sense, humanitarian actors are likewise evolving over time, and the people from the local communities are seeing an opportunity of gaining and benefiting from health care and other humanitarian services emerged along with the settlement (Jansen 2015: 160).

Agamben's theoretical approach is centred on sovereign power, and the state, whereas Turner's idea underscores, how it is possible to perceive refugee camps, as arenas of certain types of governmentality. These arenas' affects *[...] the ambiguous position as being at once abandoned and the objects of government and improvement* (Turner 2016: 144). This relates to the notions of biopolitics, thus governmentality is a composition of different institutions, reflections, procedures, analyses, and what is tactically calculated, which together is enabling power exercise, and at the same time allow subjectivities to be produced (Turner 2005: 144). The camp is understood as an ordering element of governmental spatial containment, but also as a space of bio-political instrumentalism.

4.3.3 The exceptional spatiality

As touched upon, several scholars have been working with the camp regarding its multifaceted and exceptional spatial aspects, including the camp that process refugees (Agier 2014), migration detention centres (Conlon, Gill, and Moran 2013), transit spaces (Davies and Isakjee 2015) and gated communities (Diken and Laustsen 2005).

The camp can be understood as a spatial practice, in the demarcating sense, which is creating an obvious distinction of the inside and the outside, mainly geographically situated peripheral, encircled by fence, dividing refugees from nationals (ibid.). This idea can be directed back to Agamben's idea of *homo sacer,* as bare life, banished by law. By focusing on the concepts of the legal and the illegal, Diken is noting, how this demarcation is blurry, and that lines are not as obvious, as a fence surrounding a prison. The state of exception is reflecting a space, inside and outside of the natural order of things, and are balancing on the conceptual lines of temporality, since they are often responses to temporary emergencies, and are per se, not created as permanent installations (Turner 2015: 142.). Some refugee camps are staying for several years, even decades, but are, as Turner argues, still to be understood as temporary, since *[...] neither those in charge of establishing the camps not those who inhabit them know how long the camp will remain or for how long the individual refugee will stay in the camp* (ibid.). Within the settlements of Uganda, an exploration of this temporality is vital, since the settlements is build as small villages, with families, houses and crops growing (Appendix 1). How does this temporality of the camp affect the settlement in the context of Uganda? Is the settlement balancing on the mentioned line of temporality? How is the distinction of inclusion and exclusion, and what spatial dimensions reigns?

The refugee camp was to be understood in a military context that, according to Turner, was conceived as being situated geographically peripheral and with a clear definition of the inside and the outside (Turner 2015). Theoretically, this isolation is also what defines the lives of the people within the camps, despite the definitional lines being non-visible (Turner 2015; Agier 2010; Ticktin 2014; Malkki 1995). In other words, the clear boundaries, of being spatially and legally excluded from the host state, is what is marking the position and life of refugees. Practically though, these boundaries, defining the camp, are pervious and often crossed for a range of reasons, such as trade, economy, intercultural exchanges, education, and employment.

Professor Bram J. Jansen (2015), explores how the camp can alter from an emergency point, to a point of transit - a place that enables access to education and economic possibilities, based on humanitarian ideas – all measures that creates the possibility of turning the camp into a 'normal settlement' (Jansen 2015: 150). Hence the dynamics of the camp is a two-way process, which allows the refugee spaces to be included into local cities over time, and also having a positive effect on the local economy (ibid.: 151). In his studies of a Kenyan refugee camp in Kakuma, Jansen found that the camp is a space of inclusion, and not only associated with the state of exception. He points out how the camp, over time *[...] also represents service delivery and empowerment, and possibilities, and refugees organized and managed themselves in relation to this* (ibid.: 152). This notion emphasises refugees as being social agents, with capabilities to develop and manoeuvre life in the camp, thus influencing and adjusting it. Jansen is considering refugees as more than bare life, stressing how people *[...] aided, assisted and emancipated, develops into an economy with distinct livelihoods and processes of social and spatial organization* (ibid.: 153). Refugees as social agents broadens the insights, and makes it possible to expound different angles of the empirical data, as it helps to form a more thorough analysis. Jansen's studies has shown, how the refugee camps in Kenya have taken the shape of small cities, and are linked to wider socio-economic importance for the life of both the nationals and the refugees, thus stressing how the camp has to be seen and understood in relation to the neighbouring and surrounding cities, homes, countries etc. (ibid.: 163).

The infrastructural mobility of refugees, regarding controlled access, is contrasting the permanent immobility of the transit spaces, since the structure here is rigid and non-negotiable (Diken 2004: 93). The refugee camp, within a host society, is varying in regards to the specific conditions in the given. There are examples, that aid in the camp, along with humanitarian dependency, is increasing a desire for refugees to stay longer in the camps. This is contrasting to a hypothetical life in the cities, where different aspects of illegality are constraining the opportunities of refugees. This is likewise the case of benefits regarding the system of security, inherent in many camp systems, which again is underscoring the inside/outside controversy (Jansen 2015). By returning to Agamben, it is in this exceptional space, with the suspension of law, and where inclusion/exclusion is interchangeable, that the camp becomes *subjected to a strongly moralizing and ethical biopolitical project by humanitarian agencies* (Turner 2006: 760) – *biopolitics*, that according to Foucault is the response and solution to both biological- and structural power problems (ibid.).

4.3.4 The feeling of rootedness

Demarcation of inside and outside, is a symbol of disconnection and segregation from the host state, which exclude the refugees, and limits them to bare life (Agamben 1996). Refugees are subjects to specific humanitarian projects, which keep them excluded from a given society and from general public life (ibid.). This general exclusion from local integration, education and employment, is leading to isolation – culturally, physically, and socio-economically. Diken is capturing this problem, by stating how *[...] the sterilized mono functional enclosure minimizes contact with the outer world which is physically behind the fences, refugees cannot touch the outer world* (Diken 2004: 91). Malkki is also addressing this depoliticisation and dehistorisation of refugees, as a consequence of hegemonic discourse, along with the question of belonging (Malkki 1996, 1992). In her studies she has explored the common ideas of what it means to be rooted in a place (Malkki 1992). *[...] people are often thought of, and think of themselves, as being rooted in place and as deriving their identity from that rootedness* (ibid.: 27) From this quotation, questions arise of whether rootedness is created in the Ugandan context, since the settlements are composed as small villages? Is it possible to create a new form of rootedness, and does the fact that the different villages are inhabited by the same ethnic groups, affect this rootedness, or are the settlements a kind of limbo, containing groups of uprooted, displaced people?

Malkki stresses, how a spatial segmentation is *[...] built into the lens of cultural relativity that [...] made the world appear as culture gardens separated by boundary-maintaining values* (ibid.: 28). Spatial segmentation is not only exposed in the narratives of *[...] cultural diversity,* but moreover in the *[...] internationalist celebration of diversity in the family of nations* (ibid.). She delves into the concepts of nation and culture, as being conceived as something existing in the soil. Culture and nations are corresponding concepts as they are both spatialising and territorialising, since both concepts depends *[...] on a cultural essentialism that readily takes on arborescent forms* (ibid.: 29). Arborescent root metaphors, suggesting that nations take the form of grand genealogical trees, with people rooted in the soil that nourishes it (ibid.: 28). This territorialisation is, argued by Malkki, filled with sedentary, reflected in language, and social practices (ibid.: 31). She underscores, how the literature on refugees as uprooted people, is dominated by the focus on broken roots - in *uprooting, the orderliness of the transplantation disappears* (ibid.: 32). This problematised narrative has affected and defined policies, as a politico-moral problem. Malkki exemplifies this with a phrase from a post-war study of a typical refugee:

Homelessness is a serious threat to moral behaviour.... At the moment the refugee crosses the frontiers of his own world, his whole moral outlook, his attitude toward the divine order of life changes.... [The refugees'] conduct makes it obvious that we are dealing with individuals who are basically amoral, without any sense of personal or social responsibility.... They no longer feel themselves bound by ethical precepts which every honest citizen . . . respects. They become a menace, dangerous characters who will stop at nothing. (Cirtautas 1957:70, 73 in Malkki 1992: 32)

This narrative revolves around, how the loss of roots, also results in the loss of moral bearings (Malkki 1992: 32). Malkki stresses, how the premise of characterising the refugee as a problem or burden, is still widely spread, as being anomalies and displaced, stripped from legal status (e.g. Agamben's bare life). This pathological condition of displaced persons is a result of the sedentary idea of rootedness (ibid.: 33). She is linking this idea of a refugee, being both generalised and problematised to the discursive externalisation of refugees, from the national order of things. Malkki is drawing on the term *Naked unaccomodated man* (ibid.: 34)*,* as a social category defining the refugee as a liminal personae, since the narrative of a typical refugee is seen as uprooted, naked, cultureless and nationless, characterised by, what Hannah Arendt (1973) express as: *a native gone amok* (cf. Arendt 1973: 302 in Malkki 1992: 34). The ideal refugee is objectified as a unified mass, aberrant, and an object of medical, humanitarian interventions (cf. Foucault 1979 in Malkki 1992: 34). Malkki observed, during her studies, a narrative of *refugee-ness,* as the ultimate temporariness of exile, and a refusal to put down roots, whereas refugees living in the town, was broader personas – *not essentially "Hutu" or "refugees" or "Tanzanians " or "Burundians"* (cf. Malkki 1990: 44ff in Malkki 1992: 35-36). This emphasises the point, made by Turner and Agier, of perceiving the camp as a space of temporality, with life set on hold. Turner is though stressing how these excluding and marginalising elements of the camp, also paradoxically is a simultaneous opportunity for refugees to shape new identities, new political projects, communities, and projects of resistance (Turner 2015).

Like emphasised, the camps are, according to Turner (2005, 2015), not to be seen as static and permanent installations, but rather as places where identity and politics can obtain new systems of meaning. Malkki is arguing, how refugees in the Mishamo camp in Tanzania, created new normative versions of history, and Turner is emphasising how this also happens with everyday measures, like rumours and gossip (Malkki 1995; Turner 2010). Accordingly, Jansen argues that refugees can be seen as socio-economic actors, and the camps as spaces

where identity is formed and preserved, produced, and reproduced (Jansen 2015). With these assumptions in mind, refugees are not apolitical subjects, but are rather in a space of agency, where the spatial- and temporal aspects that defines the camp, are challenged.

These conceptual understandings of the camp are clarifying, how refugee camps are not static entities, and the demarcation of the inside and the outside can mould and remould over time. This leads to an evolution of how a local community, and the general public surroundings, can change perceptions of, and react to, the refugee camp.

5. Exceptional humanitarianism?

To shed light on the humanitarian ideas exemplified in the policy framework, a more narrow and contextualised reading is necessary. This chapter aims to examine the complexity of the manifestations, thus narrowing the scope, focussing on the camp and the perception of a refugee, within the context of Uganda - based on the three empirical pillars. To do this, an exploration of the biased understanding of the camp, being both a space of exception where life is depoliticised, as well as a highly political space, will follow. To emphasise the paradoxes of the refugee camp regarding the field of research, this section will elucidate the presented different approaches to the camp, and the perception of refugees, to explore how the manifestation of the humanitarian ideas are unfolded. A thorough analysis will examine the camp as an exceptional space for humanitarian ideas, but also as a place of complexity - a state of exception - as well as historic and a place where new identities can arise. To understand the camp, and the perception of refugees in the context of Uganda, seen in the light of the internationally praised political framework, this section will be drawing on the diverse spectrum regarding the presented concepts. This is done to achieve a contextually wide knowledge, and to shed light on the specific case of the Ugandan policy framework, the Refugees Act 2006.

5.1 The humanitarian paradigm crisis in practise

The contemporary global evolution seems to question the core principles of universality of non-political humanitarianism, impartiality, neutrality, and humanity as one, developed according to ICRC, The Geneva Convention of 1951, and UNHCR (ICRC 2014). Fassin is accordingly arguing, that politics and humanitarianism tend to merge, why humanitarianism

indeed is politics (Fassin 2012). The humanitarian rhetoric and practices blend with the political, and it becomes almost impossible to break with its confines. As the forthcoming will emphasise, the camp and the settlement, are manifestations of the practical and emotional complexity between humanitarianism and politics. The humanitarian tendencies are characterised by the distinction between politics and humanitarianism that has become vastly blurred, hard to distinguish, and almost inseparable. Lemberg-Pedersen is, in relation hereto, rhetorically asking, if universalistic apolitical *humanitarianism is dead?* (Lemberg-Pedersen 2016). In order to find solutions to, both the present refugee crisis and the challenges inherent in the humanitarian paradigm crisis, the international institutions have 'been forced' to turn their inspirational glance away from the ineffective Western-centric responses to humanitarian action, which have showed themselves insufficient. The Western institutional gaze has for the past decade turned towards the Ugandan refugee policy framework, as a possible solution to approaching the challenges of contemporary migrant issues.

Already in 2003, UNHCR, whom were searching for durable solutions to the emerging refugee crises, brought an article about Uganda's successful SRS (McKinsey 2003). In an article Juan Castro-Magluff, UNHCR's Acting Representative in Kampala, states how *…refugees who live active and self-supporting lives in exile are better prepared to return home when peace is established in their countries of origin,"* (ibid.). The quote makes it evident, how repatriation is among the top priorities to refugee responses. But where refugee situations are typically perceived by temporality, the current global situation seems far from a solution, and it has taken character of a protracted refugee situation. UNHCR has, since the bringing of the article, sought to relieve budgetary pressures, and decrease typical emergency relief instead of more long-term development solutions (ibid.).

5.1.1 Uganda's refugee framework

Uganda began receiving refugees long before the country gained independence, and has since been developing its own policy framework for refugees. This has been done by formally subscribing to the regulations from the 1951 Convention, despite differences in the national policy frameworks and implementation methods, relating to the aforementioned SRS and the Act.

It is important to recall the notions from the historical section, in order to contextually understand where this progressive policy framework derives from. Uganda has not always been the host, but the people has through historical hardship, experienced being refugees and internally displaced themselves. People from the government, and even President Yoweri Museveni, whom fled to Tanzania in the 1970s, have personal experiences with displacement (World Bank 2016: 16). Another important aspect is the ethnic, cultural, lingual, affinities and personal ties, across the postcolonial border drawings (Appendix 2, 16-25, 100-105). Tribes, clans, and family-ties exist across national boundaries and borders, which makes it immensely difficult to speak of an 'us and them' dichotomy, despite diverging nationalities (World Bank 2016: 16). Barnett argues, drawing on examples from European history, that humanitarianism is a humanity which involves memory, and a *[...] society of memory are enforced to become societies of caring* (Barnett 2011: 227; Appendix 2, 9-15). This notion is further in line with Donini, Gordon and Haskell, whom argue that humanitarianism has its foundation in Western capitalist hegemony. There is, in this sense, no unified humanitarian community, but instead a pluriversality or multiple humanitarianisms. The specific Act is anchored in a spatial and societal culture and history, representing one of such humanitarianisms – an approach that has been praised as a possible alternative, to the contemporary Western refugee challenges. It seems, from the Western interests in the Ugandan refugee model, that *substructural change [maybe] influence(s) developments in the superstructure* (Haskell 1985: 341). Uganda has, as a historical and contemporary parallel to the Western responses of humanitarianism, been developing, what can be described as an influential subculture to the Western humanitarian paradigm. The Act, is diametrical from the humanitarian refugee solutions in contemporary Europe, and can be seen as an inspiring attempt to shape, what can be perceived as a new humanitarian paradigm.

The rights, summed up from the Act, are closely linked to the SRS, which, through the years, has aimed to, integrating refugees in local communities. Paul, from a local NGO, is emphasising how [...] *here some of them refugees mingles slowly into the community* (Appendix 3, 38). In the long term the SRS aims to help the refugees to become self-sufficient. The rights are, per definition, breaking away from the common prospects of refugee frameworks in the West. The international media is often comparing the Western refugee responses to the Act, since *[...] Uganda has become a go-to example of the success of refugees' right to work and for the viability of market-based approaches. It shows that another approach – beyond dehumanising encampment or urban destitution – is possible* (Betts 2017). Contained encampment, or care and maintenance, are characterised by large

risks of humanitarianising refugees, by embedding them in an unbreakable concentric circle of dependency within protracted refugee situations (Turner 2005: 320; Jansen 2015).

The Act is, in many instances, offering an alternative to the customary idea, that there is no in-between short-term emergency relief, and long-term development, by treating both the present crisis and the continuous annual refugee influx. It can be argued, that the Act is bridging these two measures, and reconcile them, into a balanced blend of humanitarian universality (the law) and politics (the interests). Ticktin has emphasised the necessity of humanitarianism embracing long-term solutions, anchored in state implemented development, instead of emergency relief as symptomatic treatment, and underscores this as the vast difference between *carring* and *curring* (Ticktin 2011: 62). The Act is, by seeking to empower refugees via a human rights approach, founded in the framework of the Geneva Convention. It is arguable that the Act aims to change the *socio-political realm* (ibid.), and thereby improve the conditions of the refugees, instead of only alleviating present pain - since *a different kind of listening reveal the patients to be more than the mould they were required to inhabit in order to get help* (ibid.: 106). The narrative is emphasising how *[...] deeply felt compassion has resulted in an incredibly progressive policy towards refugees, one of the best in the world* (Kende-Robb 2017) closely linking the Act to, both the freedom of movement, the freedom to access employment, the freedom to access land*,* and the fact that refugees are placed in settlements and not in traditionally organised camps.

The main ideological purpose of the refugee settlements, is that beyond being a present need for protection of human rights, it facilitates the possibility of agricultural production, and aiming at securing refugees in the long term. The Ugandan settlements can, apart from being a rhetorical strong concept, be said to reflect a wider cognisance of refugees' own abilities, and how prohibitions and restriction of these rights, might limit these abilities, in a different context.

5.1.2 From Warehousing to Self-Reliance

As the previous section has explored, the humanitarian paradigm is found in a global crisis, whereas the Act, is narrated as being more humane than contemporary refugee responses, progressive and helps better the lives of both the refugees and its local citizens (Hosseini 2017). Based on the idea that *[...] their [the refugees] new home may be the best place on the planet to be a refugee* (Hattem 2017), this thesis aims to explore the empirical phenomenons

of the humanitarian ideas manifested in the Act. This legislative framework can be argued as being a humanitarian philosophy written in formalities, and as the previous analysis stresses, the humanitarian ideas are manifested globally, politically and nationally. Further it is evident how the humanitarian project is aiming towards neutrality and being apolitical, but it is paradoxically unfolding between state sovereignty, responsibility to protect, and the fragmented landscape of different interests, actors, and politics.

The term camp is not mentioned in the Act, but settlements are being presented as the designated areas for the placement of refugees. By omitting large amounts of barbed wire, and the rhetorically value of 'a camp', from the Act, the Ugandan settlements are breaking with the common perception of camps as just warehousing refugees. Uganda is not only breaking with the ideational, and rhetorical ideas of commonly understood, refugee camps, but also the physical appearance.

5.1.2.1 The spatial characteristics

The road from Fort Portal to Rwamwanja settlement is diverse, leading through Kibale National Park, turning left to a small dusty road of clay and gravel, passing small Ugandan houses along the road. Located far from Fort Portal, the Rwamwanja Settlement is situated, in spacious fertile surroundings. When approaching the settlement, a sign is constituting the entrance, but without a guarded access point. Passing by the entrance sign on the right side of the road, an enclave of concrete buildings, surrounded by barbed wire, is forming the formal

offices of the governmental institutions, marking a shift from a regular Ugandan village and the Rwamwanja refugee settlement. Within this demarcated area, some were sitting in the shade of the trees, protected from the hot midday sun, and some were strolling around, curiously observing our presence. The settlement is, besides the fenced governmental buildings, not visibly demarcated.

By following the road ahead, you are suddenly placed in the midst of the settlement, which looks like a large natural reserve. Along the road, still wide enough for two passing cars, women walked with goods on their heads, precisely as observed when travelling across Uganda. After ten minutes drive a small spartan school, with children playing outside, appeared on the left. The larger road, turn to small gravel roads, and by following these into the lush, green settlement, villages are appearing in the horizon. On the peak of a small hill, a herd of bleating sheep are curiously observing the action in the settlement, the view of the breath-taking landscape of the Rwamwanja settlement unfolds (Appendix 1).

The roads in the settlement are small, bumpy and muddy, and along these roads, small formations of houses appear. The villages are surrounded by large areas of fields with crops, which refugees are cultivating for themselves and their families. After thirty minutes drive, a large fenced and guarded area, enclosing the Reception Centre Mahani is located. It was only

the formal buildings that were fenced, leaving the rest of the settlement unfenced. During a tour around the area, the Assistant Commander, Sophie, was asked whether locals and refugees lived together in these small villages, to which she responded, that the villages in the settlement only were inhabited by refugees (Appendix 11, 68-71).

Based on the initial SRS initiatives of empowering refugees to self-reliance, the Act specifies the responsibility of the government to designate and provide land to refugees, thus creating villages constructed by houses and land of crops. By approaching settlements as being a space for development, humanitarianism is manifested as long-term durable solutions. The international media is accentuating this narrative: *Welcoming refugees with plots of land and cash 'gives boost to local economy'* (Withnall 2016) and this attention is manifested in the Western CRRF approach from the New York Declaration, as durable and crisis solving alternative.

This narrative told by the international media, is not purely made up, but leans on the formal regulation, as the Refugee Regulations 2010, expanding on the Act, is emphasising the access to land use:

(1) A refugee who is residing in a designated refugee settlement or a refugee area shall have free access to use land for the purposes of cultivation or pasturing, except that they shall have no right to sell, lease or otherwise alienate the land that has been allocated to them strictly for their individual or family utilization (Refugee Regulations 2010: 11(65)).

Rwamwanja settlement is surrounded by varieties of flora and fauna, corresponding to the general picture of the rural areas in the region (Appendix 1). Along with the picture of the settlement containing small villages, it is placed far from urban settings and markets, and the poorly developed infrastructure is making mobility and transportation difficult without a vehicle. This places the refugee settlements, within Agier's scope of an extraterritorial space, as the settlements in Uganda in general, are placed in rural and peripheral areas. In this sense, the geographical characteristics of the settlement are leaning towards the normative understanding of *care and maintenance* camps, despite the beautiful scenery.

5.2 Exclusion or integration?

The Act articulates, how the settlements are implemented in the host community and also ensure that: *[…] refugees are integrated into the communities where the refugee camps or the refugees are settled* (Refugee regulation 2010). As stated in the Act: *"integration" means a process of interaction and peaceful co-existence and the sharing of available services between refugees and nationals* (Act 2006: 1(2)), and formally constituting how: *local settlement and integration of refugees whose applications for refugee status have been granted* (ibid. 6(44(1(b))). In Uganda it is formally a refugee right, to be granted the opportunity be integrated into the host society, and the Act accentuates the integration within these, letting refugees and locals freely interact, work together, and live side by side. Thus, creating new inclusive possibilities, which can render the life and perceptions of refugeeness. The international praise often enhances the picture of how refugees are living together in harmony, having access to the same social services as the locals, contributing to the local economy:

These families [the refugees] contributed more positively to the local economy than those not given their own land, boosting it by an additional $220 a year, as they hire agricultural labour from other households and purchase tools and supplies from local businesses […] foster[ing] positive relations between host communities and refugees (Withnall 2016).

Further *[...] Uganda has not only kept its borders open, it has welcomed refugees with open arms and open hearts* (Hosseini 2017b), *Refugees make a substantial positive contribution to the economy of their host country if they are welcomed and given plots of land* (Withnall 2016), as well as being applauded as: *be[ing] the best place on the planet to be a refugee* (Hattem 2017), *Building Resilience and fostering social Inclusion* (World Bank 2017b), and *Uganda's Refugee Hospitality Puts the Affluent World To Shame* (Woldemariam 2017). This right, both firmly anchored in the Act, and praised in the international narrative, aligns with the universal legislations from the 1951 Convention. The international focus is painting a picture of infinite possibilities for refugees, whereas the reality is more difficult. The bad infrastructure might affect the possibilities to move freely, to integrate, and to interact with the locals, why it can create an undeniable kind of exclusion. The Act is aiming towards shaping the foundation for creating positive social relations, not excluding refugees from society, but the implementation of the regulations, are challenged, due to the geographical placement of the settlements.

On the bumpy road to the settlement, an informal conversation occurred, revolving around the general lives of refugees in the settlement. Paul was asked, whether refugees could form lives and stay in Uganda forever? He stressed:

Yes, they can stay. But they have to stay as a refugee. They will always be a refugee [...] They can become Ugandan by registration. If they become citizens of Uganda they can no longer stay in the settlement. But the process is not easy. Because they don't want to make them Ugandans (Appendix 3, 17-31).

These tendencies are also emphasised by the international articles. An article in the German, Der Spiegel, states how: *The message is clear: You are welcome to stay - forever if you want* (Titz et al. 2017), which is a common perception among the international media, but also the practically engaged parties (Appendix 3, 17-31; Appendix 5, 68-70; Appendix 9, 122-127)

The Act underscores: *(1) A person shall cease to be a refugee if— (d) that person becomes a citizen of Uganda* (Act 2006: 6(1(d))). But as highlighted in an analysis by the World Bank, *The Constitution of the Republic of Uganda, 1995, implicitly excludes refugees from becoming Ugandan citizens, whether by birth or by registration* (The World Bank 2016c: 11). This creates both a political and juridical paradox. When asylum is obtained, refugees are settled within a designated settlement, with the possibility of building a life. If a

refugee is obtaining citizenship, the rights of the Act withdraws, which is limiting the refugees access to the settlement area, and they are immersed and subject to banishment from belongings and existing relations. Thus, this opportunity of obtaining citizenship is implicitly undermined, by the existing Constitution of the Republic of Uganda 1995. If citizenship is obtained, an inclusion within the political community, along with obtaining the associated political right occurs. The former refugee has the right to combine bios and zoē, being bare life with political rights, but is paradoxically also restricted from this by the 95 Constitution. This places the refugee within the idea of bare life, but it is arguable that the Act is pushing the boundaries of the very same, and is undeniably a development of bare life, via social interaction.

5.3 The possibilities for political activities

The Act is promoting social integration, thus offering refugees the position of being more than zoē, completely denying bios. Articulated in the Act: *Subject to this Act, a recognised refugee shall - not engage in any political activities within Uganda, whether at local or national level* (Act 2006: 5(35d)). Political engagement is prohibited to the citizens, implicating the removing of bios, and the refugee can be found as bare life, subject to the law, but as well as excluded from this. On several occasions during the field trip, divergent statements within refugees' political activities[19] were explicated. During an interview at his office, Ben stressed:

Yeah, they demand! They demand. They have refugee welfare councils. Those refugee welfare councils they have representatives. Women representatives man representatives. If women have issues, they can advocate through their chairperson, and that chairperson can come here at the office and say at our village we have this problem (Appendix 9, 70-75).

Sophie as well explicated, how the refugees have the right to vote in local settings regarding local councils (Appendix 5, 87-88).

While visiting Gulu University, Northern Uganda, a local Professor in History, Claire, explained how the refugees do not have the right to vote. She stressed how it often occurred

---

[19] Refugees have right to freedom of association. But association for profit and political measures are prohibited (Act 2006: 4 (29 (g))).

that the refugees were informally paid by government affiliates to vote and she also stated how it was sometimes difficult to distinguish a refugee from a national (Appendix 8, 132-147). Therefore, they often succeeded in voting, though not having the formal rights to do so (ibid.). If this is the case, that government affiliates are informally paying refugees to vote, refugees are positioned as strategic political devices, informally attaching bios to the refugee badge. A duality in the implementation of the Ugandan policy framework can be extracted, as the policy on one hand underlines how refugees are restricted from engaging in any political activities, while they on the other hand are granted local political engagement, as well as being informally paid to vote. This duality is impacting the possibility of placing the refugee within the structure of homo sacer.

5.4 Governance in the settlement

As one of the four fundamental pillars of the Act explicates, any refugee can obtain asylum, thus being protected by common and universal human rights of the 1951 Convention, which is the centrepiece of International Refugee Protection (1951 convention: 2). The refugees are protected by law, while they, as mentioned, paradoxically are excluded by the very same in line with the foundation of Agamben's notion of bare life, Homo Sacer, not protected by law, but only subjected to it. While the government proactively, according to the Act, is granting prima facie asylum, they are at the same time representing a monolithic sovereignty, for instance regarding *[...] termination of refugee status* (Act 2006: 2(5(d)); (9(d))). This highlights the frictions between humanitarian implementation and manifestations, and the universal equality, regarding the humanitarian principles. The settlements are therefore depoliticising the refugees, while they at the same time are highly politicised.

The necessity of establishing a number of administrative institutions, and committees are explicated in the Act. The public Office for refugees, responsible for administrative matters, coordinating inter-ministerial, and non-governmental activities concerning refugees, an Eligibility Committee, advising the ministry on refugee related matters, along with a Commissioner for Refugees appointed by the president, responsible for day-to-day operations, administration, and law enforcement, are presented as necessary within the act (Act 2006).

According to the Act, the established Office shall:

(2) Without prejudice to the generality of subsection (1), the Office shall— (m) ensure the maintenance of law and order in refugee settlements.

Section 10. Other officers and employees, is accordingly underscoring: *There shall be such other officers and employees of the Office as may be necessary for carrying this Act into effect, who shall be appointed by the Public Service Commission.* (Act 2006: 3(7-10))

As presented in the descriptions of the Rwamwanja settlement, a distinct demarcation between the formal buildings and the rest of the settlement was apparent (Appendix 1). Within this area, organisations as the ICRC, the WFP, UNHCR and Office of Prime Minister (OPM) were located, whereas local NGOs were situated outside this area.

These various institutions, act as de facto governments in the settlement, as a device for the enforcement of the Act. When granted asylum, refugees are subject to the assigned regulations from the Act, which are enforced within the settlement. As previously appointed, the rights of the Act withdraw, if cessation of refugee status occurs. As a normal citizen of Uganda, one is not a subject to the Act, but only assigned to comply with the regulations, inherent in the existing Constitution of Uganda. The framework of the Act is manifested within the concept of refugeeness, along as within the settlement and positions refugees outside the legal framework of Uganda. Agier is, accordingly, emphasising how refugees are governed by separate regulations, which makes the exceptional space of the camp, ordinary (Agier 2010: 36). Agamben stresses, how the camp is a state of exception, *a piece of territory that is placed outside the normal juridical order [...]* (Agamben 1996: 40). The Ugandan settlements are, in this sense, leaning towards the notion of Agamben, and the state of

exception, which is an example of how the humanitarian 'ought-to-be-apolitical', becomes vastly interest based, and politicised.

5.5 State of exception and temporality

When exploring the concepts of refugee camps and humanitarianism, an important aspect is the relation between the contemporary and the future. During the first meeting with the Assistant Commander Sophie, whom worked daily at the OPM in the settlement, she underscored:

Yes they can stay here for life [...] Yes – as long as they want to [...] Actually doing verification, when we are verifying, most of the refugees say no no no, they don't want to go back. [...] Most of them are fine with staying here. They are comfortable here. (Appendix 5, 67-77).

This idea was as well stressed by NGO informants, but on a drive, Paul explained: *when the war is over in their country, they have to go home* (Appendix 3, 12-13), thus not knowing when. The Act explicitly defines that:

(1) A person shall cease to be a refugee if— (e) the circumstances in connection with which that person was recognised as a refugee have ceased to exist, but he or she without compelling reasons arising out of previous persecution— (ii) continues to refuse to return to the country of former habitual residence or to take on another available nationality (Act 2006: 2 (6, (1(e))).

It is not temporarily explicated when repatriation has to happen, only that it has to happen when the reason for their asylum, is no longer present. The strive for repatriation, is in line with one of the durable UNHCR solutions for refugee situations. This focus on repatriation stresses the temporality of the camp, and as articulated by Turner, temporariness may become permanent (Turner 2016: 139).

The ideal scenario in Uganda is the ability for refugees to be self-sufficient, according to the goals of the SRS. This indicates how long-term plans for refugees are paradoxically double-sided, focusing on both repatriation, and long-term development. In other words, the refugees' future within the settlement remains uncertain. Refugees get the opportunity to

settle, build a house, grow crops, access social services and to be integrated into the sphere of the host community. On one hand, all these factors are impacting the diminishing of a temporary feeling, while on the other, the temporality is ever present, since refugees have to repatriate when homeland peace is attained. This uncertain existential limbo is consequently trapping refugees, not knowing whether they can peacefully create a sustainable future for themselves, their children, grandchildren etc., or if they have to repatriate. This limbo is emphasised by Turner, who is drawing out how *[...] refugee camps are meant to be temporary measures until another solution is found. Meanwhile, the length of this temporary stay is unknown* (Turner 2016: 142).

The international media has focused on the progressive narrative of possible permanence, since the refugees are *[...] given a plot of agricultural land and raw materials to build their own home upon arrival* (Withnall 2016). Driving through the landscape of the Rwamwanja settlement, the eyes are catching sight of spartan refugee houses, built of mud, and wood with tarpaulin roofs. The distinction between these houses and the local houses outside the settlement, was these exact white tarpaulin roofs, patched with blue UNHCR logos.

These refugee houses are spread all over the governmentally provided acres of land, and formed different zones and villages of the settlement (Appendix 1). According to the Assistant Commander Sophie, the villages all had different names, and the refugees were thoughtfully divided into these villages based on ethnicity, the amount of people in the families etc. (Appendix 11, 92-93). By settling, the refugee initiating agriculture, social

services, vocational training, sewing-courses, carpentry classes etc., the temporality of the camp is challenged (Appendix 4).

On a walk through the scenery of the settlement, Evelyn, whom worked in the same non-governmental organisation as Paul, introduced Jim, an elderly refugee. Jim explained how he originally fled from Rwanda, and had stayed in the settlement since 1965. He was a self-sufficient farmer, independent from humanitarian aid, and had no plans of returning to Rwanda. He explained that he was very fond of living in the settlement, since he had everything he needed, and had established a home there. The arrangement of his house, and plot of land, seemed to have been facilitated at 50 x 50 metres, before the new framework decreased the plot of land to 30 x 30 metres. Jim's house peeped out from the smaller and more common spartan refugee houses. His house was well established, made of clay bricks, and with a regular regional thatched roof, as seen outside the settlement, with no tarpaulin imprinted UNHCR logos (Appendix 1).

Jim's scenario explicates the mentioned problematic temporal paradox, between legislation (Act 2006), the authoritarian perception (Assistant Commander), and the lived experience (Jim). Diken is stressing how the idea of exception infiltrates every aspect of the refugees' life, and as the spatial characters affect the state of exception, so does the temporality of the camp (Diken 2004: 87). Turner is accordingly emphasising, how the camp, within this setting of the settlement, exists between the temporary and the permanent (Turner 2015: 42). The Act is placing the temporality of the settlement in a definitional grey zone,

between short-term emergency relief (carring), and long-term development (curring), which is both generating possibilities, as well as limiting the room to manoeuvre.

On the same trip, on a hill, another refugee was introduced - they called her 'the Pygmy'. As described in the field notes:

At the hill, we were guided to a small spartan refugee house, and Ben walked over, opening the door. [...] A small elderly woman, the Pygmy they called her, unwillingly showed her face, not saying anything. We were told that she was ill and old, and urgently needed assistance. (Appendix 1, 251-257).

This scenario contradicts, the aforementioned situation of Jim. The elderly woman seemed highly depending on aid, and her house was found solely, outside any attachment to a village, and social interaction.

One of the core challenges about the common humanitarian ideas of protracted, 'care and maintenance' situations is what has been termed *the dependency syndrome* (Turner 2005: 320). Refugees in Uganda are given opportunities according to the SRS, within the Act, in order to circumvent the negative tendencies of being dependent passive victims, into responsible development actors, which is corresponding to the UNHCR evaluations (2004) of the policy. The aforementioned elderly woman can be placed within the idea of the dependency syndrome, being the suffering victim and the ideal refugee, whereas the example of Jim is breaking with the idea of this suffering passive victim. These paradoxical inconsistencies, then makes the policy take one step forward, and two steps back. Further the

ambivalent idea of repatriation is blurring the actual aim of development of the refugee as a socio-economic actor that has come to stay.

5.6 Identity cards, travel documents, and the freedom of movement

Upon arrival in the settlement, refugees are undressed, given food, and registered in the aforementioned, fenced Reception Centre (Appendix 5, 34-44). Refugees have to collectively stand in line for food, from a large communal kitchen, receiving daily hot meals and are provided with relief supplies, *including saucepans, spoons, plates, cups, plastic sheeting, a hoe, soap, blankets, jerry cans, mats, and panga (machetes)* (Betts et al. 2016: 6).

Divided into groups of men, and women/children, they are given sleeping-bags and mats, and are sleeping on the floor, under a large canopy (Appendix 11, 11-12; 20-21). Posters on how to live non-violent lives, enhancing of gender-equality, and multiple hygiene advices, decorated the walls in the buildings. Refugees are staying in the Reception Centre, until the authoritarian de facto government has processed the needed information, beyond the prima facie regulations, and they are thereafter allocated a specific plot of land (Appendix 5, 35-43;

Betts et al. 2016: 6). The Commissioner of Refugees is receiving, and processing the applications regarding refugee status, and if asylum seekers are succeeding in obtaining refugee status, privileges as food ration cards, and building materials are provided, along with an identity card. The identity card functions as a practical proof that the refugee is covered by the rights of the legislation in the Act (Act 2006).

During a visit to the Rwamwanja Settlement, a returning weekly scenario played out (Appendix 1). In order to receive food for new-borns, these as well have to be registered, and each Monday the refugees can register their babies onto their identity card, which created long lines in front of the OPM, with mothers and babies chaotically waiting in the sharp midday sun.

While waiting for access to the OPM, at the first visit to the settlement, a frustrated mother argued with the authorities, making turmoil and drawing attention by shouts. Paul and Ben explained what happened, during an informal conversation:

Ben: No she's saying that the child should be added to the formal document. They are not added. Then they are going to submit the food tomorrow. So now she is complaining, what should she do. The names of the newborn is added every Monday.
Paul: Usually this yard is full of mothers with their newborns, waiting to add them to their formal document. A lot of people will be here – you'll see on monday.
Ben: They have not added a name to her formal documents. They are withholding it.. Ahhh.. So she is frustrated.

Lasse: They cannot solve it?

Ben: It is hard. The OPM is in charge and they are only doing it on mondays, so she has to wait (Appendix 10, 19-28).

This can be seen as an example on how the humanitarian governmental sovereignty is taking on, the role as a type of government of the world, which relates to Barnett's point of how humanitarian organisations have taken over state-like purposes, acting as de facto government ministries. This Commissioner is dealing with refugee applications and has the final say, of whether refugee status is granted or not. Along with these government appointed positions, the UNHCR, the WFP and a number of NGOs, play a significant role within providing and allocating resources. The involved organisational apparatus is affecting the policy, and the implementation of the very same. This combination of care and control is exemplifying how power relations, can be seen as a manifestation of humanitarianism, which underscores the paradox of emancipation and domination, presented by Barnett, since humanitarian action, as earlier mentioned, operates with emancipatory ethics, but also is an act of control (Barnett 2011: 11-12).

When receiving an identity card, proofing the granted asylum, the refugee is entitled to freely move in Uganda, despite restrictions (Act 2006: 4(30)). During the field studies, the Assistant Commander Sophie stated how *[…] the refugees need to have proof of where they are going and if they are going to get employment, they need to have proof of this* (Appendix 5, 55-57). Refugees, as well has the right to travel outside Uganda, with the exception of the country of origin:

(1) A recognised refugee staying in Uganda is entitled to a travel document for the purpose of travel outside Uganda, unless compelling reasons of national security or public order require otherwise (Act 2006: 4(31)).

To travel outside Uganda, a travel document is needed, and the Commissioner has to be notified in writing of the travel plans (ibid.; Refugee regulations 2010: 48-49). This is corresponding to Uganda's responsibility to the legislation from the 1951 Geneva Convention, which ought to function as universal humanitarian rights, why the Act is not especially humanitarian in itself, but is merely just following the Convention. The bureaucratic processes of obtaining a travel permit (passport), is not different from common processes of nation states. The Ugandan refugee legislation differs in the sense, that it on one hand is relying on common national legislation of freedom to travel, while on the other is

governed by the local Establishment, where refugees only have the rights of movement within the specific framework. The rights of freedom to movement appears as a distinct duality within the policy, as refugees are free to move while at the same time restricted and governed by the Act.

Another vital aspect within the freedom to move is the practical, geographical and infrastructural circumstances of this. As touched upon, the Rwamwanja settlement is placed far from Fort Portal, at the end of a bumpy gravel road. No public transportation was passing by, local boda boda motorcycle taxis were sporadically spotted on the road, mainly carrying goods, and vehicles are an absolute necessity, in order to reach either the settlement or the city. The bad infrastructure is in this sense creating vast challenges for the possibilities to move freely. Thus, having the freedom to move, refugees are restricted by the spatial characteristics of the settlement, placed in the periphery of society. This spatial distinction is, recalling Turner, what marks the definition of the inside and outside, inclusion and exclusion (Turner 2015), why the notion of freedom seems to get blurred in the practical aspects of the good intentions. The aspect of whether refugees are included or excluded of society, likewise is echoing the national's perception of the dichotomous relationship, between 'us and them', also within the de facto government of the settlement.

5.7 The violent refugee?

During an informal conversation with a local, Ibrahim, he was asked, how the nationals were responding to the refugees coming to Uganda. He explained:

The local people don't care. They have no problem with them, you know […] it's only ahm… If you.. Ahm.. If you.. Ahm.. People, specifically the Sudanese, their behaviour is quit violent to local people. They are not so nice to us, you know, the way they talk are so arrogant. They want to fight all the time. But the rest of the people, like the Somalis… […]Yeah.. you know they don't.. They are nice, you know. (Appendix 7, 48-57).

This idea of some tribes being more than commonly violent was continuously expressed in the field, and during interviews (Appendix 8, 207-215; 6, 17-20; 11, 85-95). Consequently, it is apparent, how the concept of refugees is provoking fundamental indefinability. As Diken stresses, refugees are both being subject to human rights, as well as being a threat towards the order. Professor Claire underlined, how this aspect, was one of the main reasons for dividing

the tribes within the different settlements, to maintain peace between the internally conflicting tribes (Appendix 8, 78-84). The Act is responsible for protecting refugees, why roots and history inevitably, and most necessary, must be taken into consideration, thus differing from the idea of being a place of depoliticised and dehistoricised state of exception.

The Assistant Commander Sophie informed that the Rwamwanja settlement is receiving between one hundred and six hundred refugees a day (Appendix 5, 90-91).

On a trip through the settlement zone, which she was responsible for, a hold was taken in the small refugee village, Maheka. People were working with their crops, children playing in the high grass, and Sophie was asked, whether refugees were ever fleeing from this scenery. Sophie narrated, *They do.. They do.. […] They want money* (Appendix 6, 12), she took a minute to think, while hesitating and continued:

Okay, I can say like sort of con-men, cause the will come and lie to you, saying I'll sell to you my plot and tell you I'm going back to Congo. Then after one week they are back here, starting fighting with other groups here in the settlement. Because they want money (Appendix 6, 17-21).

Sophie is enhancing, what was sensed as a general tendency of suspiciousness among the local establishment of the organisations, which as well wad underlined by Claire, who stated

how, *The South Sudanese have their own mind-sets. A lot of violence… so they are still psychologically… they are very violent. You have to handle them with care.* (Appendix 8, 209-211). This suspiciousness and loss of moral bearings is emphasised by Malkki, as being regressive, but she acknowledges how this idea of refugees as being a problem, is still widely spread (Malkki 1992: 32). Sophie additionally pointed out, how the administrators found that the refugees often lied, or exaggerated their stories, being dishonest and unreliable, as well as being violent (Appendix 5, 59-60; 6; 11, 85-95). This is an example of a common perception of refugees, from the de facto government, whom are causally involved in constructing a space of exception. This underscores Malkki's point of how the loss of roots, often results in the perception of the loss of moral bearings. Refugee's as burdens, contradicts the humanitarian ideas from the Act, and the notions from the SRS, since one of the core ideas behind the strategy, is abandoning the stigmatising perception of refugees, and move towards categorising them as being responsible self-reliant agents.

5.8 Rootedness and negotiation of new identities

As earlier stated, the temporality of the settlements in Uganda is a dichotomy, since it is creating a space of temporality, as well as a place of permanence. Refugees are given a place to settle, among like-minded from the same tribe. Differing from the politics of warehousing, where refugees are stuck in time and space, the humanitarian ideas inherent in the Act, and recalling the story about Jim from Rwanda, makes it possible for refugees to create a sustainable future, and a new sense of belonging. The refugees in Rwamwanja is not 'trapped in a tent', but is, by getting the access to a physical space beyond the basic needs, obtaining the opportunity to, analogically 'plant' themselves a life of existential content. This process is mirroring the refugee's life in retrospect, along with the common and traditional life of the local community surrounding them, psychologically linking the two parties. Refugees are therefore, in this context, becoming social agents with a history, and the settlement a space where *[...] old habits and structures no longer make much sense, new identity positions are made possible* (Turner 2015: 144), or old habits generate new meanings, in a new context. Refugees as social agents, are co-creating, and continuously negotiating and renegotiating the space of reality. Within Malkki's studies she underscores how *[...] people are often thought of, and think of themselves, as being rooted in a place and as deriving their identity from that rootedness.* (Malkki 1992: 27). These roots are specifically arborescent, and she finds that an alternative conceptualisation of roots and identity is necessary, as identity is always mobile

and processual, which is aligning with the humanitarian ideas of the settlement. In line with Malkki's ideas, the space of the settlement has importance in rerooting refugees, as they are renegotiated and remoulded. A shift from perceiving refugees as a homogenous and objectified mass, is observed, as the history of divergent tribes are recognised, acknowledging refugees as heterogeneous subjects. The Act is, in this light, implicitly encouraging a development of new identities in new spaces, putting down new roots, but within the tribes and well-known frames. Thus, Jim is an example out of many, who underlines the possibility of creating a new form of rootedness within the Ugandan refugee settlements.

Turner stresses how *[...] the humanitarian refugee regime itself is not monolithic and is full of contradictions that make space for the emergence of new subjectivities and socialites* (Turner 2015: 147). The boundaries between the settlements and the host community are obliterated, and the Act allows refugees to integrate into the host community, as well as giving the host community access to developing services equally to the refugee. The remoulding of the identity and the 'rerooting', takes place on a daily basis through interaction between everyone involved, surrounding and related to the settlement. By this, life is perennially moulded and remoulded.

The policy is though failing in recognising individual particularities and histories, regarding self-reliance via farming. Despite many refugees originally being farmers, used to grow crops to provide for themselves, the existence of natural division of labour must be acknowledged. Further a paradox occur, when the Act is trying to oblige to the roots of each tribe, recognising history, and erasing the temporality, while it at the same time maintain the idea of repatriation. Another important aspect in this paradox is concerning the freedom to move and obtaining travel documents. Though ethnic history is taken into account, refugees have to hand in their passports, when obtaining travel documents (Act 2006: 4(31(3))), and Sophie as well stressed:

If you are from the north, and another one is from the south, issues are also there. So there is tribalism there. So we're trying to divide them and make sure that it is the same refugees living here. So if they are coming here, we tell them, if you're a soldier there, you surrender soo. You become a refugee. You've had you're differences in tribes, but when you're here you speak one language (Appendix 11, 91-95).

This contributes to creating a sense of neutralisation of identity, and sense of belonging, but only as a means of a new identity to be created.

5.9 Refugees as socio-economic agents

The Act and the SRS, explicate the importance of promoting Self-Reliance and sustainable development, as well as the importance of integrating refugees into local, national, and regional development plans, while at the same time prohibiting political engagement (Act 2006: 5(35(e))). This approach is highly embraced by the Western narrative of the policy framework, praising it as *The Ugandan Exception* (Woldemariam 2017), enhancing how Uganda *[...] exemplifies the moral high ground abandoned by the United States [and the West]* (ibid.), and the fact that *[...] refugees in Uganda are given large plots of land in sprawling settlements to build homes or, if they like, small farms* (Hattem 2017), but is also comparing it to the current refugee influx in the Western part of the world. The Act is approaching refugees as socio-economic agents, and instruments of development, and is accordingly embracing the promotion of self-reliance, which has to be implemented in the settlements:

(1) The Minister may, in accordance with the Constitution and any other law, by notice published in the Gazette, designate places or areas on public land to be transit centres or refugee settlements for the purposes of—(b) promote self-reliance among refugees and sustainable development in the affected areas (Act 2006: 6(44)).

When entering the settlement, a small local NGO, was situated beyond the fenced formal area, after passing an outside carpentry. Minimalistic equipped buildings constitute workshops for girls, who are learning how to sew on manual foot pedal sewing machines (Appendix 1). Ben was working and managing this small agency, fundraising money for vulnerable girls, as well as conducting courses, to help them to a self-sufficient future (Appendix 4). He explained, how his organisation was locally funded, helping raising money, taking care of orphans, as well as mobilising special interest groups for refugee girls, and giving them start up kits, aiding them to obtain vocational skills, aiming towards self-reliance (Appendix 4, 19-29). As CARA was criticised for controlling the refugees, rather than protecting them the development of SRS and the Act, is exemplifying a fundamental change. A change from mainly aiding suffering bodies, to focusing on the refugees as being a part of a sustainable development plan, opposite the idea of just emergency relief. This idea places refugees in the centre of a humanitarian and socio-economic politics in a dichotomy of being politically excluded, while at the same time having the possibility of being included into the host community. This exemplifies a conceptual bridge-building of the Ugandan approach,

which combines universal humanitarianism with the political. Jansen's ideas of the settlement, as a set of choices, which both includes a flight from insecurity and poverty, in search for education, health care, and economic opportunity, is in line with this. The strive for changing the perception from refugees as mere suffering victims, into active actors, is one of the cornerstones of the Act, which makes it stand out from common responses to refugee crises (Jansen 2015: 163). The Act is applauded for being a power of humane generosity, progressive, compassionate, especially in comparison to European Union, as being a refugee heaven, and for having an economic impact on Uganda (Hattem, 2017; Woldemariam 2017; Hosseini 2017a; Withnall).

The focus on refugees as socio-economic agents via SRS and the Act, by counting in economy, promotion of self-sufficiency, receiving international funding, and helping refugees in starting small business, is not only beneficial for refugees, but also for the host communities. By placing refugees in settlements in rural areas, growth is added to the local arenas, as the nationals gets access to education, businesses, and social services, which are established and internationally funded. Jansen is arguing how, the economic incentive is creating a local desire for the refugees to stay in the settlements, and is forming a form of interdependency (Jansen 2015: 155). Refugees are dependent on humanitarian aid, and the host communities are entangled in the benefits arisen by the establishment of the settlement as relief goods, services, trade, employment, and intercultural contact (ibid.). In the midst of aid, opportunity is created, since it is economically affecting the society, as well as benefiting it. Ben revolves on the economical prospects, of how refugees can contribute positively:

Yeah, it is benefiting the economy. The government has constructed government buildings, you see they have because of the settlement. There is the private sector also, and they enjoy this, because it is constructed for the host communities as well [...] they are employing very many people. So, to me, as a person, receiving refugees is an economic advantage (Appendix 9, 140-148).

This is an example of how globalised institutional fragmentation, places humanitarian action beyond the non-political universal ideal.

The Act is a demonstration of humanitarian action with politico-economic interests, enhancing integration, generating an informal, social and economic tie between the nationals and the refugees, which enhance opportunities for parties involved. Jansen illustrates, how a socio-economic landscape is helping the refugees increasing relative normality, and the

option of moving in and out of humanitarianism (Jansen 2015: 163). The settlement becomes a possibility of shaping a new life, and a new identity, around and beyond humanitarian action.

5.9.1 Reciprocity and capitalism

Uganda has a long and complex history of receiving refugees, as well as having internal conflicts. A general tendency from the conversations during the field studies, were the emphasis of mutual historic memory, of shared experiences. Ben, Paul, the Assistant Commander Sophie, and Professor Claire, stressed how history is affecting the Ugandan way of managing refugees (Appendices). Ben expressed how *[...] you are treating the refugees like you know them, like one of your own. [...] Ugandans have an open hand to receive the refugees* (Appendix 9, 165-168), which is referring to the notions from the historical section. Claire is as well emphasising this society of memory:

Yes…so at times where refugees come… crossing the borders, for some, they are coming home. So you welcome them. Our brothers are coming home. When peace returns, they will go back. And that is why I always say…we shall not politicize…some of things, over-politicise. We should not politicize the refugee crisis…because, the only thing that separated us, was political boundary, brought in by colonialism. Without those boundaries, we would have been part of the same conflict…one way or the other (Appendix 8, 81-87).

Besides formally emphasising the refugees as social agents, the informal perception of the refugees as one of their own, underlines a common history, in spite of cultural diversities, from before the colonial border drawings, as emphasised by Jakob Eilsøe Mikkelsen, Area Representative in Africa, for Save the Children (Appendix 2, 9-25). Barnett reflects this idea, when he elaborates on how historicist notions affect humanitarianism. The Ugandan politician Matia Kasaijaa, was one of many, whom were forced to flee Uganda, has stated in an article brought by the World Bank: *In Uganda we operate an open policy, because we have suffered* (World Bank 2017b). The narrative is as well orbiting this historical memory, underscoring how it is a *Lesson from their own history* (Titz et al. 2017). This collective memory, is affecting the humanitarian approach, formally impacting the policy, and how this is practically implemented.

This idea of reciprocity can be seen as an informal version of R2P, as the individual moral compass of helping and protecting the ones in need, which is displayed in the attitudes towards the influx of refugees in Uganda. This is a manifestation of the humanitarian ideas, which by history, is expressed in the helpfulness and reciprocity of the culture. Barnett stresses accordingly, how societies of memory, are forced to become society of care, creating reciprocity and, being well aware that Uganda one day could be in need of help again (Appendix 8, 64-79 Appendix 2, 9-16, 105-110).

Opposing the thought of reciprocity is the economic incentive within the policy, as well as it being practically observed in the field. When asked if the settlement could receive more refugees, Ben replied: *Yes, we have room for more refugees. More refugees means more money* (Appendix 6, 81-82) as well as during the interview: *Yeah, they are employing very many people. So, to me, as a person, receiving refugees is an economic advantage. [...] So, economic, it is an advantage* (Appendix 9, 146-154). This stance is the Assistant Commander, Sophie, agreeing on (Appendix 5, 104-105), and during the tour at the Reception Centre, Mahani, when meeting some co-workers, Sophie blessed them for keeping the place clean. *I am telling them they are keeping the place clean so he is saying like, you should be blessed. And I am like, you should also be blessed with more refugees... You know.. For work* (Appendix 11, 47-49). Both for Ben and Sophie, the economic benefits of receiving more refugees are embraced, as it is providing opportunities, and is of vast importance for local development. Claire is as well stressing the importance of counting-in political strategy, regarding the refugee approach:

Museveni have used the refugees...as a tool to rise to power [...] So for this strategy adopted...it is good. Because one; it will make the refugees settle. And once they are settle,

you engage them in economic activities. If they are not engaged, they will get involved in subversive activities. That can lead to war. Museveni has learned that lesson… to support and settle them, and monitor them from within. As they are being monitored for within, peace is build, both regionally and locally (Appendix 8, 125; 144-149)

Economy and politics are clearly affecting the approach to the refugee crisis (Haskell 1985; Barnett 2015), creating the dichotomy of reasons to help, placing history and reciprocity on one side and capitalism on the other.

5.10 Unifying the implementation of humanitarian ideas.

The analysis has explored, how the presented diverse humanitarian ideas, are manifested within the framework of the Act. These manifestations have shown to operate in definitional grey zones of humanitarianism, as a duality, promoting the traditional universal ideas of the phenomenon, but also the interest-based, and more contemporary, political approaches to crisis.

The refugee settlement, is paradoxically contributing in creating a state of exception, while at the same time expanding beyond it. The state of exception is the 'State of Nature', and bare life is paradoxically and continuously, both included and excluded from within the policy. History and ethnicity are essential elements, in order to shed light on the humanitarian ideas that are practically manifested, in the Ugandan settlements. The acknowledgement of history underlines the understanding of heterogeneousness of refugees, which is affecting everyday life in the settlements. The Act is formally accentuating and transforming the refugees into social agents, enhancing a paradox, of whether the Act is based on reciprocity, or if it is merely a state of capitalistic humanitarianism.

6. Universal principles?

During the analysis, important tendencies have been explored, to understand the humanitarian ideas, within the Act. This has unravelled how the analytical conceptualisations are situating the Ugandan example in a global context, illustrating the conceptual elasticity and proximity of humanitarianism. The following will elaborate on reflections of the tendencies uncovered

in the analysis, regarding humanitarian universality in the context of the global refugee crises, and appertaining suggested solutions.

Approaching the Act, it can be emphasised how there exist no unified humanitarian community. The universal ideas of humanitarianism, anchored in the ICRC ideology, and the Geneva Convention of 1951, can be said to have crystallised into a pluriversality of multiple humanitarianisms of today. The Act is representing such, if the premise of pluriversality is accepted. The previous analysis has explored, that the case of Uganda, is breaking with common contemporary perceptions of humanitarianism, and especially with humanitarian action, and practical manifestations. It has also been highlighted, how the policy is limited within its scope, and contains vast pitfalls, especially in the gap between the humanitarian ideas of the Act, and its actual manifestations. This further indicates, that in order to understand the praising Western narrative of humane exceptionality, of the policy framework, calls for a contextualisation – the Act, can only be understood as exceptional, relative to contemporary global tendencies, and sporadic historic examples of response to displacement crisis':

"*There is a tragic irony when Uganda is accepting its millionth refugee from South Sudan, with thousands more arriving every day, the United States and Europe, with such greater resources, are trying to close the door […] There is a lesson here. We should be giving aid to countries like Uganda but we should also be standing with them. If Uganda can open its arms to vulnerable fleeing war, so can the rest of the world* said President and CEO of the International Rescue Committee (IRC), David Miliband (IRC 2017).

The above-mentioned illustrates this contextualisation, which also has been touched upon in the initial parts of the thesis, and it places Uganda's refugee approach within a global scenario. It highlights, what is perceived as the differences between contemporary responses to displacement issues, and long-term solutions – the so-called Humanitarian-Development Nexus. It also explicates how emergency relief, or lately, 'pro-active inactivity', is a 'preferred' Western solution to crises on one side, and how Uganda's response aims to break away from mere immediate fiscal relief solutions, or closed doors, and into a more long-term state implemented development approach on the other – or even to mitigate the two. The 'Western Model', which has been seen dominating the European response to refugee influx' since the chaotic times of the post-Cold War era, and until today's refugee crisis, can to a large extent be characterised as *care and maintenance* (what Ticktin characterises as *Carring*

instead of Curring), human deterrence by encampment (warehousing), and protraction (UNHCR 2001). These practical manifestations, paradoxically contradict the core of the legislation from the 1951 Convention, inspired by the universal ideas of ICRC, which 196 nations, including all European countries, have signed. Ratifications from 2000 have further meant, that the laws from the Convention are universally applicable (ICRC 2010).

6.1 Problems with Humanitarian Universality

As touched upon, the thesis has aimed to look into the concept of humanitarianism, and whether it is possible to understand it as a changing and changeable paradigmatic phenomenon, despite what ought to be universally applicable human rights, embedded into the Convention. To shed light on this, the Ugandan example has been examined, since it has been praised as progressive and exceptionally humane.

The challenges of universality, within humanitarianism, literally lie within the term itself. Human and cultural diversity, and universal principles, simply repels each other, despite the seemingly good intentions. The humanitarian core principles, as initially proposed by the ICRC, as emphasised, laid the foundation of the universal law enforcements of the 1951 Geneva Refugee Convention. A benchmark, which transformed humanitarianism from a humanitarian moral codex, to a transnational juridico-political measure. The problem with the Convention, and thereby universal humanitarianism as an instrument for protecting refugee rights, is its lack of flexibility and acknowledgement of the complexity of displaced peoples' specific situations and causes - in other words, the problem is more what the 1951 Convention is not including, than what it actually includes and opts for. The international universality is in this sense, and maybe unintentionally, creating a hegemonic bio-political dehistorisation of refugees – a state of exception - as emphasised by Agamben and Agier. The complex refugee crises of today, and the problems with the European protracted containment asylum system, are clearly indicating that solution and problem are not compatible, and that a humanitarian paradigm shift is necessary. The closed European doors, and use of military capabilities, and money for deterrence in the Aegean Sea[20] and in Italy[21] seems, with the critical assumptions from the conceptual framework, and the memory of

---

[20] See NATO (2016).

[21] See Reuters (2017).

ICRC's inactivity under the Biafran War and the Genocide in Rwanda in mind, like a contemporary proactive excuse for inactivity. Recalling the notion of Barnett, *[…] as humanitarian governance has grown, it has become more centralized, more distant from those it wants to help* (Barnett 2011: 222). The Convention has, since the anchored paragraphs and post-Cold War operations, been working within the same claim of universality, despite the changing dynamics of the contemporary, so-called globalised, world order. The anachronistic Convention is from and for, a gone by era, and clearly not made for contemporary global mass displacement. Western nations, are politically taking action, to passively avoid their humanitarian responsibly to the Convention. The European refugee crisis, is a clear indication on how nations, which are responsible to the Convention, are breaking the universal humanitarian rules of the legal framework – and if EU is breaking the rules, how can it expect others' not to? If universal humanitarianism is made redundant by its own 'creators', it must be close to dead, or its moral foundation must at least be severely wounded.

The above-mentioned has outlined the basis for, why transnational institutions, nation states, and scholarly literature, are rhetorically underscoring the need for a new humanitarian paradigm. The SRS, local integration, and organisational settlements, as a mitigating strategy between emergency relief, and medium and long-term development, have been on the transnational program since the 1960s, but have seriously gained ideational popularity in the light of the contemporary displacement crisis.

6.2 The Convention, the Act, and the Humanitarian ideas

As a result of the paradigmatic humanitarian crossroads, the international donor community began turning their inspirational glance outwards, towards Uganda. Protracted refugee situations are costly affairs (Appendix 2, 68), and SRS is, in this sense, a durable solution in all operational matters (UNHCR 2005a: 2). As emphasised, Uganda has since the 1960s been promoting SRS as a durable refugee solution – the same time as UNHCR began focusing on the more progressive and liberal approach. The difference and paradox between the two parties was, that Uganda began releasing and implementing the ideas of SRS, where UNHCR got stuck in continuous planning. The praise of the progressive and exceptionally humane Act, stems from the idea of its generous open doors, despite the simultaneous lack of resources, the granting of freedom to move, access to employment, and local integration - a significant contrast to the warehousing tendencies and deterrence actions in Europe. It is

though becoming increasingly obvious, by the examination of the Ugandan Refugees Act 2006, the 1951 Geneva Convention, and the New York Declaration respectively, that there are no contrasts to be found in the encapsulated materials.

The 1951 Convention is granting refugees the right to earn a livelihood by: wage-earning employment, under the same rules as residents (Article 17), by self-employment as agriculture, handicraft, industry etc. (Article 18), and by the right to movable and immovable property, again under the same conditions as residents (Article 13). It is further explicated how, refugees have freedom to movement (Article 26), the right to obtain travel documents (Article 28), under due process; non-discrimination (Article 3), and how they have the legal right access courts (Article 16). The Convention is aiming to secure refugees' access to public education (Article 22), and to public relief (Article 23). Recalling the earlier examination and analysis of the Act, the humanitarian ideas exemplified, are not different from those of the Convention. The Convention contains all the elements, which the Ugandan refugee approach has been praised exceptional for – both freedom of movement and long-term SRS initiatives. It therefore seems paradoxical, that the international refugee community, is praising their own principles as a retrospective acknowledgement of own old principles, instead of creating forward looking new principles, or at least aiming to implement the universal principles established by themselves. In this sense, the Act is not exceptionally humane, progressive, or liberal, except from an attempt to actually manifest the humanitarian ideas it contains, in practice. In other words, what makes the Ugandan policy framework progressive, is that it actually, at least officially, strives to keep its responsibilities to the Convention, with a not new, but the oldest humanitarian paradigmatic framework developed. If the international community believed in the universal principles of the Convention, they would not impede refugees, who might need the protection, to reach the systems of determination. Contextually, it seems, that the European, and general Western governments, are caught between populist public hostility and fear on one side, and Conventional obligations on the other. This can be seen as an 'apolitical' form of lip service, where the Convention, refugees' right to asylum, and the Ugandan exceptional example are honoured, while at the same time an increasing amount of money are spent to contain, deter, and in general keep the asylum seekers on Europe's doorstep, or even further. The Act is, oppositely, representing an individually shaped humanitarianism, despite Western funding, with a foundation on reciprocal culture-historical memory of hardship and pre-colonial solidarity, which to a large extent can be argued as manifested politically and practically implemented. The humanitarian ideas behind the Act, are not differing, the manifestations

are. The praising of the Ugandan example, and the pressure from the prevailing refugee crisis, resulted in an attempt to circumvent negative Western refugee tendencies.

The New York Declaration in September 2016, and the Solidarity Summit on Refugees in Kampala, June 2017, is the latest attempt from the international community, to manifest the existence of a universal humanitarian community, and to assure its further contemporary relevance. The declaration proclaims to pave way for two new global concepts, with initial implementation in 2018. The two new concepts are: *a global compact on refugees and a global compact for safe, orderly and regular migration* (UNHCR 2016b). All member states agreed on these concepts, and further assured a reaffirmation to their obligations:

[…] to fully respect the human rights of refugees and migrants (Ibid.), and *[…] that protecting refugees and the countries that shelter them are shared international responsibilities and must be borne more equitably and predictably* (ibid).

The four key objectives proposed for CRRF are, to ease pressures on host countries, to enhance refugee Self-Reliance, to expand third country solutions, and to support conditions in countries of refugee origin, for them to return in safety with dignity. Volker Türk, the UNHCR Assistant High Commissioner for Protection, is calling the Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework (CRRF), a humanitarian paradigm shift (Volker Türk 2016). As a follow up on the adoption of the new framework, a Leaders' Summit was co-hosted by seven Member States and the UN-secretary General. At this Summit, 47 states further agreed to commit to legal- or policy changes to enhance:

[…] refugees' access to education, lawful employment and social services, substantially increased humanitarian aid; and expand access to third-country solutions, such through resettlement or complementary pathways (UNHCR 2016b).

The new framework, agreed upon, is ambitious, ambiguous, and not very predictable. It is, a reconfirmation of the initial Conventional legal framework - a reconfirmation and rethinking in present need, but the so-called 'new global concepts' are more reactionary than innovative. The ambiguity stems from the notions, and the focus on enhancing deeply anchored repatriation processes, and the SRS at the same time. This seems like a conceptual contradiction, despite the returning illustrations of good intentions, inherent in the Declaration. The CRRF can therefore be said to reflect yet another retrospective echo of both

the 1951 Convention, and contextually also the Act. There is nothing new about the new paradigm - it is taking one step forward and two steps back, or simply creating an iterative historical process.

6.3 Camp, Settlement, and Refugees

As emphasised, camps have served as the most profound instrument for containment in the Western context, which has often lead to protracted refugee situations. At first sight, the Ugandan settlements, are defying spatial segregation, containment, and according to the name, also the immediate temporality of the camps, both regarding theoretical conceptualisations and empirical manifestations (Appendix 1). The settlements are conceptually rendering, what traditionally has been understood as the defining characteristics of a refugee camp, and therefore also the ideas inherent in the constellation of a humanitarian space. In many instances, the settlements can be seen as an alternative approach to refugee situations of encamped protraction, and as a possible mitigating solution to the Humanitarian-Development Nexus. The strategy differs in the way it, spatially and economically, recognises and acknowledges host states' being reluctant to local integration, while it at the same time decrease the costly, need and aid-based refugee strategy. As a no-encampment policy, it aims to grant refugees legal mobility, and thereby break away from contamination.

The organised Ugandan settlements, is governed by a substantial body of authorities – the de facto government, which operates within a static legal framework, and normatively anchored rules. The settlements can therefore be seen as a reflection of control, along with spatial and human relational segregation, as a result of the rural placement. The perimeter where camp and settlement are distinct, is beyond the physical specificities, that the camp *[...] is established to prevent the contamination of the nation and its citizens by outsiders* (Turner 2015: 3), where the settlement, along with the SRS, seem to pass on the security-burden, from the international- and local aid community, to refugees themselves. The settlement strategy, further prevent undesirable and irregular migrant flows, over continents.

SRS, the cores of Uganda's refugee policy, aims at structurally integrating governmentally provided services, which move from emergency relief to development. As outlined in the previous, refugees are provided land to grow crops, build houses, and to settle. This is a conceptual and practical attempt to change the perception of refugees, from suffering victims, into development agents. Food aid is therefore gradually diminished, from arrival, and over a five-year period (Betts et al. 2016: 144). The division of labour, the

insecurity of agricultural input, the distance to possible market access, unpredictable conditions of the climate[22] might, as emphasised, comprise the livelihoods and the granted rights, of refugees, and therefore also their perceived status.

The recent pledge for international help, according to food scarcity in the Ugandan settlements, might indicate, that the strategy have serious flaws, and also that the intentions of empowering refugees into self-sufficiency, is lacking substantially. The UNHCR and the WFP urged in May 2017, the international donor community to support the humanitarian agencies in Uganda, with 1,4 billion Dollars (UNHCR 2017b), of which EU has announced to contribute with 85 million Euros (EU 2017). 60 million of these, are aimed at immediate emergency relief, and the remaining, 20 million Euros, channelled through the EU Trust Fund for Africa, are aimed to support SRS initiatives, socio-economic development of host communities, along with medium and long-term integration of refugees into the local communities in Uganda (ibid.). It seems confusing, whether EU is funding an ideal perception of SRS as a 'new paradigmatic' way forward, with the relatively small contribution taken into consideration, or if the money are aimed towards where they are needed the most.

Food scarcity is not just a recent challenge caused by the enormous influx of refugees from South Sudan, but has been an on-going struggle, dating back to before the contemporary crisis. In 2011, the Deputy Commandant in Nakivale settlement, in the Isingiro district, underscored that *[...] the biggest challenge is to make sure that food arrives on time to prevent food riots which we normally experience in the months of September and November* (Tibyangye 2011).

The aforementioned, further confirms that Uganda's refugee strategy have not managed to pull refugees out of the 'dependency syndrome', and exposes the vulnerabilities and critically influential variables, beyond policy and regulations.

The vast critical situation in Uganda, has gained poor media attention, compared to the European refugee crisis and the Rohingya refugee crisis[23], as a result of the empowered focus of refugee portrayal. The majority of the media publications about the crisis in Uganda have though been telling a story of one-sided success.

---

[22] Refers to, the 2011 East African Drought.

[23] *The Rohingya are a stateless Muslim minority in Myanmar. The latest exodus began on 25 August 2017, when violence broke out in Myanmar's Rakhine State. The vast majority of Rohingya refugees[655.000 red.] reaching Bangladesh are women and children, including newborn babies.*(UNHCR 2017c).

Since the Act was ratified in 2010, the media attention has been minor but renewed media attention has emerged as a result of the South Sudanese Civil War. This relates to what Malkki is categorising as the ideal construct of a refugee, which is created by a totalitarian fiction of humanity, and further tendencies of standardised and singular narrative of refugee as a suffering victim of helplessness – a miserable sea of humanity. Refugees in Uganda are thrusting the perception of the ideal refugee, as they do not depict stereotypical front-page suffering, but as the South Sudanese influx has enlarged, this has invoked media attention based on the recognisability of the universal narrative of suffering. The international political attention, and the humanitarian narrative of saving, comprises the suffering in a controlling and continuing apparatus, creating a distinct overlap between humanitarianism and politics.

6.4 The manifestations in sum

Throughout this discussion, it is evident how the Act relies heavily on the legislations from the 1951 Convention. The Act, and the humanitarian ideas within it, are in full accordance with the UNHCR ideas of SRS, and the manifestations shows to be highly politicised, creating an overlap between humanitarianism and politics. The Western praise of the Act, seems to be more focused on ideas, than on practicalities, which is only relative, compared to the problematic contemporary European refugee crisis. The Ugandan response is not exceptional according to the Convention, but the ideas of it, are definitely pursuable. The Act and the appertaining settlements exemplify pluriversality and the notion of multiple humanitarianisms, being an elastic phenomenon, bendable to be compatible to specific needs and objectives.

Despite that the Act is breaking with the approach to contemporary refugee crisis', the seemingly good intentions, is exposed vulnerable to lack of resources and food scarcity, and also regarding practical paradoxical manifestations of temporality and spatiality. The settlement strategy is creating positive outcomes, embracing refugees as socio-economic agents, as well as causing exclusion as a result of problematic governance and physical attributes. The settlements are inevitably a space of ambivalence, recognising refugee as more than bare life, creating possibilities of settling and forming roots, but never the less restraining refugees to be caught within the dependency syndrome - but only a syndrome of manifestations.

7. Conclusion

This thesis has aimed to study how the progressive and innovative Refugees Act 2006 manifest itself as a humanitarian project, as an idea and practically. Initially, the thesis began by contextually exploring contemporary tendencies regarding the prevailing global refugee crisis. The on-going Syrian refugee crisis, along with the Civil War in Libya have caused major struggles for the European Union, and laid the foundations for needing new solutions to oblige to the large influx of refugees. The humanitarian responses to this crisis have been characterised by insufficient short-term emergency relief, deterrence, and protracted encampment. In search for durable solutions, Uganda's policy framework has been illuminated as a possible humanitarian solution to the fragmented, national inconsistency of contemporary Western policies. The case was placed in the midst of humanitarianism, politics and crisis. The Act is by a thorough reading, not working towards a re-imagination of humanitarianism, but is merely meeting the obligations and commitments of international regulations and politics. Via the settlement strategy, the policy is inducing refugee empowerment, by aiming to bridge the gap between emergency relief and development. The mantra *World We Want 2030,* from the campaign to reform development practices, has not yet been achieved by the Ugandan refugee approach, but the political framework is creating a potential fundament for continuously working towards a *World We Want*.

The humanitarian ideas and manifestations are highly political, by focusing on the common benefits, economically and living standards, of both refugees and host communities. This has been done by medium and long-term development, focusing on state implemented development strategies, which are shaped by a rights based refugee approach, enhancing local integration and self-reliance. One the other hand, the Act is encapsulating universal humanitarian rights, emphasising the equality of both asylum seekers and refugees. The Ugandan example, in relation to the contemporary European refugee crisis, is differing in its experienced manifestations, regarding empowerment and settlement strategy. These manifestations have attracted the attention from Western policymakers and the media, shedding light to this mitigating developmental approach, compared to contemporary protracted encampment tendencies.

The settlements are, as a humanitarian space, complex and paradoxical, as it is both a space of possibilities and limitations. The Act is, by its inherent humanitarian ideas, unique in its approach to refugees as being responsible agents, the granting of land, freedom of movement, and the focus on local interaction and integration. These humanitarian ideas are

manifested within the refugee settlement - the spatial appearance, the temporality, the established households, the growing of crops, being without fence, creating a less demarcated humanitarian space. In this sense, the settlement is, a non-static consequence of humanitarianism, and all aspects of the settlements are continuously moulding and remoulding, proportionally to both the global and the local. In this sense, humanitarianism is an ever-changing phenomenon, which is highly visible in the manifestations of the settlement. The proximity of the ever changing complex humanitarian manifestations in the space of refugee camps, are echoing global tendencies, and these tendencies are highlighting mirrors of a wider diverse contemporary global and political landscape, which is affecting humanitarianism, into a fragmented plural phenomenon, influencing and influenced by, local responses to present crises.

Humanitarian tendencies can be understood as a double-sided phenomenon, which is paradoxically exposed between contemporary manifestations of local refugee responses, and universal obligations to international law. Short-term costly emergency relief and isolationism shape the present Western humanitarian tendencies, which are contradicting the core values of the acclaimed democratic universal regulations.

As emphasised, the Ugandan humanitarian refugee response face obvious challenges - the impact of the large influx from South Sudan causing lack of resources and food scarcity, infrastructural limitations, temporal uncertainty, multiple interests, and inherent power relations. But the Ugandan Refugees Act 2006 is tendentially unique as a humanitarian project, due to actual aim of implementing the rights-based Self-Reliance Strategy and the closer compliance with the 1951 Convention. Uganda is complying with the legislative universal conventions, 1951 and the OAU, by the creation of an individual humanitarianism, based on a fundament of shared history, ethnicity, mentality and culture, across the red soil of East Africa.

8. Remarks on further research

Since humanitarianism, and contemporary responses to complex displacement crises, are measures that are moulded and re-moulded over time, it is necessary to maintain continuous studies of ideas and manifestations of the phenomenon, in order to respond to immediate trends and interests. Contemporary humanitarian responses are, beyond the specific scope of research, contextually highlighting general, global, political and societal tendencies. Recent humanitarian initiatives regarding refugee responses in the Ugandan case are showing the

constant conceptual elasticity, and circular rethinking of principles and initiatives, which underscores the need for on-going exploration and examination.

8.1 Recent initiatives and future prospects

As the thesis has emphasised, the UN General Assembly adopted the New York Declaration in September 2016, along with the Member States, whom all committed to the CRRF. Uganda was, in relation thereto, confirmed as one of the pilot countries in March 2017, where the Ugandan government officially inaugurated the CRRF by:

[…] providing formal evidence to development partners of how the national strategy known as the Settlement Transformative Agenda already contains the principles and objectives set out in Annex 1 of the New York Declaration (Nuri 2017; OECD 2017: 13; UN/UG 2017: 3).

The CRRF is, in line with Uganda's commitment to the principle of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development[24], incorporated into the National Development Plan from 2015, the NDP II 2015/16-2020/21 (OECD 2017: 10). The framework, will be administered under leadership of the Ugandan government, and sought implemented in collaboration with multiple stakeholders, such as UN agencies and The World Bank (ibid.). As an institutional initiative, a Secretariat has recently been established, under the OPM to *[…] serve as a knowledge hub and platform for strategic discussions, building on refugee structures and initiatives already in place* (Nuri 2017). The CRRF initiatives, are aiming at supporting the already existing refugee policy framework in Uganda, the Refugees Act 2006 and the 2010 Regulations, and are a governmentally implemented development five-year plan, termed the Refugee and Host Population Empowerment (ReHoPE) (OECD 2017). The main goal for ReHoPE, with a joint programming budget of 350 million US dollars, is *[…] developing a coordinated strategy to transform and transition interventions in Uganda's refugee-impacted districts from a humanitarian to a development approach* (World Bank 2016c: 25).

   The core element behind the ReHoPE strategy is to explore opportunities, beneficial to both refugees and local communities, by the five-year framework of supportive self-reliance and resilience initiatives in the ten Ugandan refugee host communities, aiming at

---

[24] The principle of not leaving anyone behind: "threaten to reverse much of the development progress made in recent decades," the Agenda opens a formal bridge to greater cooperation that will "leave no one behind." (OCHA 2016: 5)

bridging the gap between humanitarian- and development interventions – the Humanitarian-Development Nexus (ReHoPE 2017: 2; UNHCR 2017f: 2). The initiative will do so, as a collective humanitarian approach, by 1: *Multi-year and multi-sectoral area-based interventions to support both host communities and refugees; and coordinated delivery under government leadership, with local government and communities as key partners*, and 2: *Enhanced resilience and sustainability at three levels: household, community and systems level* (ReHoPE 2017: 1). The ultimate goal is to establish a new, and more innovative response to protracted refugee situations, by moving beyond simple care and maintenance (UNHCR 2017f: 2).

The main goal of the ReHoPE strategy is to assist refugee impacted districts, by provision of social services and economic assistance, via the District Local Governments (DLGs), to improve relevance, cost effectiveness and equity to refugees and host communities (ibid.). The delivery of services will be different from district to district, and it will be easier to customise the present needs in the respective areas. The responses will differ between regions where refugees are settled in gazetted settlements, and the ones settled on land owned by the communities, like the West Nile. The service delivery to the settlements, will gradually have to be handed over to the local governments, whereas the goal for the ones settled on community-owned land are to intersperse refugee groupings among the host community (ibid.).

8.2 Recommendations for further research

ReHoPE has been established as a new Ugandan refugee approach, to repair the pitfalls of the Refugees Act 2006 and the challenges of its practical manifestations, as touched upon in the thesis[25], and aim to come even closer to mitigate the gap within the Humanitarian-Development Nexus. An interesting angle to further research, could be to monitor the development of the new strategy, according to the ever-changing societal landscape, and thereby see if ReHoPE can help the exceptional narrative of the Ugandan model to survive.

---

[25] food scarcity, limiting spatiality and infrastructure, lack of necessary donor funding, diverging implementation interests, natural division of labour

9. Bibliography

- **1951 Convention**: *Convention and protocol relating to the status of Published by: refugees*. UNHCR. Retrieved the 29/09/17: http://www.unhcr.org/3b66c2aa10.pdf

- **Act** (2006): *Uganda: The Refugees Act 2006.* The Ugandan Gazette No. 47, Vol. XCVIX (August)

- **Agamben, G.** (1995): *HOMO SACER. Sovereign Power and Bare Life.* Introduction p. 4-11 & part two, chapter 1-3, p. 47-58

- **Agamben, G.** (1996): *Means without End - Notes on Politics*. Theory out of Bounds, Volume 20, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis. Pp. preface, 3-14, 37-48, 121-142

- **Agier, M.** (2010): *Humanity as an Identity and Its Political Effects - A Note on Camps and Humanitarian Government*. Humanity: An International Journal of Human Rights, Humanitarianism, and Development, Volume 1, Number 1, Fall 2010, pp. 29-45, University of Pennsylvania Press

- **Akello, V.** (2009): *Uganda's progressive Refugee Act becomes operational*. UNHCR. Retrieved the 03/11/17: http://www.unhcr.org/news/latest/2009/6/4a3f9e076/ugandas-progressive-refugee-act-becomes-operational.html

- **Barnett, M.** (2011): *Empire of Humanity. A History of Humanitarianism*. Cornell University Press

- **Bauman, Z. (**2004): *Wasted Lives: Modernity and Its Outcasts*. Polity Press, Cambridge

- **Biryabarema, E.** (2017): *EU offers 85 million euros to help fund Uganda's refugee response*. Reuters. Retrieved the 10/11/17: https://www.reuters.com/article/us-uganda-refugees/eu-offers-85-million-euros-to-help-fund-ugandas-refugee-response-idUSKBN19D1IQ?il=0

- **Brinkmann, S. & Tanggard, L.** (2015): *1. Interviewet: Samtalen som forskningsmetod*e in Kvalitative metoder - en grundbog. 2. edition, Publisher Hans Reitzels. Pp. 29-53

- **Bryman, A. (**2012): *Social research methods*. 4th Edition, Oxford University Press Inc., New York. Pp. 1-44, 208-229 & 430-520

- **Betts, A., Bloom, L., Kaplan, J. & Omata, N**. (2016): *Emergency Refugee Camps* in Refugee Economies: Forced Displacement and Development. University Press Scholarship Online, Oxford Scholarship Online

- **Betts, A**. (2017): *Can Uganda's progressive refugee policies survive the influx of people fleeing South Sudan?* Independent. Retrieved the 15/09/17 http://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/politics/can-uganda-s-progressive-refugee-policies-survive-the-influx-of-people-fleeing-south-sudan-a7681856.html

- **Clark-Kazak, C.** (2017): *Ethical Considerations: Research with People in Situations of Forced Migration.* With the Canadian Council for Refugees, the Canadian Association for Refugee and Forced Migration Studies, and York University's Centre for Refugee Studies. Refuge, volume 33, Number 2.

- **Conlon, G., Moran, D., & Gill, N.,** (2013): *Carceral Spaces: Mobility and Agency in Imprisonment and Migrant Detention.* Ashgate.

- **Crisp, J.** (2003). *No solutions in sight: the problem of protracted refugee situations in Africa* (Working Paper No. 75). UNHCR Evaluation and Policy Analysis Unit. Retrieved the 03/11/17: http://www.unhcr.org/3e2d66c34.html.

- **Davies, K.** (2012): *Continuity, change and contest Meanings of 'humanitarian' from the 'Religion of Humanity' to the Kosovo war.* (HPG Working Paper). Humanitarian Policy Group. Overseas Development Institute. London.

- **Davies, T., & Isakjee, A.** (2015): *Geography, migration and abandonment in the Calais refugee camp, in Political Geography*, Volume 49, Pages 1-96 (November 2015) Special Issue: Historical Geographies of Internationalism

- **De Vriese, M.** (2006). *Refugee livelihoods: a review of the evidence.* UNHCR Evaluation and Policy Analysis Unit (EPAU/2006/04). Retrieved the 11/11/17: http://www.unhcr.org/4423fe5d2.html

- **De Montclos, M.** (2000): *Refugee Camps or Cities? The Socio-economic Dynamics of the Dadaab and Kakuma Camps in Northern Kenya.* Journal of Refugee Studies, volume 13, issue 2, p. 205-222.

- **Diken, B. and Laustsen, C. B** (2010): *The Camp.* Geogr. Ann., 88 B (4). Swedish Society for Anthropology and Geography. Pp 443–452.

- **Dryden-Petersen, S. & Hovil, L.** (2004): *A Remaining Hope for Durable Solutions: Local Integration of Refugees and Their Hosts in the Case of Uganda.* Volume 11, Refuge, number 1, p. 26-38

- **Danermark B.**, Ekstrom, M. & Jakobsen, L. (2001): *Explaining Society - An Introduction to Critical Realism in the Social Sciences.* Critical Realism: Interventions, 1. Edition, Taylor & Francis, pp. 150-176

- **Edwards, A.** (2014): *Needs soar as number of Syrian refugees tops 3 million.* UNHCR. Retrieved the 10/11/17: http://www.unhcr.org/news/latest/2014/8/53ff76c99/needs-soar-number-syrian-refugees-tops-3-million.html, (August)

- **EU** (2017): *EU announces €85 million as Uganda faces world's fastest growing refugee crisis.* Delegation of the European Union to Uganda. (Kampala/Brussels). Retrieved the 01/12/17 https://eeas.europa.eu/delegations/uganda/28663/eu-announces-%E2%82%AC85-million-uganda-faces-worlds-fastest-growing-refugee-crisis_en

- **Evans, G.** (2006): From Humanitarian Intervention to the Responsibility to Protect. Vol. 24, No. 3 From Humanitarian Intervention to R2P, Wisconsin International Law Journal, Pp. 703-722

- **Fassin, D. (**2012): *Humanitarian Reason. A Moral History of the Present.* University of California Press. Pp. 1-17 & 223-241.

- **Feldman, I. and Ticktin, M.** (2010): *In the Name of Humanity: The Government of Threat and Care.* Durham, NC. Duke University Press.

- **Fleming, M.** (2015): *Crossings of Mediterranean Sea exceed 300,000, including 200,000 to Greece.* UNHCR. Retrieved the 01/12/17 http://www.unhcr.org/55e06a5b6.html (August)

- **Gordon, S. & Donini, A.** (2016): *Romancing principles and human rights: Are Humanitarian Principles salvageable?* In International Review of the Red Cross, Principles guiding humanitarian action (February)

- **GoU** (2017): *Refugees in Uganda: a historic overview.* Retrieved the 03/11/17: http://solidaritysummit.gou.go.ug/content/refugees-uganda-historic-overview

- **Haskell, T.** (1985): *Capitalism and the Origins of the Humanitarian Sensibility*, Part 1, The American Historical Review, Vol. 90, No. 2 (April), pp. 339-361

- **Hattem, J.** (2017): *Uganda may be best place in the world to be a refugee. But that could change without more money.* The Washington Post. Retrieved the 02/09/17: https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/worldviews/wp/2017/06/20/uganda-may-be-best-place-in-the-world-to-be-a-refugee-but-that-could-change-without-more-money/?utm_term=.e34bca274375 (June)

- **Hoffmann, P.J. (**2016): *Humanitarianism in Treatment: Analyzing the World Humanitarian Summit.* Future United Nations Development System. Briefing 41 (August)

- **Hosseini, K.** (2017a): *Welcome to Uganda.* UNHCR. Retrieved the 03/09/17: http://www.unhcr.org/news/stories/2017/7/597752304/welcome-to-uganda.html (July)

- **Hosseini**, K. (2017b): *Khaled Hosseini marks one millionth South Sudanese refugee in Uganda.* UNHCR. Retrieved the 03/09/17: http://www.unhcr.org/news/stories/2017/8/59944a0b4/khaled-hosseini-marks-millionth-south-sudanese-refugee-uganda.html (August)

- **Hovil, L. (**2010): *Hoping for peace, afraid of war: the dilemmas of repatriation and belonging on the borders of Uganda and South Sudan.* New Issues in Refugee Research (Research Paper no. 196). UNHCR. (November)

- **Hyndman, J.** (2000): *Managing Displacement: Refugees and the Politics of Humanitarianism*, University of Minnesota Press.

- **IOM (**2013): *Migration in Uganda: A Rapid Country Profile 2013.* IOM Mission to Uganda, Republic of Uganda

- **ICRC** (2010), Status of the Protocols additional to the Geneva Conventions: ICRC statement to the United Nations, 2010. Retrived 15/11/17: https://www.icrc.org/eng/resources/documents/statement/united-nations-protocols-additional-statement-2010-10-18.htm

- **ICRC** (2014), International Committee of Red Cross: *Fundamental Principles.* Retrieved the 14/11/17: https://www.icrc.org/en/fundamental-principles

- **van Mierop, E. S**. (2016): *Coming clean on neutrality and independence: The need to assess the application of Humanitarian principles*, International Review of the Red Cross (2016), 97 (897/898), 295–318. Principles guiding humanitarian action

- **IRC** (2017): *Refugees: Uganda's Leadership puts US, European Policies to Shame*, International Rescue Committee. Retrieved the 28/11/17: https://www.rescue.org/press-release/refugees-ugandas-leadership-puts-us-european-policies-shame

- **Jacobsen, K. & Landau, L.B.** (2003): *The Dual Imperative in Refugee Research: Some Methodological and Ethical Considerations in Social Science Research on Forced Migration.* (Working Paper #19) (July)

- **Jallow, T., Tournée, J.,** Mwesigye **, A.,** Schierbeck, H., Kasahura, F., Mayanja, F. & Mwange, G. **(**2004): *Self-Reliance Strategy (1999–2003) for Refugee Hosting Areas in Moyo, Arua and Adjumani Districts, Uganda. Report of the Mid-term Review.* RLSS Mission Report 2004/03. United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, Government of Uganda. Pp 1-3

- **Jansen, B. J. (2015):** *'Digging Aid': The Camp as an Option in East and the Horn of Africa*. Journal of Refugee Studies Vol. 29, No. 2. Oxford University Press. (December). Pp 149-165

- **Kaiser, T.** (2000): *Dispersal, division and diversification: Durable solutions and Sudanese refugees in Uganda.* Journal of Eastern African Studies. 4:1, Pp. 44-60

- **Kaiser, T.** 2005: *Participating in Development? Refugee protection, politics*

- *and developmental approaches to refugee management in Uganda.* Third World Quarterly, 26:2, Pp. 351-367

- **Kende-Robb, C.** (2017): *Uganda's policy towards refugees is the best in the world. Here's why.* World Economic Forum. Retrieved the 05/09/17: https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2017/07/uganda-refugees-what-we-can-learn/ (July)

- **Kees van Donge, J.** (2006): *Ethnography and Participant Observation*, in Doing Development Research. SAGE Publications Ltd. Pp. 180-189

- **Kiapi, A** (1997): *The legal status of refugees in Uganda.* 3 East African Journal of Peace and Human Rights. Pp. 115-129

- **Krause, M** (2014): *The Good Project: Humanitarian Relief NGOs and the Fragmentation of Reason*. University of Chicago Press. Chapter 4, Pp. 92-125

- **Krause, U** (2017): *Researching (with) refugees? Ethical considerations on participatory approaches.* AMMODI. Retreived the 19/11/17: https://ammodi.com/2017/12/11/researching-with-refugees-ethical-considerations-on-participatory-approaches/

- **Lemberg_Pedersen, M.** (2016): *European Deterrence Politics and the End of Humanitarianism.* Refugees.dk. Retreived the 17/11/17: http://refugees.dk/en/focus/2016/july/european-deterrence-politics-and-the-end-of-humanitarianism/

- **Loescher, G. and Milner, J.** (2004). *Protracted refugee situations and state and regional insecurity. Conflict*. Security, and Development, Vol. 4

- **Lund, C. (**2014): *Of What is This a Case?: Analytical Movements in Qualitative Social Science Research.* Human Organisation, Vol. 73, No. 3, Pp. 224-234

- **Macchiavello, M.** (2003): *Forced migrants as an under-utilized asset: refugee skills, livelihoods, and achievements in Kampala, Uganda.* UNHCR, Evaluation and Policy Analysis Unit. (October)

- **Mackenzie, C., McDowell, C. & Pittaway, E.** (2007): *Beyond 'Do No Harm': The Challenge of Constructing Ethical Relationships in Refugee Research.* Journal of Refugee Studies, Vol. 20, No. 2. Pp. 299-319

- **Malkki, L. H. (**1992): *National Geographic: The Rooting of Peoples and the Territorialization of National Identity among Scholars and Refugees.* Cultural Anthropology, Vol. 7, No. 1, Space, Identity, And the Politics of Difference. (February). Pp. 24-44

- **Malkki, L. H**. (1995): *Refugees and Exile: From "Refugee Studies" to the National Order of Things.* Annual Review of Anthropology, Vol. 24. Pp. 495-523

- **Malkki, L. H.** (1996): *Speechless Emissaries: Refugees, Humanitarianism, and Dehistoricization.* Cultural Anthropology, Vol. 11, No. 3 (August). Pp. 377-404

- **Mayoux, L.** (2006): *Quantitative, Qualitative or Participatory? Which Method, for What and When?* in Doing Development Research. SAGE Publications Ltd. Pp. 115-129

- **McKinsey, K.** (2003)*: Feature: Refugees in Uganda move towards self-reliance.* UNHCR. Retrieved the 03/09/17: http://www.unhcr.org/news/latest/2003/10/3f8aa81e4/feature-refugees-uganda-move-towards-self-reliance.html (October)

- **Meyer, S. (**2006): *The 'refugee aid and development' approach in Uganda: empowerment and self-reliance of refugees in practice.* New Issues in Refugee Research (Research Paper No. 131). UNHCR, Policy Development and Evaluation Service. University of Oxford. United Kingdom

- **Miliband, D.** (2015): *The Defining Humanitarian Crisis of our Time.* Center for International Relations and Sustainable Development. Retrieved the 05/12/17: http://www.cirsd.org/en/horizons/horizons-spring-2015--issue-no3/the-defining-humanitarian-crisis-of-our-time

- **Miliband, D. & Albright, M**. (2016): The Refugee Crisis is Real. Foreign Policy. Retrieved the 05/12/17: http://foreignpolicy.com/2016/09/19/the-refugee-crisis-is-real-albright-miliband/ (September)

- **Mujuzi, J. D. (**2008): *From Archaic to Modern Law: Ugandas Refugees Act 2006 and her International Treaty Obligations*. East African Journal of Peace & Human Rights, Vol 14:2, section 36. Pp. 399-422

- **Mulumba**, **D. (**2005): *Gender relations, livelihood security and reproductive health among women refugees in Uganda. The case of Sudanese women in Rhino Camp and Kiryandongo Refugee Settlements.* Pp. 30, 94-96

- **Mulumba, D. (**2014): *Humanitarian Assistance and its Implication on the Integration of Refugees in Uganda: Some Observations.* Makerere University

- **NATO** (2016): *NATO's Deployment in the Aegean Sea*. North Atlantic Traty Organization. Retrieved the 02/12/17: https://www.nato.int/nato_static_fl2014/assets/pdf/pdf_2016_10/20161025_1610-factsheet-aegean-sea-eng.pdf (October)

- **New York Declaration** (2016): *Resolution adopted by the General Assembly on 19 September 2016.* General Assembly, A/RES/71/1. United Nations. Retrieved the 02/11/17: http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/RES/71/1 (October)

- **Nuri, R.** (2017): *Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework for Uganda launched. UN Uganda.* Retrieved the 29/11/17: http://ug.one.un.org/events/comprehensive-refugee-response-framework-uganda-launched

- **OCHA** (2016): *Leaving No One Behind: Humanitarian Effectiveness in the Age of Sustainable Development Goals.* Retrieved the 06/12/17: http://www.un.org/disabilities/documents/WHS/HEStudy_20151109_Small.pdf

- **OECD** (2017): *Responding to refugee Crisis. Lessons from evaluations in Ethiopia and Uganda as countries of destination*. Organisation for economic cooperation and development. Retrieved the 03/12/17: https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/system/files/ethipia_and_uganda_-_responding_to_refugee_crisis_-_lessons_from_evaluations_in_ethiopia_and_uganda_as_countries_of_destination_.pdf (September)

- **Patton, A.** (2016): *Is Uganda the Best Place to be a Refugee?* Working in Development. Reshaping humanitarian Action. The Guardian. Retrieved the 02/09/17: https://www.theguardian.com/global-development-professionals-network/2016/aug/20/is-uganda-the-best-place-to-be-a-refugee (August)

- **Pinella, G. (2017):** *EU needs lasting solution to refugee crisis.* EU Observer. Retrieved the 05/09/17: https://euobserver.com/opinion/138707 (August)

- **Pirouet, L. (1988):** *Refugees in and from Uganda in the post independence period.* In Hansen Holger B and Twaddle Michael (Eds.) Uganda Now: between decay and development, London: James Carrey Limited. Pp. 158-174

- **Ramadan, A. (2008).** *The Guests' Guests: Palestinian refugees, Lebanese civilians, and the war of 2006.* Antipode, 40(4)

- **Redfield** P. (2005): *Doctors, Borders, and Life in Crisis* in Cultural Anthropology, Volume 20, Issue 3, August 2005, Pages 328–361

- **Refugee and Hope International** (2017): *Refugees in Uganda.* Retrieved the 02/10/17: http://www.refugeandhope.org/refugees-in-Uganda

- **Refugee Law Project** (2001): *The phenomenon of forced migration in Uganda: An overview of policy and practice in an historical context.* Retrieved the 01/11/17: https://reliefweb.int/report/uganda/refugee-law-project-working-paper-no-1-phenomenon-forced-migration-uganda-overview (Working Paper no. 1) (June)

- **Refugee Regulations** (2010): *Refugee Regulations.* Statutory Instruments, No. 9.

- **Refworld 1969:** *Convention Governing the Specific Aspects of Refugee Problems in Africa ("OAU Convention").* Retrieved the 03/11/17: http://www.refworld.org/docid/3ae6b36018.html (September)

- **Refworld (**2006): *Uganda's Refugees Act 2006.* Retrieved the 28/08/17: http://www.refworld.org/docid/4b7baba52.html (May)

- **Reid-Henry, S. (2013):** *Review essay: On the politics of our humanitarian present.* Environment and Planning D: Society and Space 2013, volume 31, pages 753 – 760

- **Reuters** (2017): *EU offers Italy migrant help, cautions private rescuers.* Retrieved the 11/17/17: https://www.reuters.com/article/us-europe-migrants-eu-italy/eu-offers-italy-migrant-help-cautions-private-rescuers-idUSKBN19P1US

- ReHoPE (2017): *Strategy Brochure, 2017. Uganda Refugees.* Retrieved the 22/12/17: https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/ReHoPE_Strategy%20Brochure%202017.pdf

- **Robinson,** C. (2017): *South Sudanese refugees in Uganda now exceed 1 million,* UNHCR. Retrieved the 28/08/17: http://www.unhcr.org/news/stories/2017/8/59915f604/south-sudanese-refugees-uganda-exceed-1-million.html (August)

- **Sharpe, M. & Namusobya, S.** (2012): *Refugee Status Determination and the Rights of Recognized Refugees under Uganda's Refugees Act 2006.* International Journal of Refugee Law, Vol. 24, No. 3. Oxford University Press. Pp. 561-578.

- **Smith, M.** (2004): *Warehousing Refugee: A denial of rights, a waste of humanity.* World Refugee Survey. Retrieved the 03/10/17: http://refugees.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/12/Warehousing-Refugees-Campaign-Materials.pdf

- **Solidarity Summit (**2017): *Speech at the Solidarity Summit on Refugees (Kampala, Uganda 22 – 23 June 2017)* Christos Stylianides, European Commissioner for Humanitarian Aid and Crisis Management, SPEECH. Retrieved the 03/11/17: https://ec.europa.eu/commission/commissioners/2014-2019/stylianides/announcements/speech-solidarity-summit-refugees-kampala-uganda-22-23-june-2017_en

- **Soro, T.** (2014): *Agamben Homo Sacer Animatic*. Retrieved the 02/12/17: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pGUxQmRNhtk (March)

- **Tibyangye, O.** (2011): *Food shortage hits refugee camp.* Daily Monitor, Uganda. Retrieved the 03/10/17: http://mobile.monitor.co.ug/News/TodaysPaper/691252-1247434-format-xhtml-17tgspz/index.html

- **Ticktin, M. I. (**2011): *Casualties of Care: Immigration and the Politics of Humanitarianism in France,* Part I (2) and Part II (3), University of California Press

- **Ticktin (**2014): *Transnational Humanitarianism.* Annual Review Anthropology, 43:273-89

- **Bajekal, N. (2015)**: *The 5 Big Questions about Europa's Migrant crisis*. Time. Retrieved the 29/09/17: http://time.com/4026380/europe-migrant-crisis-questions-refugees/ (September)

- **Titz, C & Feck, M. (**2017): *Open Borders, Uganda Is the Most Refugee-Friendly Country in the World.* Der Spiegel. Retrieved the 28/08/17: http://www.spiegel.de/international/tomorrow/uganda-is-the-most-refugee-friendly-country-in-the-world-a-1167294.html (September)

- **Turner, S.** (2005)**:** *Suspended Spaces—Contesting Sovereignties in a Refugee Camp.* Pp. 312-332

- **Turner, S. (**2015): *What Is a Refugee Camp? Explorations of the Limits and Effects of the Camp.* Journal of Refugee Studies, Vol. 29, No. 2. Pp. 139-148

- **Türk, V.** (2016): *The New York Declaration: Once in a lifetime opportunity to enhance refugee protection.* UNSW Law. Retrieved the

29/11/17: http://www.kaldorcentre.unsw.edu.au/news/new-york-declaration-once-lifetime-opportunity-enhance-refugee-protection

- **UN/UG** (2017): *ReHoPE Strategy-Report 2017*. Retrieved the 20/12/17: http://www.un-ug.org/sites/default/files/documents/ReHoPE_Strategy-Report_2017_low-res.pdf

- **UN (2017**a): *UN Summit for Refugee and Migrants 2016*. United Nations. Retrieved the 02/12/17: http://refugeesmigrants.un.org/summit

- **UN (2017**b): *New York Declaration*. United Nations. Retrieved the 02/12/17: http://refugeesmigrants.un.org/declaration

- **UNHCR** (1964): *Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees*. General Assembly. Retrieved the 04/12/17: http://www.unhcr.org/excom/unhcrannual/3ae68c3f4/report-united-nations-high-commissioner-refugees.html (January)

- **UNHCR** (2001): *Discussion Paper on Protracted Refugee Situations in Africa Region*. UNHCR Africa Bureau. Retrieved the 01/12/17: http://www.unhcr.org/3cce5e384.pdf

- **UNHCR** (2003): *Development Assistance for Refugees (DAR) for Uganda Self Reliance Strategy: Way forward*. Report on Mission to Uganda RLSS/DOS Mission Report. Retrieved the 29/11/17: http://www.unhcr.org/41c6a19b4.pdf

- **UNHCR** (2004): *Self-Reliance Strategy (1999-2003) For Refugee Hosting Areas in Moyo, Arua and Adjumani Districts, Uganda*. Evaluations/Mid-term review. Retrieved the 29/11/17: http://www.unhcr.org/41c6a4fc4.pdf (April)

- **UNHCR** (2005a): *Handbook for Self-Reliance*. UNHCR. Retrieved the 29/11/17: http://www.unhcr.org/44bf7b012.pdf (August)

- **UNHCR** (2005b): *Local integration and Self-Reliance, Executive Committee Standing Committee 33rd Meeting*. UNHCR. Retrieved the 01/12/17: http://www.unhcr.org/42a6f29f2.pdf (June)

- **UNHCR** (2012): *Uganda*. UNHCR Global Report. Retrieved the 24/11/17: http://www.unhcr.org/uk/51b1d6350.pdf

- **UNHCR** (2014a): *World at War - UNHCR. Global Trends. Forced Displacement 2014*. UNHCR. Retrieved the 18/11/17: http://www.unhcr.org/556725e69.html#_ga=1.237703683.281529137.1434611844

- **UNHCR** (2014b): *Rwamwanja Fact Sheet 2014*. UNHCR Uganda. Retrieved the 03/09/17: data.unhcr.org/drc/download.php?id=1051

- **UNHCR** (2016a): *Regional Summaries: Africa*. UNHCR Global Report. Retrieved the 19/11/17: http://www.unhcr.org/publications/fundraising/593e4bf27/unhcr-global-report-2016-africa-regional-summary.html

- **UNHCR** (2016b): *New York Declaration for Refugees and Migrants. Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework*. UNHCR. Retrieved the 05/09/17: http://www.unhcr.org/new-york-declaration-for-refugees-and-migrants.html

- **UNHCR** (2016c) *Solutions for refugees. The 10 Point Plan*. UNHCR Retrieved the 04/11/17: http://www.unhcr.org/50a4c17f9.pdf

- **UNHCR UNHCR** (2017a): *Figures at a Glance. Statistical Yearbooks*. UNHCR. Retreived the 09/09/17: http://www.unhcr.org/figures-at-a-glance.html

- **UNHCR** (2017b): *Over US$1.4 billion needed for South Sudan refugees in 2017*. Retrieved the 10/09/17:

- **UNHCR** 2017b): *Over US$1.4 billion needed for South Sudan refugees in 2017*. UNHCR, Retrieved the 10/09/17: http://www.unhcr.org/news/press/2017/5/591966294/us14-billion-needed-south-sudan-refugees-2017.html%20 (May)

- **UNHCR** (2017c): *Rohingya emergency*. UNHCR, Retrieved the 03/12/17: http://www.unhcr.org/rohingya-emergency.html

- **UNHCR** 2017d): *With no solution in sight, refugee numbers from South Sudan cross 1.5 million mark*. UNHCR. Retrieved the 02/10/17: http://www.unhcr.org/news/briefing/2017/2/589d82834/solution-sight-refugee-numbers-south-sudan-cross-15-million-mark.html (February)

- **UNHCR** (2017e): *History of UNHCR*. Retrieved the 10/11/17: http://www.unhcr.org/history-of-unhcr.html

- **UNHCR** (2017f): *UNHCR Factsheet, March 2017. UNHCR*, Retrieved the 02/09/17: https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/UNHCR%20Uganda%20Factsheet_March%202017.pdf

- **Watera, W., Seremba, C., Otim, I., Ojok, D., Mukhone, B. & Hoffmann, A.** (2017): *Uganda's Refugee Management Approach within the EAC Policy Framework*. Konrad-Adenaur-Stiftung

- **Weiss, T. & Barnett, M.** (2011): *Humanitarianism Contested: Where Angels Fear to Tread*, Chapter 6, Humanitarianism's possible past and futures: ten guiding questions, page 105-128, Routledge

- **Weisswange, E. (**2016): *How the Dismantling of the Jungle in Calais Became a Sad Example of Fortress Europe - Observations From a Volunteer.* Huffington Post. Retrieved the 02/09/17: https://www.huffingtonpost.com/european-horizons/how-the-dismantling-of-th_b_12836162.html (November)

- **Withnall, A.** (2017): *Welcoming refugees with plots of land and cash 'gives boost to local economy'.* Independent. Retrieved the 02/09/17: http://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/africa/uganda-wfp-refugees-report-giving-asylum-seekers-plots-of-land-boosts-economy-a7385516.html (October)

- Woldemariam, Y. (2017): *Uganda's Refugee Hospitality Puts the Affluent World To Shame.* Huffington Post. Retrieved the 02/09/17: https://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/ugandas-refugee-hospitality-is-exemplary_us_595db880e4b08f5c97d0672a (October)

- **World Bank** (2016a): *Uganda Offers Refugees a Home Away From Home.* The World Bank. Retrieved the 03/09/17: http://www.worldbank.org/en/news/feature/2016/08/31/uganda-offers-refugees-home-away-from-home (August)

- **World Bank** (2016b): *Uganda's Progressive Approach to Refugee Management.* The World Bank. Retrieved the 03/09/17: http://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/fragilityconflictviolence/brief/ugandas-progressive-approach-refugee-management (August)

- **World Bank (**2016c): *An Assessment of Uganda's Progressive Approach to Refugee Management.* The World Bank Group. Retrieved the 29/10/17: https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/bitstream/handle/10986/24736/An0assessment00o0refugee0management.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y

- **World Bank** (2017a): *What We Do.* Retrieved the 02/11/17: http://www.worldbank.org/en/about/what-we-do

- **World Bank** (2017b): *Africa Takes the Lead to Support Refugees and their Hosts with Long-Term Solutions.* World Bank Group. Retrieved the 08/11/17:

- http://www.worldbank.org/en/news/feature/2017/06/08/africa-takes-the-lead-to-support-refugees-and-their-hosts-with-long-term-solutions (June)

- **World Bank** (2017c): *The Humanitarian-Development-Peace Initiative*. The World Bank. Retrieved the 02/12/17: http://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/fragilityconflictviolence/brief/the-humanitarian-development-peace-initiative

- **WFP** (2017): Uganda's Open Door Policy. World Food Programme. Retrieved the 04/11/17: http://www.wfp.org/videos/world-refugee-day-ugandas-open-door-policy (June)

- **Zahavi** (2012): *Fænomenologi* in Humanistisk videnskabsteori. DR Multimedie. Pp. 121-138

Appendix 1

1

2

3 <u>**Tuesday 10/11/2017**</u>

4 • Arrival late at night to Kampala, after a long journey.

5 • Pick-up by the pre-booked hotel, by the owner Miles.

6 • The ride from the airport took approximately one hour – first through Entebbe,
7   passing Lake Victoria, suburban Kampala, and then metropolitan Kampala.

8 • Miles spoke, besides general small talk on us, him, Denmark, Uganda, about the
9   disputes regarding the Presidents Museveni's attempt to stay in power, by rendering
10   the national constitution.

11 • It was completely dark outside. It was first when we arrived to greater Kampala that
12   we began seeing people and buildings, in the beams of the streetlights, and from
13   bonfires in the side of the road.

14 • Chaotic scenery of people crossing the streets, cooking on street kitchens made of old
15   rims.

16 • Arrived tired to the hotel, a couple of kilometres from the centre of Kampala. The
17   smell and noise were new and sense awaking.

18 • Miles ordered some local food, from a small diner downstairs. Retrieved to our
19   rooms, to take a shower and go to bed.

20

21 <u>**Wednesday 11/11/2017**</u>

22 • We woke up slightly jetlagged, and Lasse slightly late, as a result of lack of Internet
23   access – the watch didn't adapt to the local time. Julie was waiting, and woke me up.

24 • Had breakfast and coffee at the porch of the hotel, while inspecting the local
25   surroundings.

26 • Red African soil, small street shops, supermarkets, banana sellers, charcoal sellers,
27   our neighbour - a spartan equipped butcher shop of tiles, with meat hanging outside
28   on metal hooks, cows and goats slandering lazy in the side of the roads of soil, trying
29   to find something to eat, a mayhem of cars, boda boda's (local motorcycle taxis),
30   trucks, wooden wheelbarrows, pedestrians.

31 • Miles hailed us a boda boda taxi – our first, but not last experience.

32	•	The drivers, and surrounding people were very much aware of our physical
33		appearance, and tried with yells and gestures to catch our attention.
34	•	Miles warned us about going to the centre of Kampala, because of heavy rain, and
35		possible pickpockets.
36	•	Went to a central mall for a coffee, and further to a local outdoor food market
37		Nakasero.
38	•	Nakasero was chaotic and charming. Fruits, meat, chickens in cages, plumber
39		equipment, and locals' eager to communicate, while laughing, pointing, trying to
40		persuade us to buy whatever possible.
41	•	We decided to go further to the 'notorious' enormous Owino market, despite
42		warnings from Miles. We wanted to get our impression of the city and the vibe.
43	•	Mud, people, all sorts of imaginable goods. A guy tried to get things from my bag, but
44		Julie spotted it, and fended it off.
45	•	Went home tired, bought some food in the supermarket, went to bed tired from
46		impressions.
47		

Thursday 12/11/2017

49	•	We had, through a friend of Julie's, established contact to, and arranged a meeting
50		with a guy, Paul, from an NGO (Rwenzori Information Centres Network) in Fort
51		Portal, Western Uganda.
52	•	We packed our bags, to be ready for leaving and relocate immediately, if we had to.
53	•	The meeting was at Imperial Hotel, in the centre of the city. Paul came slightly late,
54		dressed in a white suit.
55	•	We had coffee and we presented our aims for the research and fieldwork, along with
56		our interest in the Uganda Refugee Policy. We further assured him that all possible
57		informants and participants would remain anonymous.
58	•	Paul was willing to help us visiting a refugee camp in the area where his NGO was
59		engaged. He called his colleagues, and arranged that we could leave straight after the
60		meeting.
61	•	Before going to the bus station to head for Fort Portal, Paul helped us obtain sim-
62		cards, in order to stay in contact during and after our trip.
63	•	The bus trip was long, and slightly uncomfortable, but the view out the window was
64		beautiful and we were curios and exited.

65 • Small spartan wooden houses, green and fertile nature, women incredibly carried
66   heavy goods on their heads, men worked with handicraft, some were dragging bikes
67   with loads of green bananas, and kids were playing. At the short stops on the way,
68   people were trying to sell us food and drinks through the windows. We were fast
69   spotted as Mzungu, and dragged a lot of attention.

70 • We arrived to Fort Portal – the administrative centre of the Karabole district, named
71   after a British commissioner. The city is a lot smaller than Kampala, and we quickly
72   sensed, that the vibes was different and more relaxed, which felt relieving after the
73   hectic days in Kampala.

74 • We were hungry, and found a small café to have something to eat. While sitting there,
75   we established contact to the NGO, via a phone number Paul had given us.

76 • By the instructions and directions of the NGO worker, Janet, we got two boda boda's,
77   and went to meet her at their office in the periphery of the city – 'The Swamp', were
78   the area called.

79 • We arrived to the office, and were welcomed by three female workers. The office was
80   small and minimalistic furnished, but well-organized, with drawings, sketched
81   strategies and notes from meetings, maps, and the 2020 development goals hanging
82   on the walls.

83 • After a short introduction, we were told to meet early next morning, to leave for the
84   Rwamwanja Refugee Settlement, 70 kilometres from Fort Portal, with Paul. We were
85   shown our rooms, privately situated at Paul's house. A bed, a table, and bathroom
86   with cold water, and a toilet.

87 • The rest of the day, we spend getting used to the new place, the new city. We dined at
88   a local café, and went to bed.

89

90 **Friday 13/11/2017**

91 • We woke up early to be ready for the trip to the settlement, and went to the ngo
92   office, after having breakfast with Paul in his house.

93 • The sun was shining, and the air was cleaner than in Kampala. Kids waved at us, and
94   women nodded and smiling, on the short way up a little hill, to the office.

95 • At the ngo office, we got a t-shirt each, with the name and logo of the. Mine was a
96   little too small, and the fabric itching.

97 • We were told to wait, while Paul finished the official paperwork, in order to allow us
98   access to the settlement, in his separate office next door.

99	• When Paul was ready, we began our trip towards the settlement. The trip, which is a
100	70-kilometre drive, took about three hours, as a result of the poor conditions of the
101	roads.
102	• There was laughs and lively talk in the car. We asked Paul about the settlement, the
103	refugee policy, and general small talk. Paul was very good at speaking loud, and he
104	interrupted Lasse whenever possible, with laughs, interposed remarks, or stories about
105	life in, and mind-set of Ugandans.
106	• Paul allowed us to record the conversation on our phones, and he began speaking
107	about the refugee situation in Uganda – both the contemporary situation, and
108	• He explained how receiving and hosting refugees is, and always has been, a normal
109	thing in Uganda. He underscored how important Uganda's own exile stories.
110	Reciprocity, cultural, tribal, and relations of kinship, means everything in order to
111	understand the full picture. Ugandans are of same kin, as many people across the
112	post-colonial border drawings. He explained how 'we understand each other – they
113	are our brothers', and how the future always has been uncertain regarding disputes in
114	the region, leaving the future uncertain for Ugandans too.
115	• When approaching the settlement, small enclaves of traditional houses of wood and
116	sun dried mud, which had dominated the general scenery on the way, began appearing
117	more rarely. The scenery became more and more rural, with wide stretching
118	savannah, trees and bushes.
119	• When we arrived to the area of the settlement, we drove down an uneven, dusty
120	gravel road. Paul explained, how the more modern buildings behind the fence
121	contained the Establishment of the largest aid institutions, UNHCR, WFP, ICRC etc.
122	and the OPM. These were the only fenced houses, and around them were small
123	traditional houses, like the ones we had seen on the ways. Paul told, that these houses
124	were where the refugees lived.
125	• My expectations and the way I imagined the settlement, was not all like the reality. It
126	was hard to distinguish between the 'inside' and the 'outside' of the settlement by
127	first eyesight.
128	• We stopped at small enclave of concrete buildings, and were introduced to Ben – a
129	collaborator of Paul's, whom worked with empowerment of young girls.
130	• After the introduction, we went with Paul and Ben, to have lunch a few kilometres
131	away, at a place they called 'the Hotel'.
132	• We chatted, while eating the local food, served by a young girl.

133	• When everyone was done, we drove back, and stopped at the fenced area of the
134	governing Establishment. While waiting for a meeting with the assistant commander,
135	Sophie, we witnessed a dispute on food rations, between the authorities and a woman.
136	• Sophie picked us up, and we had a short informal interview with her. She agreed on
137	meeting us again Monday, for a 'guided tour' in the settlement, and especially in her
138	zone.
139	• When the meeting was over, we shook hands, and began the somnolent trip back to
140	Fort Portal. We fell asleep, after a short chat with Paul about our experiences.
141	• Paul dropped us off in the centre of Fort Portal. We found a café, got something to
142	eat, and worked on our notes.
143	

Saturday 14/11/2017

144	
145	• Today we sat on a café to prepare in-depth questions based on the themes we've
146	developed from home.
147	• We went for a long walk and talked to the local people
148	• After visiting a crater lake, we decided to walk home and met a local man, Ibrahim.
149	We had a long talk with him about his life in Uganda.
150	• ·Ibrahim worked with agricultural empowerment just outside Fort Portal and new
151	about the refugee policy.
152	• He explained how it felt to be a local man living in Uganda, receiving many refugees
153	these days. It was very evident how he felt just like Paul, who explained the day
154	before that the Ugandan people see a mirror of themselves in the refugees, why they
155	are helping them.
156	• He agreed that we could record some of the conversation, while he explained about
157	the different tribes, and how this sometimes could create conflicts between the
158	different tribes.
159	• We were tired and wet after this long walk in the rain, and sat at 'our' local café to eat
160	and do notes.
161	

Sunday the 15th October 2017

162	
163	• Sunday started out at our local café – did some reading that was brought from home
164	and developed the last couple of questions before the trip to the settlement tomorrow.
165	• We met with a local man, Albert, who wanted to show us around and tell us about the
166	life in Uganda.

167	•	We drove to a small house, outside Fort Portal, who grew and dried coffee beans.
168	•	The view was wonderful, everything was very green and Albert explained that this
169		was due to the season – the rainy season.
170		

Monday 16/11/2017

172	•	After a short breakfast at Paul's, we packed our bags, got dressed - long trousers,
173		despite the heat - and walked towards the ngo office. We we're excited about what the
174		day would bring, what we would see, and how the more thorough observations of the
175		settlement would be.
176	•	At the office we sat outside, waiting for the driver to arrive. The sun was warm and a
177		little child was playing around in the garden, dressed in nothing but a t-shirt. She
178		looked curiously at us, but was too shy to say hi.
179	•	The driver arrived, a little late, and we took off towards the settlement, together with
180		Evelyn from the NGO.
181	•	During the long and bumpy drive, the car was quieter, than the last time. We reflected
182		on how the day would unfold and talked a bit to Evelyn about working in the
183		organisation. She told us how she was educated from the University, and was very
184		lucky to have this job. We talked about the life in the settlement, and she told how
185		some refugees feel restricted when living there. Often they have problems with
186		growing crops, due to the limited space, why they can't grow enough to run a
187		business. The refugees will travel to the cities to look for employment or run of and
188		settle in Gulu instead of staying in the settlement.
189	•	The driver was quiet, turning up the radio - it was loud and the signal slightly weak.
190		We went through our field notes from Friday, and talked about what questions were
191		most urgent to get answers to. The ride felt even longer this time, and the driver didn't
192		do much to make it comfortable. Speeding up, breaking down, swinging from side to
193		side, to avoid the largest holes in the gravel road. Music, and distorted radio, sweating
194		under the long trousers.
195	•	Arriving at the settlement, we started out at Ben's organisation, doing an interview
196		and were introduced to the different projects they were working on implementing.
197	•	Next to Ben's office building, was a small outdoor carpentry, where three men were
198		working under a tarpaulin, along with a minimalistic sewing workshop. A couple of
199		young women were sitting around, each equipped with a manual pedal Singer sewing

200 machine, teaching each other to sew and took care of their kids. We said hi, but they
201 seemed shy, nodded shortly and replied.

202 • Before the interview we explained Ben about our themes and questions, making sure
203 that he wanted to part take. Ben agreed and we were allowed to record.

204 • During the interview he was eager to talk about the projects, and showed us a hair
205 product that he had developed, that was supposed to be sold all over Uganda. He
206 asked, what we could do to help him selling it abroad, and further emphasised how
207 much money he would be able to earn on Chia seeds, abroad. We tasted them - not
208 bad. He told us how the organisation couldn't keep relying on funding and was forced
209 to have a steady income from something - this product was the foundation for the
210 steady income.

211 • When asking Ben questions, he continuously sidestepped the issue, not really
212 answering the question.

213 • After the interview we walked around - Lasse engaged in a talk with Ben and his co-
214 worker, and Julie ran of to look at the neighbouring school. The kids were playing,
215 singing and were very fond of the new visitor. The children where shy, but encircled
216 Julie, touching her hair and skin. The teacher walked up and engaged in a simple
217 conversation in English, while the children were looking and nodding when asked.

218 • After a couple of minutes, we left to pick up Sophie and went for lunch.

219 • We sat, 'the whole team', the driver, Evelyn, Ben, Sophie, us, around the table, and
220 were served goat with matoke (a starchy banana porridge). We spoke about our lives
221 in Denmark, and in general, how it was to be young there - marriage, kids, career,
222 salary, etc. They laughed at our perceptions of life, which obviously seemed very
223 distant for them. We asked interested their way.

224 • After lunch, we jumped in the car, ready to drive into the settlement, visiting the
225 transit centre (Maheka) and Sophies village 'Mahani???'.

226 • The transit centre was a large fenced area, with huge buildings. The area
227 differentiated from the rest of what we've seen during the drive down the small road,
228 as there were no lush green trees, but only large barren areas, of red soil and gravel. A
229 small playground was placed to the right, just after entering the fenced area.

230 • Sophie allowed us to record the walk through Maheka, as were presented to the
231 communal kitchen, big barn-like sleeping areas, and the place where the refugees
232 would gather to queue for the food serving.

233   • Heading for Sophie's village by car, we drove through several settlement zones,
234   seeing how the refugees emerged along the small road. The houses were constructed
235   of wood and sun dried mud, and a prototype of an 'optimal' house was as well
236   presented in each village to guide the construction of a refugee house. Tall crops
237   jutted out everywhere and it seemed very fertile, when driving through the settlement.

238   • After a 30 minutes drive we arrived to the village, which Sophie was responsible for,
239   stopping at the white tent of tarpaulin, with UNHCR logos. She presented this as her
240   office, and two guards meet us by the car-door. She was very proud of 'her' place,
241   and wanted us to see as much as possible. We inspected the cornfields, as told to, and
242   shook hands with curious people around. She allowed recording the informal
243   conversation, as we walk around in the village.

244   • After a 45-minute drive back to the base of the settlement, we took a detour and
245   walked up a small hill, to get a view of the settlement. Small sheep were curiously
246   following us around, as we jumped from stone to stone, admiring the wonderful view
247   of the green landscape.

248   • At the small hill we were presented to Jim, a Rwandese refugee, who had been living
249   in Rwamwanja settlements as a farmer since 1965. He told us of his life in the
250   settlement, and how he'd created a sustainable living for himself and his family.

251   • At the hill, we were guided to a small spartan refugee house, and Ben walked over,
252   opening the door. We looked at each other, as it seemed kind of rude to just open the
253   door, without knocking. A small elderly woman, the pygmy they called her,
254   unwillingly showed her face, not saying anything. We were told that she was ill and
255   old, and urgently needed assistance. Ben stressed how we were supposed to fundraise
256   money to send to them, to help refugees like this woman. We felt uncomfortable with
257   the situation, but tried to remain polite and listening. We left again fast.

258   • We reached the administrative centre of the settlement, where an interview with The
259   Red Cross was set up. The interview was not very informative, due to language
260   barriers. We were only there for 20 minutes.

261   • Outside the Red Cross, the weakly scenario Paul and Ben had presented to us, played
262   out in front of the OPM. Women and children where queuing in front of the OPM, to
263   get their children registered to their formal ID-card, and to get increased food
264   rations.

265   • Returning to the car, we both felt very tired - it had been a long day with a lot of
266   impressions, why the trip home was silent.

267

Tuesday 17/11/2017

- Today we spent with travelling from Fort Portal to Kampala, at five in the morning.

- We were cramped in a small local taxi, driving 5 hours to reach the chaotic cab-station in Kampala.

- We looked at each other with surprising and tired eyes, as none of us had seen so many cabs in one place. Continuing to the bus-station, boda boda chauffeurs kept yelling at us, to drive with their boda boda.

- At arrival at the bus-station, we located the bus that drove to Gulu. This place was as chaotic as the cab-station, with people yelling, selling goods, and trying to convince us to buy.

- After three hour of waiting, the bus finally departed towards Gulu. The trip felt long, and we didn't have much capacity to engage in the attention we got from the other passengers.

Wednesday 18/11/2017

- We woke up early to be on time, for meeting the History Professor at Gulu University. We where excited to hear what she could tell, as she had been working in the refugee settlement as well as being born in Uganda.

- We arrived at Gulu University half an hour early and walked around at campus.

- When time came, we knocked at her door, meeting a woman with a warm smile, welcoming us and introducing us to a Danish student who where currently doing an internship at the University.

- We talked a bit, all of us, before he went back to work and we started by telling Claire about our thesis.

- The interview was very enlightening and interesting aspects was enhanced.

- After an hour or so, the law professor walked in and joined the conversation. He had different points about the refugees, but was more interested in discussing rights for the homosexual.

- We felt a bit awkward, as our position was quite different than his, and we where mostly listening only questioning him if his opinion turned too radical.

- We where served cake and coke and continued the conversation.

- After the interview we had a lot to process, why we went back to the hotel to go through the important points, while everything was still clear in mind.

Thursday 19/11/2017

- Today we walked around at the local market in Gulu, getting an impression of the bargaining going on. A lot of stalls with 'fresh' fish, homemade baskets and delicious-looking food were sold at the market. During our walk around the market, a small girl suddenly saw us, her eyes widen, and she turned on her heels, started screaming/crying and ran until we couldn't see her anymore.

- When walking around in Gulu, visiting the small street-shops, a drunken man started following us, asking for money. When a group of five guys, sitting hanging out in the shade saw it, they yelled at him, and threatened him with stones, for him to stay away from us.

- We were both tired after the long trip, why we stayed at the hotel at night and went early to bed.

Friday 20/11/2017

- Today we planned to look into the data we had obtained during our field trip, and read international news about the situation in Uganda. Sitting at the local café at the hotel, while the rain was pouring down we've explored the informal conversations and the interviews, and started to talk about what literature our thesis would benefit from.

Saturday 21/11/2017

- Today we caught the bus, to travel to Pakwach. We waited for the local to bus to fill up and depart from Gulu, sitting squeezed together in a bus for 9 persons, being 12 people and a chicken. We arrived at Pakwach late Saturday night.

Sunday 22/11/2017

- In Pakwach we met a local man, who showed around the area. He wanted to show us some of the beautiful nature. We drove with him in pickup truck, while talking about everything and nothing.

- After a while, we stopped the car, since a family were standing waving in the side of the road. Their car had broken down, so we gave them a lift.

- It was two German families, where the one of them lived in Kampala, permanently, and working for the EU Delegation in Uganda.

334   •   We talked about our project, the refugee situation, and he told us about EU engaged
335   development work in Uganda.
336

337 **Monday 23/11/2017**
338   •   We spent all Monday, traveling the long road from Pakwach to Kampala. We slept
339   most of the 7-hour drive.
340   •   In Kampala we checked in to the same hotels, as we started the trip at.
341

342 <u>**Tuesday 24/11/20173**</u>
343   •   Today we had a slow morning, sleeping in and having nice breakfast at the hotel.
344   •   We went to Kampala for a walk around in an area we had not yet visited.
345   •   We sat down in a small café and looked through or notes and interviews to get an
346   overview of the collected data and plan the next step in the process
347

348 <u>**Wednesday 25/11/2017**</u>
349   •   The day went with packing and preparing for the long trip home.
350   •   The days in Uganda have been very educational, and we believe that our thesis will
351   benefit a lot from these experiences.

Appendix 2

1 Interview with Jakob Eilsøe Mikkelsen, Area Representative for Africa, Save the Children.

2 Former Programme Coordinator in the West Nile region in Uganda for UN World Food

3 Programme, and Programme Coordinator in Northern Uganda, for UN World Food

4 Programme.

5

6 Duration: 35.08 min.

7

8 Lasse: Ud fra din erfaring, hvordan vil du beskrive den humanitære situation i Uganda?

9 Jakob: Uganda er et land, der siden 1950'erne, på et hvert givet år har haft mindst160.000

10 flygtninge inden for sine grænser. Så det er et land der kender til problematikken, med at

11 være på flugt. Der har også været borgerkrig i Uganda selv, som i 70'erne drev folk på flugt.

12 Så det der er væsentligt at forstå er, at Uganda ligger geopolitisk, hvor der er gang i

13 konflikter. Både rundt om, og i landet selv. Nu…er der ingen tvivl om, at den humanitære

14 krise i Uganda, qua konflikten i Sydsudan… er noget, af det… mest udfordrende i nye tid i

15 Uganda. De huser mere end én million, og er det land der huser flest flygtninge – det er en

16 kæmpe udfordring, hvilket presser flygtningepolitikken, som historisk set er præget af

17 reciprocitet… på det at man selv blev taget godt imod.

18 Lasse: Skyldes det den etniske sammenhæng på tværs af de post-koloniale

19 grænsetrækninger?

20 Jakob: Lige nøjagtigt. Det spiller en stor rolle. Denne grænsedragning er arbitrær på mange

21 måder – og de etniske skillelinjer der er… for eksempel bor, der etniske grupperinger der

22 tilhører samme grupper – både i forhold til Congo og Sydsudan… og familie på begge sider

23 af grænserne. Så der er stor åbenhed. Hvis der har været problemer i den ene land, kan man

24 flygte til det andet Der er rimelig fri færden imellem landende.

25 Lasse: Ugandas flygtningepolitik er blevet international rost for, at være innovativ og human,

26 og det at man prøver at se flygtninge som politisk aktører, mere end folk der udelukkende har

27 brug for hjælp. Hvordan er den kæmp flygtningestrøm en udfordring for politikken?

28 Jakob: Lige præcis. Jeg tilslutter mig rosen til Uganda. Hvis man ser på den tid vi lever i nu,

29 hvor flygtningedebatten fylder rigtig meget i hele verden, og det med at finde på forskellige

30 startegier. Der er Uganda anderledes. De har for mange år siden kigge på muligheder for at

31 tage imod. Så udfordringen er, rent praktisk antallet, og erfaringsmæssigt, så bliver

32 flygtningen i Uganda i lang tid – gennemsnittet er 17 år, inden man tager hjem. Der er børn

33 der vokser op i lejrene. Udfordringen er pladsmangel, og det at give dem den jord der er en

34 del af strategien – det er hovedpointen. Og det at de kan klare sig selv. Politikken har givet

35 75.000 flygtninge muligheden for at klare sig selv, så de ikke er afhængige af fødevarehjælp

36 – og det er hele idéen i Self-Reliance Strategien, det at man skulle give folk i mulighed for at

37 klare sig selv, så de er bedre rustede til at tage tilbage. Men nu er der 1.00.000, og der er

38 heller ikke blevet færre Ugandere, og landet er heller ikke blevet større. Så det er presset på

39 ressourcer, der er udfordringen i forhold til politikken. Dette var også grunden til, at man

40 ville holde det store internationale Summit i Kampala i juni. For at skabe opmærksomhed til

41 den internationale samfund. Der er brug for international, for at man kan bibeholde

42 politikken.

43 Lasse: Mener du at det er nødvendigt at man gentænker hele idéen om politikken og

44 Refugees Act'en 2006, som følge at den massive strøm?

45 Jakob: Det kunne man meget tænke sig. Især hvis strømmen fortsætter, så er der en

46 sandsynlig for at man må gentænke. I første omgang, prøver man i Uganda, at løse

47 ressourceproblematikken. Hvis dette lykkes, så er der en tro på, at man kan bibeholde

48 politikken. Men det mål man havde ved det Summit der var i juni, så var det kun en femtedel,

49 som reelt blev støttet med – og en femtedel er lang vej, endnu. Så medmindre man får

50 indhentet ressourcerne fra det internationale samfund, så er man tvunget til at gentænke. Man

51 forsøger først at bruge guleroden, i forhold til det internationale samfund... sådan, prøv at

52 hør, det her er en god idé. Vi holder flygtningene hos os, men det kræver at I bidrager. Det er

53 det man forsøger nu. Hvis opbakningen ikke kommer inden længe, så vil man nok prøve at

54 presse det internationale samfund. Og så er der selvfølge det... kan man blive ved med at

55 give folk jord, så det kan dyrke selv, eller skal man kigge på andre muligheder... handel,

56 håndværk osv. Der er byer der er drevet og opbygget af flygtninge, og det er gode eksempler.

57 Lasse: Det at det skaber nogle dynamikker i lokalsamfundene?

58 Jakob: Ja, lige præcis. Man har valgt en landsbystrategi, i stedet for en lejrstrategi. Her har

59 også været nødt til at gå på kompromis, som følge at antallet der er kommet. Det gør, at man

60 bor tætte end før, og mere lejragtigt. Men landsbyfornemmelsen var der ret meget før. Man

61 kunne ikke skelne flygtninge fra Ugandere... der skulle man kende de særegne karaktertræk,

62 og byggeteknik.

63 Lasse: Vi havde også oplevelsen ude vestpå, at det var et stort landsbylignende område... Ser

64 du, at politikken har haft international effekt, på nødhjælpsaktører. Både Tyskland og

65   Etiopien er inde på deres egne udgaver af open door policies. Ser du at politikken har gjort

66   noget for måden man ser humantær hjælp på, i global sammenhæng?

67   Jakob: Altså… jeg synes… altså topmødet fik jo meget opmærksomhed i juni, og der var

68   mange der deltog. Der fik Uganda bred anerkendelse, og der var interesse. Men, jeg tror at

69   man tænker, at modellen ikke kan overføres én til én. Selvom der er flere steder der prøver…

70   Etiopien for eksempel. Der er lande der kigger på om det er en mere bæredygtig model… i

71   forhold til de langvarige flygtningekriser. Desværre må man nok sige, at det at man kun

72   finansiere en femtedel af det… det er nemmere at finansiere til det akutte, for at man fra

73   vestens side viser, at man gør noget. FN og NGO'er kæmper med at finansiere denne type

74   politik… også selvom det er SelfRreliance. Man er nødt til at se det som en mere…

75   udviklingskontekst, end bare humanitær… også fordi at det er billigere. Så der er også en

76   donorinteresse i at se det sådan. Jeg kunne godt se, at der kommer noget mere ud af det. Men

77   det kræver at man bliver ved med, at holde det på dagsordenen… og den Ugandiske

78   præsident er ikke så internationalt populær. Så der er andre ting der arbejder imod.

79   Lasse: Mener du, at politikken er et strategisk værktøj for præsidentens side… eller hvor stor

80   en rolle har politisk strategi i denne forbindelse? For præsidentens popularitet osv.?

81   Jakob: Man ser sådan på det… altså meget lokalt… er der noget lokal benefit? Altså det er

82   også set, at der er national utilfredshed med flygtningene… i lige netop deres område. Men

83   generelt har man været meget åben, og givet jord, og kigget på de ting der kunne komme

84   med… sociale ydelser som ugandere også kan benytte sig af. Så jeg ser det som populært og

85   politisk smart fra præsidentens side… i modsætning til lejrpolitik. Men der er ikke lige så stor

86   opbakning til præsidenten, som der var i 90'erne. Man mistænker ham for valgsvindel med

87   mere…

88   Lasse: Vi beskæftiger os meget med de humanitære idéer, og hvilke idéer denne politik

89   eksemplificerer… det at politikken bliver fremstillet som eksemplificere. Hvordan vil du

90   beskrive de humanitære idéer som politikken trækker på, og hvordan det kommer praktisk til

91   udtryk.

92   Jakob: Jeg synes… Altså i øjeblikket taler meget om det er kaldet 'Nexus'… sådan, det

93   humanitære og udviklingsdelen. Det er jo et helt klart framework for, når folk kommer ind…

94   prima facie politikken. Så er der en klart defineret pakke for, hvad de forskellige aktører tager

95   sig af. Det er klart defineret hvordan det skal foregår med madrationerne. Så den del af det

96   trækker på, noget mere langsigtet.

97   Lasse: Rent praktisk… Nu har vi talt om settlementsne, og det at man må gå på kompromis

98   nogle steder som følge at den store flygtningestrøm. Mener du at settlementsnes beliggenhed

99   har indflydelse på de fremtidige udsigter for politikken.

100   Jakob: Ja, det kan det sagtens få. Det gør jo handel meget sværere. Så der skal være nogle

101   andre politikker der hænger sammen… i forhold til 'udkantsuganda', om man vil. Så det kan

102   godt få konsekvenser. Omvendt tror jeg, at det at mange flygtninge ente selv har været i

103   Uganda før, eller har familie der har være der… så man ved hvad man kan forvente. Mange

104   vil bare gerne have muligheden for at kunne være i fred, og dyrke deres jor, og få en

105   uddannelse. Mange kommer for at få en bedre uddannelse.

106   Lasse: Er det muligt når settlementsne ligger så perifært som de gør?

107   Jakob: Jo… det er problematisk i forhold til handelsruter med mere. Nogle af lejrene ligger

108   tæt på disse ruter… men jo, det påvirker mulighederne. Men omvendt, giver det også noget at

109   man er etnisk samlet, integrationsmæssigt… man falder hurtigere på plads. Det som mange er

110   utilfredse med er frugtbarheden på jorden. Det kan være problematisk. Det kunne også vise,

111   at man gerne vil klare sig selv.

112   Lasse: De internationale aktører begynder at råbe op… FN råber op om ressourcemangel, og

113   det at international hjælp er nødvendigt. Tror du, at politikken kan risikere at forsvinde helt?

114   Jakob: Jeg tror… Uganda vil forsøge at holde på politikken så længe det er muligt. Så er der

115   også det med reciprocitet, og det at Museveni er en smart politiker. Internationalt stiller det

116   ham i et godt lys, og jeg tror at han, og den ugandiske regering vil gå langt for at holde på

117   politikken. Men hvis man kigger globalt, er tendenserne mere, at der bliver strammet på

118   flygtningeområdet. Det kan man også bruge i Uganda, til at presse det international samfund

119   ved at sige… I strammer, det kan vi også finde på at gøre. Men målet er helt klart det at

120   skaffe ressourcer.

121   Lasse: Tror du, at den Ugandiske politik, kan ligge grund for en ny måde at arbejde med

122   flygtningeproblematikker på, globalt i fremtiden, den vestlige tilgang fortsætte med, at

123   fokusere på umiddelbare katastrofer?

124   Jakob: Desværre er der ikke noget der tyder på at der bliver skiftet hest, selvom at man kan se

125   det gode eksempel i Uganda… desværre. Men jeg syntes at Uganda har fat i noget, der kan

126   udbrede sig til andre steder i Afrika. Også internationale donorer der vil kunne se fidusen i

127   det. Men det bliver nok ikke en decideret model, som tingene hænger sammen nu.

Appendix 3

1 On the way the settlement, an informal conversation between Lasse, Julie and Paul occurred

2 and Paul agreed to the recording of this. The recording starts in the middle of the

3 conversation.

4

5 Duration: 5 min.

6

7 Julie: But can they stay for as long as they want to, or do they have to go home at some

8 point?

9 Paul: Yes, they can stay as long as they want to. And they will come that's why they are so

10 many.

11 Julie: Okay.

12 Paul: Yeah, in fact it do not happened that the refugees are forced to go back, but when the

13 war is over in their country, they have to go home. But they are not forced. In fact it

14 happened long time ago doing another regime, where the government forced them to go

15 home. But now, no..

16 Julie: So they can stay here for a lifetime?

17 John: Yes, they can stay. But they have to stay as a refugee. They will always be a refugee.

18 That's why the apply to go to another country. They want to go to America, USA.

19 Julie: Aaah, okay…

20 Paul: Some go to Denmark.

21 Julie: Okay.. But what about the children that are born here, will they be Ugandan or will

22 they be refugees?

23 Paul: They will stay refugees.. The children..

24 Julie: Okay, they stay refugees even of they are born in Uganda?

25 Paul: They stay refugees. The law says as log as they stay here and if the parents are

26 refugees, they stay refugees.

27 Paul: But maybe they can be Ugandan by registration.. They can become Ugandan by

28 registration. If they become citizens of Uganda they can no longer stay in the settlement. But

29 the process is not easy. Because they don't want to make them Ugandans. Because now our

30 population will increase. The population will just increase immediately if you make the

31 refugee Ugandan.

32   Lasse: Are there…

33   Paul: [Interrupts] Because what happens here in Uganda, is some of those refugees eventually

34   becoming Ugandan. Because some marries their children. Some of those from Rwanda are

35   like that in Rwanda, but in Uganda they are Ugandans, but they started out as refugees…

36   Paul: But, he came here.. He started here.. Joined the army here.. Refugees are not supposed

37   to join the army.. Then he went back to Rwanda so in Uganda he was living very well..

38   Paul: So, here some of them refugees mingles slowly into the community

39   Lasse: But are there some of them who wanna move from here like to other towns? Can you

40   do that?

41   Paul: Yes!

42   Lasse: You can do that?

43   Paul: Yeah, around move..

44   Lasse: They can move around, freely like they want?

45   Paul: Yeah, but they need to get travel documents.

46   Lasse: Yeah, okay..

47   Paul: They are moving..

48   Julie: So they can move to fort portal if they want to?

49   Paul: Yes..

50   Julie: If they have the money for it..

51   Paul: That's where they will go to do shoppings, and some do business in fact in Nakivale,

52   that's the largest refugee camp.. You will see how many things that are owned by refugees.

53   The refugees own house and vehicles and they use them for transport. So they go to Kampala

54   and then come back to Nakivale camp.

Appendix 4

1   During a visit to the Rwamwanja Settlement, Ben agreed to an interview, before a

2   guided tour. He started out by explaining what his organisation worked for.

3

4   Duration: 26 minutes

5

6   Julie: It is okay if I record?

7   Ben: It's okay..

8   Lasse: What areas does your organisation work with?

9   Ben: So yeah.. Our organisation is called XXXX, we are a non-profit making

10   organisation, we started in 2014, October. We are supported by 70 people who are

11   board members, the funding is local, so it is a local organisation. We are just started

12   up in Kampala

13   Ben [continues with explaining about the start of the organisation]

14   Ben: We do very many activities, among them we have OVC and empowerment. We

15   look at mobilising with special interest groups, we look at refugee girls, within that

16   group we have a project about children inflicted by war project, sponsored by XXX

17   (Pauls organisation). We help children that is put of school because of orphanage, as

18   they need support to continue with primary education, we support them to continue.

19   Those who are above 17, 18, those who need vocational skills, something bring them

20   here others are connected here, we train them to skills of business, that project is very

21   broad, as we are looking at economy strengthening. In economy strengthening we are

22   looking at economy skills, we train vocational skills and we give them start-up kits.

23   The start-up kits, some we fundraise around or we get them from XXX [Pauls

24   organisation].

25   Lasse: What are these start-up kits?

26   Ben: The start-up kits we give like… tailoring machines, garments, we buy sewing

27   materials, we buy training books for mechanic students. The training so they can

28   immediately go out and starts business. Then also, in income-relating activities, see

29   that part is a part of economy strengthening.

30   Ben: Then also, we also provide social support, we do the counselling part, we also

31   provide social material support, like give them closing, bedding and other items. You

32 find children that don't even afford buying clothes, so they can have to buy clothes, or

33 buy food that is OVC [showing a paper overview of what the organisations helps

34 with].

35 Ben: So basically..

36 Julie: So you bought all this for the childrens?

37 Ben: This is an OVC, this is material support. We gave them basic needs. This is to

38 show you an example of material support.

39 Ben: So also, we also provide legal, legal support. Like, training the guardians in

40 rights of the children…. Advocating for those whose rights are abused…

41 Ben: Then we have food and nutrition security. And that one we provide food and

42 nutrition, we support guardians by giving them seeds for vegetable, cabbages, so they

43 can be able to feed the children. And that one we give specifically to widows. We

44 have organised a guardian association.

45 Ben: We also work with another company that gives us what you call chia-seed.

46 Julie: Chia seeds?

47 Ben: Have you heard of it?

48 Julie: Yeah!

49 Ben: So we get chia-seed, the company give it to us, and then we give it to the

50 guardian association, they grow it, and after the company gives us money to buy it.

51 They give it freely, so we can earn money to buy feed and buy clothing for the

52 children. And that we are looking at the opportunity to learn them to be able to

53 provide for themselves, for we can not sustain giving,

54 Julie: Are there a planned time frame for when the refugees has to be self-sufficient?

55 Ben: A what?

56 Julie: Are there like – now we've been helping you for six months, now you have you

57 have to do it yourself?

58 Ben: Yeah yeah.

59 Julie: Are there a timeframe?

60 Ben: Yeah, if we give like.. If we give to a family, we usually connect safe-

61 assessments, is what you call household OVC. If we see a development then we

62 graduate that family.

63 Julie: So when you see the development, then you stop helping?

64 Ben: Yeah, then…. After giving the seeds, we have a frontier, to usually visit the

65 families give advise on the services, we give those families bags ,tarpaulins...

66 Ben: Then also we have nutritioning, education support. This girls.. The refugee girls
67 they bring on board, most of them are single mothers. They has to come here
68 everyday, so her family needs food. In corporation with Pauls organisation, we buy
69 them food, we also help them showing how they can bring op those children, proper
70 feeding, proper helping.
71 [Ben continuous explaining what the organisation are working with – girls at risk
72 vulnerable children]
73 Julie: So all in all you kinda act like social workers?
74 Ben: What?
75 Julie: You make sure that everyone is alright?
76 Ben: Yeah, yes we do.. That is what our organisation is about, helping the children
77 who needs it. We also do community awareness about food security.
78 Ben: For people in Africa he grow and store food. He grow and store food for up to
79 another season, but refugees are growing and selling immediately and find out by the
80 end of the day, that people are very hungry, they have nothing to eat, they sold their
81 food.
82 Lasse: So that's a probl.….
83 Ben: So, we did an assessment in 2015, that 40% of the households in the camp are
84 used to have only one meal. So there was a need to conduct awareness of growing and
85 keeping food. They only grow mays, so they can get cash, because here in
86 Kamwenge, mays is a source of income so they have left out the growing of banana.
87 So we tried to teach them to grow sweet potatos and other crops. So we were asked to
88 be involved in growing, harvesting and management and we do an internship with the
89 WFP.
90 Julie: So how is the soil around here to grow crops, it is fertile?
91 Ben: Yeah – the land here is very fertile.
92 [Ben continues to talk about what the organisations works with, household, small
93 holder peasants,]
94 Julie: So you have a lot of different programmes?
95 Ben: Yeah, a lot of different in the different district and sub-counties and the projects
96 are running very well
97 Ben: As we create awareness of rights, we sometimes see that people rights are
98 abused in health facilities, we help an organise a monthly meeting with the
99 management of the facilities to address the problems.

100   How, cause you have a lot of great programmes, how do you choose who can be a

101   part of a programme, and when that person can be in the programme?

102   Ben: Okay…

103   Julie: Cause when you arrive here to the settlement…..

104   Ben: Like for that with better health we do it in communities that are near, because

105   this sub-county is very big

106   Julie: So if you're active here in the settlement, then you can be a part of the different

107   programmes?

108   Ben: Yeah.. But still, sometimes w go on radio-talkshows, to create awareness,

109   talkshows on the radio. So that when someone who is not near Rwamwanja can know

110   that when they go to a health facility, have to get this right, have to talk to the doctor

111   freely, have to have the right to confidentiality, those issues.

112   Julie: Okay..

113   Ben: We are also helping the people with their political rights.

114   Julie: So the locals have the right to vote?

115   Ben: Yeah, locally they do….. For that with helping people work with another NGO

116   in Fort Portal, and it is a very big organisation. They support us with funds and what

117   we do specifically is we bring awareness to civil rights and political rights. When we

118   found out that citizens rights is abused, we bring in leaders, so they can tell them that

119   you promised this, but you never did it! So we are also doing that, and people are

120   appreciating it.

121   Lasse: So in general you get positive feedback for the projects?

122   Ben: Yeah yeah..

123   Lasse: In general for the project?

124   Ben: Yeah yeah! Becaue there have been problem with the people not being included

125   in the sub-county documents, but now they include them, so the project is doing well.

126   Ben: Lastly, working with XXX (Pauls organisation) we are expecting you to help us..

127   For refugees we are training them to have vocational skills..

128   Julie: You are training girls from different zones?

129   Ben: Yeah.. We are training the girls. [Continues talking about how we have to help

130   fundraising, as they have a lot of expenses]

131   Julie: You talk a lot about how the refugees have civil rights, and legal rights – do you

132   think it is safer for the refugees to be in the settlement instead of self-settling, because

133   of your many and very helpful programmes?

134   Ben: Yeah. No from the civic education, they do it in host community, yeah! That

135   education you don't want to take it to the refugees.

136   Julie: But the refugees still live in the host community, right?

137   Ben: What, come again?

138   Julie: The refugees and the host community are they living together?

139   Ben: Yeah, they live together, but when we are collecting the political right education,

140   we do it only for the Ugandans, not for the refugees. And then we also work with the

141   local government, with local government I mean the sub-county leadership and the

142   district leadership.

143   Ben: So that's a lot of the things that we do. With fundraising we are fundraising

144   locally.

Appendix 5

1   Semi-structured interview with Sophie, Assistant Officer at Rwamwanja Settlement.

2   Sophie is responsible for the village Maheka within the settlement, 13.10.17. We

3   introduced ourselves, and with some help from Paul, we got to ask Sophie some

4   questions.

5

6   Duration: 17 minutes

7

8   Ben: Is introducing Lasse, Julie and Paul and are telling Sophie that we are interested

9   in knowing about the settlement, the refugee crisis and whether we could have a tour

10 around in the settlement.

11

12 Paul: I am *******, I am from the local NGO, Fort Portal. I work with Ben, helping

13 to make programmes for the girls to learn how to sew on the sewing machine. I have

14 these Danish students, visiting and exploring the refugee policy for their master thesis.

15 Julie: I am Julie, from Denmark

16 Lasse: I am Lasse. Lasse from Denmark.

17 Sophie: Hi I am Sophie, nice meeting you.

18 4:00 Julie: Thank you for taking your time.

19

20 [Indistinct chattering going on…]

21

22 Paul: So the students want to know what you are doing in the settlement? Because

23 they find that the Ugandan policy is very different and good.

24 [Laughter]

25 [Paul continues chattering and explaining]

26

27 Paul: The Danish student wants to know how the project goes, how the refugees are

28 managed, the process and the whole experience of Uganda. That is what interests

29 them. They find that the policy is very special and they want to know about the

30 process of being a refugee in Uganda.

31 Sophie: The process?

32   Paul: Yes, the process..

33   Julie: What and how are you working with the refugees?

34   Sophie: Okay the process for the refugee. First when they arrive here then we,

35   assistant commanders we undress them, given them lunch. Then the IPs they also

36   meet them. Cause when they arrive here they can have had difficulties in their past.

37   Then IPs and Ops, they are implementing persons, they go and meet them in the

38   transit centre.

39   So there are a lot of activities. We have to verify them Identify the young ones, the

40   old ones. Before we settle them. So after all this is done we give them food and food

41   for their children and are staying here in the transit centre until they are having

42   refugee status. Then they get the plot of land. And for us. According to our boss, the

43   commander, he doesn't allow us to sit around them. For us our main project is to

44   monitor.

45

46   […] Silence

47   A bit of chattering is going on

48

49   So how is the movement? Cause in Europe refugees is not allowed freedom of

50   movement. Can they travel around?

51   Sophie: Travelling in the country they need to get travel permits, because if the get

52   issues on the way they will call us to know if they are refugees and if they live here.

53   Then we have to ask for someone from here to go and get them.

54   Julie: They can move wherever they want to?

55   Sophie: Yes – apart from Jusurra. But to get a permit the refugees need to have proof

56   of where they are going and if they are going to get employment, they need to have

57   proof of this

58   Julie: Okay. So they cannot leave without a permit?

59   Sophie: No, but they do. Some run off, but they often return again, when they don't

60   have more money.

61   Julie: Okay okay… Where are your refugees coming from?

62   Sophie: Mainly from Congo. But some of them come, they go back to their country,

63   they lie to come here. But we identify them, so they tell us why they come here.

64   Julie: So they tell you why they come here?

65   Sophie: Yes, they tell us why they come here.

66   Paul: How long can the refugees stay here – can they stay here for life?

67   Sophie: Yes, they can stay here for life.

68   Paul: Then you are giving them land and the can stay here as long as they want?

69   Yes – as long as they want.

70   Julie: So you are actually building a village where they can stay forever?

71   Sophie: yes.

72   Lasse: How do you experience the beliefs and ideas of people that are being settled

73   here? Do they want to stay here forever or do they see at as a temporary place?

74   Sophie: Actually doing verification, when we are verifying. Most of the refugees say

75   no no no, they don't want to go back.

76   Lasse: Okay.

77   Sophie: Most of them are fine with staying here. They are comfortable here. And we

78   have kids here, kids who have been abandoned, even mothers. Then we have albinos,

79   they live right here next to us.

80   Paul: There are also living for them self?

81   Sophie: Yes, for protection. We want them to be self-sufficient.

82   Lasse: Is it safer for refugees to live in the settlement?

83   Sophie: Yes it is.

84   Julie: And you have space enough to receive more refugees?

85   Sophie: Yes..

86   Lasse: Do the refugees have the same legal rights as nationals?

87   Sophie: They can go talk to the nationals if they like. They can also vote here in the

88   settlement. They choose some to represent them and can vote in the community.

89   Julie: How many approximately are you receiving?

90   Sophie: We receive refugees every week. Around 3, 4, 5, 600 a day. In the whole

91   camp are there around 65000 refugees. We've got 45 villages in 13 zones.

92   Paul: A commander takes care of they own zone. So there are 13 zones and 45

93   villages. But how do you see if it's a village?

94   Sophie: We've named them.

95   Lasse: Do you see with this continues influx of refugees that there would be limits on

96   capacity and resources in the future?

97   Sophie: In the future yeah, of course there will be need for more space in the future.

98   Lasse: but that is in the future and not at the moment?

99   Sophie: No no, at the moment we have space

100 Julie: Do you experience a pressure from the government, the refugees and other

101 parties, than earlier experienced?

102 Sophie: No, this settlement works very well. We don't get the refugees from South

103 Sudan, 'cause they don't wanna go to Rwamwanja settlement, they want to stay with

104 their tribe. We don't feel pressured. We would like to receive more refugees. More

105 refugees means more work.

106

107 [Indistinct chattering]

108

109 Paul: How big is the space that is given to the refugee when they settle?

110 Sophie: 50x50 metres

111 Julie: That's a lot.

112

113 [Indistinct chattering]

114

115 Sophie: A person with special needs will be given more

116

117 [Indistinct chattering]

118

119 Paul: Another thing, maybe we could go see the reception centre, how does it work,

120 how do they get food? And just move around?

121 Sophie: That would be okay. And actually I would love to take you to my village.

122 Maheka it is called. You can come back on Monday, would that be good for you? In

123 the afternoon?

124

125 [indistinct chattering]

Appendix 6

1   During a walk through the village Maheka, and informal conversation about refugee

2   matters compared to the European way of managing refugees occurred. The

3   conversation was accepted being recorded, before walking though the village.

4   Ben, Sophie, Evelyn, Lasse and Julie was walking around and talking, accompanied

5   by to security guards who was responsible for maintaining peace in this village.

6

7   Duration: 20 minutes

8

9   Lasse: Do you experience often that people run away from here? Or try to self-

10   settling, without telling? I mean just suddenly they have left their house in the

11   settlement and are gone?

12   Sophie: They do.. They do.. […] They want money.

13   Julie: Why do they do that if they like it here in the settlement?

14   Sophie: Why do they do that? Because they want money…

15   Julie and Lasse: Ooh okay…

16   Lasse: They want money…

17   Sophie [interrupts] Okay, I can say like sort of con-men, cause the will come and lie

18   to you, saying I'll sell to you my plot and tell you I'm going back to Congo. Then

19   after one week they are back here, starting fighting with other groups here in the

20   settlement. Because they want money.

21   Lasse: Okay okay..

22   Sophie: Soo they are free living here and still they can go to another country. But they

23   lie, and tell you things to get more money and more food, that they don't need.

24   Lasse: When they come here do you have a goal, that they have to be 100 percent

25   self-sufficient? At some point? Is it a goal or is it just you help them, and that is how

26   it's going to be in the future as well?

27   Sophie: No because the government only give them the land because its a bit big, they

28   get food, they get cash, so they can also cultivate their land and get things to grow.

29   Ben: Lets go and look. The sun is very hot, you will enjoy that one of Gulu. Here we

30   have this big tree with shadow.

31   Lasse: How long does it take constructing their houses? How long does it normally

32   take?

33   Ben: It depends on how you maintain the.. How you want it.. But these here can last

34   for five years [Pointing at the houses build of wood and mud with tarpaulin roofs].

35   Lasse: Okay..

36   Ben: After they give them new tarpaulins

37   Lasse: While they are building their houses, are they sleeping in the reception area?

38   Or are they living in the houses next door?

39   Ben: They live in the small houses.. They construct some that are very small and live

40   there.

41   Sophie: They live there while they are building a bigger one.

42   [Walking around in the village, managed by Sophie]

43   Julie: When talking about how we are managing refugees in Europe, because we have

44   a lot of refugees coming right now, do you think that the way you receive refugees in

45   Uganda are more humanitarian?

46   [Ben and Sophie are laughing]

47   Julie: You can be honest

48   Lasse: Yeah, you can be totally honest

49   Ben: According to the refugee policy it is humanitarian.

50   Sophie: But some times it is necessary to do like you do. For security purposes.

51   Ben: Yeah…

52   Sophie: It think I would prefer their way of doing it. Because ours are so free.. They

53   can just go around as they like too.. Go around to another village, go to another

54   camp.. They escape like moving at their own, you know.

55   Evelyn: It was to the refugees to prefer this one, instead of yours, but it creates

56   problems. But they lie to get money and they move around. Yours is better for

57   security purposes.

58   Julie: The refugees must be safe here?

59   Sophie: Yes, they are safe

60   Evelyn: People like those ones [Pointing at the refugees, working on their land]

61   Lasse: But do you agree that the Ugandan way of managing refugees is the way it

62   should be done everywhere?

63   Ben: Yeah, definitely!

64   Sophie: Yeah, with less freedom.

65   Evelyn: If its possible.

66   Sophie: They feel like home actually

67   Ben: Do you have enough land in Denmark, to provide for the refugees like this?

68   Lasse: That is a problem as well.

69   Sophie: They don't..

70   Lasse: And as well we have the European Union, and within the EU we need to

71   coordinate with all the other countries – how many are you taking and how many are

72   you taking? And off course with the last influx from the south, Syria and these places

73   it created chaos, because some countries where like, We cannot take any more, but

74   people kept coming, because they where fleeing. So I was actually thinking like, you

75   are getting refugees all the time now, what about resources? You are not reaching a

76   point where you don't have any more resources to fed and help more people?

77   Ben: No not really…

78   Lasse: Do you think that you will reach a point where it's going to be problematic?

79   Sophie: Maybe in the future, but now we are not seeing it. We can receive more

80   refugees.

81   Ben: Yes, we have room for more refugees. More refugees means more money

82   [laughs] Let's walk further, so you can visit the children..

83   Julie: Thank you so much for showing us everything.

84   Ben: The children are close to here, so we can visit and you can see how they live, the

85   children that has been abounded that we are helping and funding. You must go home

86   and tell about our work, so that you can help funding.

Appendix 7

1 Informal conversation with the national, Ibrahim, 14.10.17

2

3 An informal conversation with the national, Ibrahim, in Fort Portal the 14th October

4 2017. We introduced ourselves and told Ibrahim about our research to gain an

5 understanding of the local perception of the refugees in Uganda.

6

7 Duration: 04:02. The informal conversation occurred before and after the transcribed.

8

9 Lasse: The Ugandan model is found to be a really progressive and innovative way of

10 dealing with refugees.

11 Ibrahim: Yeah yeah (Ibrahim is knotting his head continuously, while Lasse is

12 explaining the basis for our research)

13 And there's a large influx of refugees.

14 Ibrahim: Yes.

15 The thing about people fleeing because of conflict is not stopping.

16 Ibrahim: No, no it will continue and continue.

17 Lasse: You never know what will happen. And that is what we want to investigate.

18 We are here to learn about the Ugandan model, how you are managing the refugees

19 here, and we find it quite impressive.

20 Ibrahim: We've got so many refugees in Uganda.

21 Lasse: Yeah – you have open arms (gesticulate with his arms)

22 Ibrahim: Laughs a bit

23 [Short silence]

24 Lasse: You are treating them in a very humanitarian way.

25 [Short Silence]

26 Ibrahim: That only makes the president... You know… Ahm.. So the outside people..

27 People will just, I mean, really like the president just because of that. It's like no

28 problem, you can stay here as long as you want to.

29 Ibrahim: But aaaah, besides that he has had the power in a really long time.

30 Lasse: Yes, we heard about that.

31 Ibrahim. So people don't like him that much.

32   Lasse: Yes we've heard about how he wanted to change..

33   Ibrahim: Yes, the constitution.

34   Lasse: And we saw some clips about how the people in the parliament were fighting.

35   [Ibrahim laughs]

36   Ibrahim: You should have seen the clips, you know..

37   [Short silence]

38   Lasse: So do you know what will happen? Is he gonna stay in power?

39   [Ibrahim is mumbling]

40   Ibrahim: There's nothing there's gonna happen, you know… He's just gonna.. You

41   know.. Stay..

42   Lasse: Okay okay.

43   Lasse: But how are the locals taking it. I mean with the refugee policy? Are the

44   satisfied?

45   Ibrahim: The refu.. You see.. The refugees don't care because they know the president

46   is still in power.

47   Lasse: But I was thinking the locals? The people living here?

48   Ibrahim. The local people…

49   Lasse: How do they think about refugees coming, the local people?

50   Ibrahim: The local people don't care.. They have no problem with them, you know.

51   Lasse: Yeah yeah [Knots his head to encourage Ibrahim to continue talking]

52   Ibrahim: it's only ahm… If you.. Ahm.. If you.. Ahm.. People, specifically the

53   Sudanese and the [Mumbles – Ilitrians? 2.35] their behaviour is quit violent to local

54   people. They are not so nice to us, you know, the way they talk are so arrogant. They

55   want to fight all the time. But the rest of the people, like the Somalis.

56   Lasse: Congo, Burundi…

57   Ibrahim: Yeah.. you know they don't.. They are nice, you know..

58   Lasse: Yeah.

59   Ibrahim: So the local people they don't care. If you are nice to them they are nice to

60   you.

61   Lasse: That's how it should be.. It makes sense..

62   [Short silence]

63   Lasse: Most of the people are coming from south Sudan and staying in the north

64   primarily.

65   Ibrahim: So many.

66   Lasse: In Adjumi, Gulu,

67   Ibrahim: Even in Kampala.

68   [Short Silence]

69   Lasse: A saw that you've reach more than a million refugees now.

70   Ibrahim: Yeah!

71   Lasse: That's a lot of people

72   [Ibrahim laughs out loud]

73   Lasse [Explains about refugees in Denmark]: We didn't take a lot of people in

74   Denmark. There's this right turn in politics in Europe.

75   Ibrahim: Yeah yeah

76   People in Europe are getting more closed. They want to protect their own.

77   Ibrahim: Yeah yeah.. Like waaa…

78   Lasse: Exactly. Just like if they are afraid.

79   Ibrahim: You are right, you know. You are being afraid and all.. Because you have…

80   Lasse: But there's capacity and resources. Shouldn't we use it to help? You know..

81   Ibrahim: Yeah yeah.

82   [Short silence]

83   Lasse: But as we talked about – it is really interesting and fascinating how it's done

84   here.

85   Ibrahim: Yeah [Laughs] Yeah yeah.

Appendix 8

1   Interview with Professor Claire at Gulu University, the 18/10/17

2

3   Duration: 42 minutes

4

5   Claire: The challenge is now, that there is a lot of pressure on resources, a lot of

6   strain. Resources are over strained, there is food crisis. Because the refugees are given

7   money, instead of food. For them they don't negotiate. They go to the market…so

8   there's custody. There is a looming crisis

9   Julie: So that is affecting the locals as well?

10   Claire: Its affecting both the locals and the refugees, yea. But you look at it again like

11   an opportunity, and people have to work harder to produce more food

12   Lasse: Is that as well…I heard a podcast from the UN, this morning. They are talking

13   about, that you, here in Uganda, are working on a new framework, on refugees. Is that

14   a result of this breaking point, which we have now? With the crisis on food and

15   resources…is it to formulate a new policy in a way?

16   Claire: Yes, that is what they're trying to do. The government is saying…Even the

17   refugees should get involved in production. The indigenous communities should

18   expand production.

19   Lasse: Erm…the thing is, that it affects the locals as well – is it a general crisis now

20   with food for both parties?

21   Claire: Yes, they feel the stress. You have to look for resources, and right now in

22   Northern Uganda, who are hosting the biggest number of refugees…the environment

23   is being destroyed. They have to cut down trees, so they can construct settlements,

24   and for wood fuel. Right now there are no tries, and no wood fuel. The UNHCR, has

25   to go to other parts to look for wood fuel.

26   Julie: Do you know if you are working with the Western parts of the country, to, for

27   instance send refugees down to some of the camps, that have more space and

28   resources? In West they said, please send some more refugees. We have a lot of

29   space.

30   Claire: You know…the refugees even don't want to go to some of the places. Given

31   the cultural differences. The refugees from Sudan will prefer to live in the North.

32   Because they share historical and culturally.

33   Lasse: There are no ethnic tensions?

34   Claire: No…

35   Lasse: It sounds like, when you say that South Sudanese people don't want to go, they

36   want to stay with the people they know, and shares culture with. The policy in

37   Uganda, they have to become self-sufficient, I mean, that is the goal over time, and

38   become agents of development. So in a way it sounds like, they have a voice, a

39   meaning, and that it is taken seriously.

40   Claire: Yes, they have a voice – when they say no, they say no. You have to explain

41   to them, why you are doing something. Why you are moving them, and involve them.

42   Lasse: The thing about the open door policy – do you see it as a more humane way of

43   dealing with refugees than the common perception, of how it is done in Europe, for

44   instance. We put people in camps, and they don't have freedom to move. Is the

45   Ugandan model more humane?

46   Claire: Yes. To me, the way we do it in Uganda, is more humane. These are minority

47   people, who used to have their freedom of movement, and of interaction, and involved

48   in economic activities. Now, when you keep people in camps, you stigmatize them.

49   And traumatize them. You don't give them freedom to think and to do things. I think,

50   by allowing them to interact, you empower them. The problem with, for instance, the

51   Sudanese community is, their level of development is quite low. And culturally they

52   are still coming up. So when you keep them in camps, they will learn nothing, and

53   they wont be able to change their mind-sets…stagnation. The problem is the culture

54   and mind-set. They don't have diplomacy of negotiation, or compromise. That kind of

55   thing can only be removed, if you allow them, to interact with the local communities.

56   Refugees who live in Uganda for a longer time, are now coming out of that. They're

57   even telling you, our brothers, still have that mind-set. The camps are disempowering

58   and destroying them. The open door policy should allow them to interact with the host

59   communities, and empowerment to undertake economic activities.

60   Julie: So they can contribute to the local society?

61   Claire: Yea.

62   Lasse: We have talked about reciprocity – the thing about giving, and being generous.

63   Because… a lot of people in Uganda say, of course we want to…we have open arms.

64   People can come here, because they are our brothers. Like you said. Is it as well a way

65   of saying, that we have been in trouble in Uganda, during internal disputes and

66   conflicts – is it a way of giving back, and helping each other, in the region of East

67   Africa?

68   Claire: Yes. One thing is…given our historical conflicts, at one time we were also

69   refugees. And given that experience, we know exactly what it means to be a refugee.

70   When a group arise as refugees, you fast reflect on your own life in exile. That makes

71   you develop empathy for them. We have also been hosted as refuges…then the part

72   that our peace in Uganda is volatile. The peace is fragile. Any time, anything can

73   happen. If you mistreat refuges, what will you expect in any case of breakdown in the

74   political stability? So that is also in our minds. You know…elders always tell us, be

75   very careful what you do to the refugees. That's why we co-exist. Now we have

76   learned from each other…from historical and cultural background. We share a lot. It

77   is only political boundaries, which have separated us. For instance, Congo, there are

78   the same ethnic groups in Uganda. They share ancestry. That alone makes you have a

79   heart, because they are our brothers. Only politics separated us.

80   Lasse: Yes?

81   Claire: Yes…so at times where refugees come… crossing the borders, for some, they

82   are coming home. So you welcome them. Our brothers are coming home. When peace

83   returns, they will go back. And that is why I always say…we shall not

84   politicize…some of things, over-politicise. We should not politicize the refugee

85   crisis…because, the only thing that separated us, was political boundary, brought in

86   by colonialism. Without those boundaries, we would have been part of the same

87   conflict…one way or the other. Post-colonialism…

88   Lasse: Erm. Do you think that this policy, is embracing…I mean, we have a crisis,

89   with resources and food, which is becoming critical? The Secretary from UNHCR is

90   calling for the international community to help, and do something. Do you think, that

91   the policy, when it was made official in 2006, that the politicians didn't know how

92   large the amount of refugees would be?

93   Claire: I don't think they should be surprised. The know that, South Sudan has a big

94   unstable population. So they are bound to come…they have been coming and going,

95   to and fro. They are aware…The problem is, the risk management aspect. Not most

96   districts had had provisions for risk management, and the refugees are one of those.

97   All areas don't have this. The North is bound to receive them…if they come, where

98   will they go? They will go to these areas… The West Nile region have this

99   management, and that is why you want to settle them there. The refugees too, know

100   where to go.

101   Lasse: Both Germany and Ethiopia are trying to implement, what they call Open Door

102   Policies… the Ugandan model has been praised internationally, a lot – people are

103   saying that this might be the future of handling refugees. We need to find solutions to

104   a non-stationary global refugee situation, because people are, and will always be on

105   the move, we need to find new solutions to approach the global crisis. Do you see that

106   the Ugandan model has affected the international donor community?

107   Claire: In what way?

108   Lasse: In the way, that more and more countries and institutions, are willing to see if

109   they can do the same thing… besides what we have heard about Germany and

110   Ethiopia. Do you think that the international donor community sees the Uganda

111   model, as something they want to implement too?

112   Clare: No, don't think so. It is because that, for instance when you look at the

113   European Union – they seem to have restrictions now. They are not opening up their

114   hearts to receive refugees. The same is happening in African countries – given the

115   need they are in. Economic crisis. Some of them don't want to see refugees around,

116   and some of them look at refugees as a sort of insecurity. A sort of economic

117   problems, straining their resources. But why is Uganda opening up to receive

118   refugees? It is because of political reason. You realise that, for the NRN

119   government…people say I talk like a politician… the NRN government came to

120   power, as a result of the support from refugees, from Rwanda. And they know what a

121   refugee can mean… the Rwandese refugees, at the time they came, they had, as

122   rebels, joined hands with the National Resistance Army…the red rebel groups. So,

123   first of all, they joined the NRA, to overthrow the Ugandan government. Now, when

124   they did that, they then turned to the NRN services, who also gave them their

125   support… To overthrow the government. So Museveni have used the refugees…as a

126   tool to rise to power. He is aware of the opportunities and threat; the refugees can

127   mean to be. And why were the refugees a threat to the Obote government? Because,

128   the Obote government, didn't want anything to do with the refugees. To him, they

129   meant insecurity and burden, they were wrong people. So using it as a strategy,

130   Museveni is only to keep the refugees relevant. To make them supporting the

131   regime…and that is exactly what he is doing.

132   Lasse: So it is almost like the kind of populism we seen in Europe and the West.

133   Claire: Yes! Yes! Populism…strategy. Yea… So he knows, he has to make refugees

134   his friends, and absorb them and monitor what happens.

135   Julie: Internationally the policy has been praised… do you think this has an influence

136   too?

137   Claire: Yes! That is the way to manage a problem best…politics. You are solving a

138   problem, you are hosting the refugees, to solve your own problems. But the refugees

139   benefit, and then you also benefit more.

140   Lasse: Do you think that the Uganda policy is as innovative and progressive, as

141   internationally praised? Even though it is politics, and strategy?

142   Claire: Yes, it is. For Museveni… that's why we sometimes appreciate Museveni…

143   the way he looks at things. He doesn't look at things negatively. He looks at problems

144   positively – and that is what we should always do. Positive perspectives. So for this

145   strategy adopted…it is good. Because one; it will make the refugees settle. And once

146   they are settle, you engage them in economic activities. If they are not engaged, they

147   will get involved in subversive activities. That can lead to war. Museveni has learned

148   that lesson… to support and settle them, and monitor them from within. As they are

149   being monitored for within, peace is build, both regionally and locally.

150   Julie: How about the political situation right now? Because there is a bit

151   of…Museveni wants to expand his time on the post…do you think it will affect, how

152   the refugees will be received in the future, and the policy goals?

153   Claire: No! it wont affect… that's a political issue. And to him…

154   Julie: A lot of locals seem sceptic…

155   Claire: Yea… Now the challenge is… one thing we also have to realise, for

156   Museveni…he says…He want to register the refugees so they can vote… so they will

157   vote for him

158   Julie: So they actually have a political voice?

159   Yea! They vote, but they do it illegally… you get it? And because someone is hosting

160   us, we cannot vote against him. You know… there is a lot of politics… people don't

161   understand that. And for us, at the local level, we know! The refugees are voting…

162   when getting the id's… they are also given id's. So they have two ids'… they have

163   the national id of Uganda, and a refugee id.

164   Julie: So they can vote twice?

165   Claire: Yea.

166   Lasse: So it is a tool, in a lot of ways… strategically?

167   Claire: Yes… it is very strategic. You know… you have to understand the motive.

168   The strategy is there… but what was the motive? So for us, we look at the motive.

169   The motive is to sustain himself, to stay in power. Refugees vote.. they vote… but

170   those who vote, are especially the refugees who look like us. We have physical

171   resemblances. But those who don't share these resemblances, with the Ugandans, find

172   it hard to vote. Because the tall tribes with tattoos in their faces… they cannot go and

173   vote, because people will say; you're a refugee, you can't vote. But the ordinary ones,

174   they can vote, and be registered, because you cannot distinguish.

175   Lasse: So there are a lot of ethnicity and tribalism in this? It is a very complex thing.

176   So the way you can see how the policy is played out, is to go out locally and see what

177   happens?

178   Claire: Yea, Yes! First the risk areas… Museveni want to settle the refugees to

179   minimize stress to his position… Because, like when the West Nile Group went to the

180   bush, they linked up with rebel leaders… forming a coalition to help one another. To

181   fight the government… so that explains why he opens up the door… then they are

182   monitored from within… that is his strategy. But its good… it has brought peace, and

183   we appreciate it. Refugees at large can become a insecurity…

184   Lasse: The Sudanese situation… a lot of people, media, scholars, are praising the

185   narrative of Uganda. But of course there are always sceptics too… there have been

186   sceptics writing about that it is an incitement, for inactivity, for the politicians. That

187   they can say… ok, we are implementing the policy, and then we do nothing from

188   there. So, so… when we hear from the camps about lacks of food, water, the soil is

189   not fertile enough… they were farmers at home, they were used to do things

190   differently… in this sense, do you see that there are a lot of problems in in general

191   with this, and that the scepticism about it is legit?

192   Claire: There is a lot of problems, you know… as a said, the areas where the refugees

193   are settled, in the North, they are dry bells, and the soil is sandy. Not much food

194   production can be undertaken. And that means, that they have to open up other areas,

195   more fertile areas. There is a food crisis, and it calls for the UN, to supplement food.

196   This is a business of saying, shouldn't be given food… the giving of food should be…

197   done, so it will backup, the grain of crops. At the time when crops are being grown,

198   people are opening their gardens, land for agriculture, the refugees… The suppliers

199   leave. So there is a balance. Instead… there should be a graduate withdrawal.

200   Reducing numbers yearly… having seen what has been produced, are the refugees

201   engaged in agriculture, in the communities, are they growing? Then the allocators

202   should reduce gradually… but not the way it has been done… don't give them money,

203   because there is no food to be bought. Because the populations didn't expect the

204   refugees to come in big numbers… at that time. We practice subsistence agriculture…

205   it should be for families in need, not for sale. This causes a crisis in food supply.

206   Prices are hiking at the markets… refugees don't negotiate. The indigenous people

207   suffer, because they don't have cash.

208   Julie: When we visited the settlement in the West, one of the things they said, people

209   wanted more…they got some food, but they wanted more. Do you find that it is the

210   same in the north?

211   Claire: Yes! Because, the food being given, is not much… people have… they eat a

212   lot. And that is in our culture… people don't eat in bits, everything at once. At then

213   eat much!

214   Julie: Its not like greed…its for survival?

215   Claire: Yes… its for survival. Families are big, and what is being given is just small…

216   yea. Then given their way of nature, the way of eating… the refugees. It becomes a

217   problem. Some people want to sell it…money! But its not a general thing… those

218   who don't have relatives, overseas, they want to send dollars. The refugees are also

219   categorized… there are some who are privileged. They have relatives who send them

220   dollars… from the West. Those kind of families are better of. They live in, or close to

221   the towns.

222   Julie: are they self-settled, or du they apply for going?

223   Claire: No… the just walk out. They just leave the camp, to go and stay in the camp.

224   And then they go back to the camp to get the food rations, and then they go back to

225   where they live, in town. Like in Arua, my home town… we live with them. They

226   even tell the indigenous… have my card, go and get food for yourself.

227   Julie: Is it a helpful thing, or does it become challenging…

228   Claire: But even as the refugees go to get the food... they are also desperate. They

229   don't have the money. So if a refugee gives his or her food card, you go! Its helpful

230   coexistence. There are also really poor refugees… the ones in the camp. Privileged

231   ones live in the towns.

232   Julie: Do you experience they go overseas as well?

233   Clare: No! They don't. Some of them would love to go, but there are restrictions. In

234   South Sudan there is a culture… your brother's money, is yours. You share with

235   family, and the clan, not only the nuclear family… the bigger clan.

236   Julie: In the West, they as well talked about, that people tries to go overseas. To U.S.

237   Or U.K, because they think it s better over there. Do you recognise this?

238   Claire: Yea. They try… but a lot of them are not qualified. You need education…

239   some are too old, and can not be granted asylum.

240   Lasse: The thing about freedom of movement, like they don't have in Denmark, but

241   here, you need to get permission to leave, right? It seems like a problem with

242   whereabouts… is it still freedom of movement, or is it restricted in Uganda?

243   Claire: In essence, it is supposed to be restricted… but the refugees walk out. Get on

244   the bus, and go to Kampala… live there… no one will challenge you. And then the

245   refugees themselves, are hostile… there will be violence without restrictions. The

246   South Sudanese have their own mind-sets. A lot of violence… so they are still

247   psychologically… they are very violent. You have to handle them with care. If they

248   see the indigenous people acting according to the laws, they also begin be like them.

249   And that is why freedom of movement is good. Instead of stigmatizing, disempower

250   them… now they can think outside the box. Find new ways to get food. Sudanese are

251   used to free things – most of them don't want to work. The young don't work,

252   because they know that the relatives or the UN, will give – they need to get out of

253   this, and become self-sustained.

254   Julie: A part of the policy is also, that the refugees learn from the locals. So the locals

255   is a big part and important of the policy. What will the locals gain?

256   Claire: In essence… the locals are supposed to benefit from employment… especially

257   when they can be recruited to work in the camps. But unfortunately, due to

258   corruption, you see those working for the OPM and the ngos, prefer bringing their

259   relatives. Nepotism! There was a crisis meeting…. To solve this problem… it should

260   be given to the indigenous people, or competitively to the locals. Uganda is so

261   corrupt… that's a fact that everybody knows…really corrupt. Its all about

262   benefitting…

Appendix 9

1 2nd interview with Ben. After a break, playing with the children in front of the
2 organisation and having a bit to drink, we presented the questions we were still curios
3 about. Ben agreed on answering some of them and we sat down for a 2nd interview.
4
5 Duration: 28:46 minutes
6
7 Lasse: You have a lot of great projects in your organisation. Is there a timeframe for
8 how long you are gonna be here with these projects? Are you pulling out at some
9 point and people are supposed to more or less to be self-sufficient?
10 Ben: Noo, as a.. We are an organisation and we are here to stay.
11 Lasse: Okay
12 Ben: But at times we have projects that arrive has a short life span. For example we
13 have one project we have been implementing for three years, which is ending this
14 year. So we have, we are working on another plan, for 5 years, from the beginning of
15 18 to 2022. So that's how we do it.
16 Lasse: So that's how you do it, you have to negotiate new projects every three to five
17 years?
18 Ben: As I told you I am working on this enhancement of this cosmetics education
19 project, next year, I want it to be the main fund for our projects. So you can sustain
20 our own activity instead of depending on donors. If you come to give support then
21 fine, but if you are still there you can go. But most of our projects are training for
22 skills that are helping and give you a start-up kit. And then you can sustain and be
23 more safe.
24 Julie: We are very interested in the way you implement the policy because it is being
25 praised for being progressive, how you do it. That's why I would like to ask you,
26 when the refugee get the skills through your programmes, are they then able to move
27 and then live en for example Fort Portal and make a small business? I mean, as a
28 refugee you are free to move around?
29 Ben: Yeah – the refugees are supposed to stay in areas near the settlement, they can
30 not go very far. They get skills in business, but they have to live within. They don't go
31 very far.

32   Lasse: But aren't the policy saying that they are free to……

33   Ben: [Interrupting]: But for Ugandans some go to Fort Portal or other places and

34   districts. They are free, because they have tailoring machines, they have garments,

35   they can go whenever they want. But we always provide the refugees with money for

36   fur months so they can get starting.

37   Julie: Okay, but they need to start within the settlement?

38   Ben: Yeah, within the settlement. Even we encourage them to make use of the skills

39   in the refugee community. So they have to stay around, where the skills can be shared.

40   Lasse: Thinking about as well the rights you where talking about, what legal rights are

41   the refugees covered by? Are they covered by the Ugandan legal rights or are they?

42   What sort of right do they have like legally? Juridically?

43   Ben: When it comes to community policy, the refugees are told how they have to live.

44   They are taught Ugandan law. Because as refugees are in Uganda, they have to

45   obeyed by Ugandan laws.

46   Lasse: And be protected by the law?

47   Ben: Yeah, they are protected by the law. So if they have like issues, like their rights

48   are abused like maybe, a man has beaten the wife, they also report. They have to

49   report to the policy person who is in charge of family and child protection. So they

50   has to come to that office. There is the community services, officer, the office of the

51   commander who is responsible for addressing those gender issues, sexuael issues.

52   There is a legal officer working with commander working at the office, who help

53   them elaborate on the case. They provide them with transport when they are going for

54   like, court-session, they give them food, the lawyer is there.

55   Lasse: It is something you experience a lot in the settlement? Crime? Do you have

56   problems with rebel groups in the area?

57   Ben: No, we don't have. We don't have at all. Maybe except the local people who

58   fight themselves. Maybe they are drinking, there is a lot of drinking. When the have

59   harvested, then they are drinking and take a lot of alcohol and at the end of the

60   evening they fight.

61   Lasse: Yeah yeah, I see. But they never clash with the refugees?

62   Ben: No, they don't clash, they don't yeah… Maybe in the beginning we experienced

63   that maybe they could fight yeah, but the policy of the government of Uganda if the

64   refugees are getting a service, also the Ugandan should get. So this one is motivating

65 the Ugandans to have refugees. So that policy has enhanced co-existence. They are

66 living well.

67 Lasse: Yeah, it looks really nice out here. Can refugees demand something when they

68 come to Uganda? I know that now they are getting help, they are staying here and you

69 are helping them.

70 Ben: Yeah, they demand! They demand. They have refugee welfare councils. Those

71 refugee welfare councils they have representatives. Women representatives man

72 representatives. If women have issues, they can advocate through their chairperson,

73 and that chairperson can come here at the office and say at our village we have this

74 problem. That council is regarding the welfare of the refugee. Then if a village have a

75 police post, they call it police outpost, the village have 7-8 policemen to protect them.

76 Lasse: Okay, so the police are here all the time to protect them?

77 Ben: All the villages have a police person. Then there is every village have a food

78 committee, so that in case people have issues of food, that committee has to rise up to

79 the council and say our village need food. If someone missed food, they can advocate

80 for the food of that household so that they don't suffer. So there are good systems in

81 refugee safety. No one can suffer. There is also task force, like SGB task force, like if

82 anyone is fighting that task force will go there and ask 'what happened' and the task

83 force will deport the trouble makers to the OPM. And this task force can intervene

84 immediately. But some refugees struggle they want to go to America, or to Denmark.

85 The refugees don't struggle there, the refugees are paid. I here that they are paid up to

86 800$. They will be educated, but here they are not educated very well and they do not

87 get paid very well. I hear in America they can get 3000$.

88 Lasse: Being a refugee there is this thing about time. You don't know about your

89 future, what will happen. Do you experience that the people being here in the

90 settlement, would like to reach a goal, maybe become self-sufficient, move to a town

91 in the future?

92 Julie: Or maybe go home?

93 Ben: Yeah! The issues of going home, the have started what they call voluntary

94 repatriation if you are going back to a country they are calling it voluntary

95 repatriation. They have started it in late 2015. The one who will say, they want to go

96 home, the officer will facilitate him, transport him and take hi back. By that time,

97 there was not peace in Congo and some other places so they had to stop it. Yeah, so if

98 someone is willing to go, and the other end will take you. But for now they had to put

99   in on hold. And there are children who come alone – they call then unaccompanied

100   minors. That is abounded children. The children who come alone, the Red Cross do

101   the work of tracing, like they told you about the other day. That process is not simple.

102   They have ended up separating the children. That was what I did in the beginning

103   when I started working in the settlement.

104   Julie: Can you elaborate on the voluntary repatriation?

105   Ben: In the future there will be what we call general repatriation. General repatriation

106   that when it is said that there is peace in your country, they are prepared to repatriate

107   you, if you have constructed, are guardians they have to fund your repatriation and

108   take you back to your country. That one will happened. Because originally between

109   63 and 1995, this settlement was having refugees from Rwanda, but later, when there

110   was change of leadership in Rwanda the government in Rwanda requested for their

111   people. So in 95 they repatriated all of them.

112   Lasse: Aaaah okay.

113   Ben: They took them back to Rwanda.

114   Julie Okay. So if you come here as a refugee and you built like, a small business, you

115   built your future here and if there is peace in your country, then you have to go home?

116   Ben: You have to go home. Yeah yeah.

117   Julie: Okay, and make room for some new ones?

118   Ben: Yeah, yeah. If you are not interested in going back to your country you can

119   apply for the integration, you can be integrated in the Ugandans or you can apply to

120   go to another land.

121   Lasse: So you can actually apply to stay here? In Uganda.

122   Ben: Yeah, some times people stay. Because we had a family who stayed, they where

123   a part of the Rwandies but they stayed here.

124   Julie: They stayed here despite the repatriation?

125   Ben: Yeah, Even they are still here. That family is right there, the other house

126   [pointing out his office]

127   Lasse: Aaaah..

128   Ben: Yeah, they are fro Rwanda, they are Rwandi – they came in 65. But up till now

129   is here.

130   Julie: Do you think.. Because you have a lot of refugees from South Sudan in Uganda

131   right now, do you think it is a socio-economic challenge for Uganda with all the

132   refugees coming to the country? Or do you think it is more beneficial for the society

133   and are the refugees developing the society?

134   Ben: I can only tell you me own thoughts, I cannot talk on the behalf of the country.

135   Julie: It's okay, we are completely aware of that.

136   Ben: At times, some Ugandans enjoy the coming of refugees, because they get

137   employment.

138   Julie: Wouldn't you say that the influx of refugees are contributing to developing the

139   society?

140   Ben: Yeah, it is benefitting the economy. The government has constructed

141   government buildings, you see they have because of the settlement. There is the

142   private sector also, and they enjoy this, because it is constructed for the host

143   communities as well.

144   Lasse: So it is actually kick-starting the small communities and many sectors of work

145   and possibilities?

146   Ben: Yeah, they are employing very many people. So, to me, as a person, receiving

147   refugees is an economic advantage. But to the whole Uganda that I cannot tell.

148   Julie: That's okay. We understand.

149   Ben: But, what I hear is that the government demanding them to provide money, to

150   make sure the government are able to provide for the refugees, but look at the

151   development of this town it wouldn't be there if there was no settlement. Then it

152   wouldn't have been developed like this.

153   Lasse: Okay.

154   Ben: So, economic it is an advantage.

155   Julie: But the government is only providing land, right? And then NGOs, like

156   yourself, has to fundraise….

157   Ben: Yeah, we fundraise for all the projects.

158   Julie: So you don't get money from the government?

159   Ben: No, vi don't get money from the government, except the land which is given to

160   the refugees. So if I can not fundraise for myself, I cannot construct anything, I cannot

161   construct the office, but it is also, I pay for renting this office, I pay every month to

162   be here, which is not simple.

163   Lasse: We are very interest in the Ugandan refugee policy, you are receiving refugees

164   with open arms, and you wanna help…

165   Ben: Yeah, you are treating the refugees like you know them, like one of your own.

166   You see this settlement is from 65, you now it is for the refugees. So there are very

167   many areas in Uganda that is specifically to shelter the refugees. Ugandans have an

168   open hand to receive the refugees. So whenever crosses the boarder, the comes in and

169   comes to safety.

170   Lasse: But receiving refugees is a decision made by the authorities.

171   Ben: Yes, since 1959 we've received refugees like that.

172   Lasse: Okay, so it is not a new thing..

173   Ben: Also like, this country that allow that by receiving refugees, they will also be

174   providing services. So if they commit to providing services, then the government

175   cannot say they won't have refugees. But in northern Uganda theirs is too many. But I

176   hear there's still land in northern Uganda for the refugees.

177   Lasse: So you have capacity to receive refugees?

178   Ben: We still have land and the government is still given permission to providing

179   services.

180   Lasse: Is it the idea that some of the people from South Sudan who is currently in the

181   northern Uganda, should go to some of the other settlements, like here in the west?

182   Ben: Yeah okay, they can. But all that speak a similar language they all are put in one

183   place. So that's why they usually don't bring them here. Like in Nakivale settlement

184   there are 7 nationalities. But here in Rwamwanja over 98% is Congolese.

185   Lasse: Do you think that this political decision, that the policy is like an open door.

186   Do you think it has something to do with the thought of giving to each other? Uganda

187   was once in political turmoil, and people in Uganda needed help. Do you think that

188   the policy has something to do with you giving back?

189   Ben: Yeah of course! It is a bit like our brothers. Like in the case of in the 70s Uganda

190   was at war. So Ugandans had to flee to other countries like Tanzania. So now we are

191   doing good here, and also we are preparing for our future. Not tomorrow maybe, but

192   someday. And even some refugees who where fleeing choose to stay in the other

193   country, never coming back.

194   Julie: Thank you so much for your thoughts.

195   Ben: Yeah, here they are allowed to do whatever they want. They are allowed to do

196   business, some of them are buying cars. You see here in Uganda, most of the refugees

197   they are happy of the services they are getting. Some of them are receiving food and

198   they said it openly, that they sell it. They receive it and then they sell it. Then they

199   save the money for back home. And they are free to do that.

200   Julie: But they still need permit for travelling, right?

201   Ben: Yeah – when they are moving like for business, they need permission, they have

202   to go to the office of the refugee commander, then they get that permit to go of.

203   Just one last question – is it restricting the refugees that the settlements is this far from

204   the city? If they wanna go to towns it is really difficult.

205   Ben: They are given permits, because they have to keep that promise of protecting

206   them whenever they can, because in case you get a problem when you are moving,

207   then they have to call the officer commander – then the officer has to sent a vehicle to

208   come ad get him. So it is about security.

Appendix 10

1   Informal conversation with Paul and Ben, outside OPMs office, 13.10.17

2

3   An informal conversation occurred with Paul and Ben, while waiting to get accepted

4   and invited into the OPM in Rwamwanja settlement the 13th October 2017. Earlier on

5   we had introduced ourselves and our research, and both Paul and Ben allowed us to

6   record the informal conversation, while waiting.

7

8   Duration: 02:56. The informal conversation occurred before and after the transcribed.

9

10

11   A lot of turmoil is happening when we enters the Office of Prime minister as a

12   refugee woman is arguing with the staff, while we are standing in the hallway,

13   watching it as it plays out. The woman is very loud and sounds very frustrated. We

14   step outside with Mark and John, to give them room to solve the problems and are

15   asking John and Mark what the fight was about:

16

17   Ben: It's a conflict

18   Lasse: Is it the food she should have had?

19   Ben: No she's saying that the child should be added to the formal document. They are

20   not added. Then they are going to submit the food tomorrow. So know she is

21   complaining, what should she do. The names of the newborn is added every Monday.

22   Paul: Usually this yard is full of mothers with their newborns, waiting to add them to

23   their formal document. A lot of people will be here – you'll see on monday.

24   Ben: They have not added a name to her formal documents. They are withholding it..

25   Ahhh.. So she is frustrated.

26   Lasse: They cannot solve it?

27   Ben: It is hard. The OPM is in charge and they are only doing it on mondays, so she

28   has to wait.

29   Lasse: But then she wont receive any food?

30   Paul: Nooo.. But she has food for herself as she has the formal document, but she

31   needs food for the newborn.

32

33   […] Very loud. People are arguing..

34   After a few minutes Sophie is picking us up and showing us into her office in the

35   OPM building.

Appendix 11

1   During a guided tour around the fenced area of the transit centre, Ben, Sophie and

2   Evelyn agreed to the recording of the informal talk.

3

4   Duration 9:58 minute

5

6   Ben: We'll go over there to see the kitchen.

7   [Walking towards the communal kitchen area.]

8   Lasse: How many people are currently situated here?

9   Ben: It depends..

10   Lasse: It just seems like there are not a lot of people right now.

11   Ben: No, last week the refugees.. See here the put down their mats. They are divided

12   into groups of women in there and men in here.

13   Lasse: Do they sleep here?

14   Ben: Yeah, they sleep here.

15   Julie: What if they come with nothing?

16   Sophie: Like, what do you mean?

17   Julie: Like, nothing to sleep on?

18   Sophie: We give them mats and sleeping bags.

19   Lasse: Okay.. It's really nice that they can sleep inhere. It seems very organised..

20   Sophie: They are given mats, they are given some sleeping bags or simple blankets.

21   They are also given equipment..

22   Lasse: So basically to make sure that they can sleep and be able to survive..

23   Sophie: Yeah, before they can be able to go to their land.

24   Sophie: For them they call it obb.

25   Julie: Obb?

26   Sophie: Yeah, that's the area for their children.

27   Julie: Oh, like a playground.

28   Sophie: Yeah – obb. That's how you best understand.

29   Sophie: So there is like a hospital on the other side, if you can imagine. We can go

30   there on the other side, where you can se the hospital.

31   Julie: Oh, yeah.. And that's for free? To go to the hospital?

32   Sophie: Yeah, for free. Social services they are for free.

33   Ben: Julie, do you know what happens when the refugees come and sleep in those

34   centres? Then women and children are sleeping inside this big thing, but men are

35   sleeping in there. That is another quality..

36   [Sophie and Ben laughs]

37   Ben: That's what they do. Women and children go in there, men go in there.

38   Sophie: Because they are men.

39   Ben: Because they are born to suffer.

40   Sophie: ah ah, Not born to suffer. That's why you call them men

41   [walks around in the area]

42   Ben: There has just been some people who had stolen something in there. Some

43   people from outside who stole it from those who where in the process of being a

44   refugee.

45   [Walking around and seeing the transit centre area – Sophie, Ben and Evelyn are

46   talking together with a few people in the area]

47   Sophie: [Yelling: I am blessing you with more refugees] I am telling them they are

48   keeping the place clean so he is saying like, you should be blessed. And I am like, you

49   should also be blessed with more refugees… You know.. For work..

50   Julie. Yeah..

51   Sophie: Even you are a visitor, they call you up here..

52   [Walking a bit]

53   Julie: How many refugees are living in your zone?

54   Sophie: It is hard to tell. Unless.. You have to ask the zone commander, in the area.

55   Lasse: Cause it goes up and down as well?

56   Sophie: Sorry?

57   Lasse: Because it goes up and down with the number?

58   Sophie: Yeah.. Or, like for the zone or for the whole camp?

59   Lasse: For the zone..

60   Sophie: The zone?

61   Lasse: Yes..

62   Sophie: Yes.. But you see the camp has 65000 refugees. But I actually think they have

63   reached 70000

64   Julie: Wow.

65   Sophie: 70340 something. Today I saw the statistics for the refugees. You know we

66   keep adding so, keep checking on the statistics to keep track.

67   Julie: Are there any nationals or locals living here?

68   Sophie: No, only refugees.

69   Julie: How do they engage with the locals then? Its pretty far from here.

70   Sophie: It is free land. They even move to their.. Their farms. To do some work, and

71   they are paid.

72   Lasse: What about the permission to leave? The permission to travel?

73   Sophie: We do give them travel permits.

74   Julie: How long time is that? A travel permit?

75   Sophie: So long as… So like if you are going to Kampala to visit the hospital it is

76   open, so long as you can not know.

77   Julie: No.

78   Sophie: How long that person are going to be there. It also depends on what the

79   person is going to do.

80   Julie: So they need to tell you what they are going to do?

81   Sophie: What they are going to do. So that in case they get them there you can assist

82   so you can tell them what they are doing there.

83   Lasse: So you don't experience that people are feeling excluded fro the local

84   community?

85   Sophie: No no.

86   Lasse: No, they can get with one another… If you are from the north If you are from

87   the north

88   Sophie: Yes.. The challenge is only within themselves. The still have tribalism and

89   conflicts. So if they get to know that your are from Rwanda, and they are Congolese,

90   their issues come.

91   Lasse: So what happens?

92   Sophie: If you are from the north, and another one is from the south, issues are also

93   there. So there is tribalism there. So we're trying to divide them and make sure that it

94   is the same refugees living here. So if they are coming here, we tell them, if you're a

95   soldier there, you surrender soo. You become a refugee. You've had you differences

96   in tribes, but when you're here you speak one language.

97   Lasse: Yeah okay. So it comes to violent clashes some times as well?

98   Sophie: Yes.

99   Lasse: Yes.

100   Sophie: But they are reducing.

101   Sophie to Ben: Lets go to Maheka.

102   [Children from the playground come running]

103   Sophie: They are wondering what's wrong with that skin colour..

104   Julie: What's wrong.

105   [Sophie and Evelyn laughs]

106   Lasse: Now we are getting red, that's even worse.. Before we where white, now we're

107   red.

Appendix 12: Interview guide

Interview guide.		
This project aims to explore the Ugandan model and the humanitarian ideas it exemplifies. The conducted interviews and observations is a part of a theoretical study of the Refugees Act 2006, forming one of three empirical pillars for our master thesis. **Researchers:** Julie Marit Hinze Nielsen & Lasse Juhl Morthorst **Confidentility:** No personal details are needed, the participants will not be exposed to any physical or psychological harm and will remain anonymous and will not be held responsible for statements expressed in interviews or the thesis. The answers will be kept in a lockbox and will be destroyed when the thesis is handed in the 2nd of January 2018. **Introduction:** The interview is pursuing to gain insight into experiences of the everyday life of refugee matters in Uganda. **Time:** The interview will not last more than one hour. **Recording:** If accepted, this interview is recorded and transcribed.		

Themes	Research questions	Interview questions
Humanitarian work	In what way are the work by non-governmental institutions relating to the different political and societal expectations and demands?	• What area does your organisation work with? • What are the possibilities and Challenges you meet? 　o Are there certain ideas behind the placement of the settlements in regards to fertility of soil? 　o Are there any thoughts behind how the settlements are contributing to the local communities? 　o How are the refugees engaging with nationals? 　o Is it your perception that the refugees are included or excluded from the local communities? • How do the refugees engage in your programme? • What are the responses you meet about your programme? • What is the feedback? • What is the timeframe of the programme? • Do you experience a pressure from the government, the refugees and other parties, than earlier experienced?

Refugees	Exploring the perception of refugees, aided within the settlement, the idea of self-sufficiency and the contribution to the Ugandan economic growth.	• Is the programme helping in creating a safe and sustainable future for the refugees? • Do you believe that the refugees are safer within a settlement, rather than self-settling? • Do you find that the placement of settlements is limiting the refugees as the settlements are placed in rural areas? • Is it a general idea that the refugees are supposed to become self-sufficient and what is the timeframe? • Is it the idea that the NGOs are leaving? • How many people are depending on support? • What is the goal for self-sufficiency? • Do the refugees have freedom to move or/and what are the restrictions? • Are the refugees contributing to the Ugandan socio-economic situation or is it a socio-economic challenge? • Are the refugees politically passive or do they have a political voice and influence? • Is it okay to demand influence, when you are helped as a refugee?
Settlement	Changing the rhetoric of the camp, into settlement and exploration of this. What is the perception of a refugee camp versus the settlement?	• Are there any thoughts in not calling it a camp? • Is it creating a different perception of the common idea of a camp? • Do the refugees have the same legal rights as nationals? • Who governs the settlements? • What are your experiences with people leaving the settlement to self-settle? • Are the settlement, the objectives and the programmes contributing in creating an exceptional space beyond the norm? • Do you experience crime and rebel-groups within the settlements?
Policy		• Do you find that the continuous influx of refugees is a challenge for the settlements and the humanitarian help? • How do you find Uganda's open door policy different from other humanitarian initiatives? • How would you describe the humanitarian ideas in the open door policy - in what way are

		this policy more humanitarian than other refugee initiatives? • Is the Policy creating a new and more humane idea of humanitarian initiatives/interventions? • How has the open door policy affected the international donor-community? • Do you find that the open door policy is as innovative as internationally praised? • Does the current political situation and the public scepticism affect the overall policy goals? • Does economy play a part in implementing the open door policy? • Do you find that the refugees are categorized as victims or individual actors of economic development in the open door policy? • Do you believe that the large influx of refugees is a big challenge to the open door policy and the help given in the settlements? • The settlements in northern Uganda has gained media attention because of the large influx of refugees from South Sudan. Do you think the policy will risk being lost in the influx. Perhaps due to the pressure in capacity and humanitarian help?
Humanitarianism		• What has been the main humanitarian goal in developing Uganda's Open door policy? • Is the Policy creating a new and more humane idea of humanitarian initiatives/interventions? • How would you describe the humanitarian ideas in the open door policy - in what way are this policy more humanitarian than other refugee initiatives? • What are the main challenges within the open door policy? • The policy has been internationally praised for being both innovative and more humane. How would you describe the humanitarian ideas the policy exemplifies and how is this manifest itself in the field? • What humanitarian goals are most important to focus on in the open door policy?