Power Distribution Between Refugees and Host Population
- A Case Study of the Nakivale Refugee Settlement
Abstract

The UNHCR reports an anticipated growing number of migration movements in Africa that will increase the amount of prolonged refugee situations, with the international debate regarding refugee policies discussing local integration as a durable solution. Local integration policy is dependent on the acceptance and willingness of the host population and can engender tensions between refugees and hosts, which could be a result of their uneven power distribution, with one group possessing more social power, leading to more opportunities in the community. The objective of this study is to examine the relationship between refugees and host community in a settlement and seeks to expose any tensions that could arise between the groups from an uneven power distribution by using an analytical framework based on Norbert Elias’ book *The Established and the Outsiders*, which focuses on community problems between two groups. This thesis draws on a field study of the Nakivale Refugee Settlement in southern Uganda that has a refugee policy partially aimed towards local integration. The data has been collected through semi-structured interviews and observations as part of an ethnographic approach. The interviewed key stakeholders have been refugees and host populations living within the settlement as well as government officials and representatives from international organisations, IGOs and NGOs. Using Elias’ theory as a universal analytical tool showed us that there are established-outsider constellations creating tensions in a community, however these tensions do not fully rely on the qualities of the relationship. Moreover, results from the study indicate that the relationship between nationals and refugees in the settlement and the tensions it fostered are to a very large degree influenced by external factors, more specifically by the Ugandan government and international organisations as well as the complexity of group dimensions and situations, which contributed to a weakened host population.
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1. Introduction

1.1 Research Problem and Relevance

The International Community is experiencing a great increase in migration movement and according to the United Nations High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR), this trend will continue in African countries (United Nations High Commission for Refugees, 2013a). On the international stage, debates concerning policies on how to control the creation of prolonged refugee camps and settlements in Africa are taking place, with three durable solutions brought forward and promoted by the UNHCR: local integration in the host country, voluntary repatriation to the refugees’ country of origin or resettlement in a third country. Firstly, local integration policies aim for broader freedom of movement and greater possibilities for establishing a livelihood in the host country by integrating the refugees in or outside refugee settlements. Secondly, the repatriation approach aims to provide humanitarian aid in isolated camps and has a strong focus on the relocation of the refugees back to their country of origin. Thirdly, resettlement to a third country is an alternative in situations where it is impossible for a person to go back to their country of origin or remain in the host country (United Nations High Commission for Refugees, 2013b).

Prolonged refugee situations can generate a number of adversities for both the host community and the refugees, such as competition over resources, alienation and local tension between the two groups (Loescher and Milner, 2005:8f). These challenges can occur regardless of whether the host country focuses on repatriation or integration, although the solution will differ in each case. On the one hand, repatriation focuses on the isolation of refugees in secluded camps, which many authorities on the ground argue to be the best solution to ensure safety (Lomo, 2000:273). On the other hand, since integration gives refugees possibilities to establish livelihoods and earn income, and to create potential business relations with the host population, it could prevent engagement in criminal activities or hostile encounters with the host population (Loescher and Milner, 2005; Malik et al, 2011). Due to the challenges of increased refugee flow, many states are reluctant to promote and establish integration of refugees since it could create incentives for them to prolong their stay or generate even greater refugee flows (IOM - Policy Challenges, 2012). Considering that local integration is one of UNHCR’s three durable solutions to prolonged refugee situations, it is important to fully investigate its consequences, thus this study will focus on local integration in a refugee settlement. Local integration policies are argued to allow refugees to become
more self-reliant and to be able to support the host country's economy by “contributing to agricultural production, providing cheap labour and increasing local vendors’ income from sale of products”, which could lead to a better relationship between refugees and host communities (Loescher and Milner, 2005:11). One part of the success of local integration depends on the acceptance and willingness of the host population to ensure the refugees access their livelihoods, which makes their relationship important to understand and examine (Dryden-Peterson and Hovil, 2003).

Earlier research on the relationship between nationals and refugees has been directed more towards conflicts over the use of natural resources rather than uneven power distribution as a source of tension. The tensions created by the establishment of a refugee settlement and the coexistence between the two groups could be a result of uneven power distribution, with one group holding more social power and thereby having more opportunities in the community. This differential could manifest itself when it comes to social services or influence over their society. Sociologist Norbert Elias (1965) argues that uneven power distribution is generated through the degree of the social cohesion among the groups (Elias, 1965b:xxii). This would imply that host populations that have lived in the country for generations would have more social power than the somewhat newly arrived refugees due to the host populations’ stronger social cohesion. With this in mind, no research has looked at the relationship between the two groups in the perspective of using Norbert Elias’ theory as an analytical tool. In accordance to the framework, our research will focus on a certain divisions of groups. When looking through the glasses of Elias, we can achieve a deeper understanding of the relationship and possible tensions between the host population and refugees. Additionally, it might also help to further explain less successful attempts and obstacles for local integration in protracted refugee situations, such as refugee settlements. This could encourage future researchers to apply the framework when aiming to improve local integration in prolonged refugee situations.

This paper will focus on local tensions that can arise between host populations, henceforth also referred to as nationals, and refugees in a refugee settlement’s environment. Using the Nakivale refugee settlement in southern Uganda as a case study, an area declared refugee land in 1960 and is inhabited today by both nationals and refugees, it is highly possible that local tensions between the groups could be found. In 2006, Uganda implemented the Refugees Act 2006 that focuses on local integration, which is meant to recognise the right of refugees to freedom of movement and to earn livelihoods, in line with UNHCR’s local policy approach. The purpose of the act is to temporarily integrate the refugees into Ugandan
society and to create a better environment for them, in order to later promote and assist in voluntary repatriation (The Refugees Act, 2006). Since the local integration approach contributes to greater contact between refugees and host populations and, if not properly implemented might lead to more conflicts, Uganda makes for an interesting country to conduct this research in.

1.2 Objective
This study sets out to examine the relationship between nationals and refugees when a local integration approach is followed through a field study in the Nakivale refugee settlement. In order to achieve a deeper understanding of the relationship between the two groups, the paper seeks to understand local tensions between them in the perspective of uneven power distribution, by using Norbert Elias’ book *The Established and the Outsiders* (1965) as an analytical framework. Thus, the study will observe and portray the situation as perceived foremost by the refugees and nationals. Additionally, the study will try to identify potential obstacles for development and improvement in the implementation of local integration policies.

1.3 Research Questions

- *Through the glasses of Elias, what is the social power distribution between nationals and refugees in the Nakivale refugee settlement?*
- *What are the external factors, if any, which might influence the social power distribution between the two groups in the Nakivale refugee settlement?*

1.4 Analytical Framework
The foundation of the research is the theory presented by Norbert Elias in *The Established and the Outsiders* (1965), which is used as an analytical tool. In his book, Elias presents a theory that focuses on community problems created by uneven power distribution between two groups, labelled *established* and *outsiders*. The main thesis of the book is that the ability to be cohesive is what defines the powerful position of the established group; the stronger cohesiveness there is within one group, the more powerful it is and therefore gains a superior position in the community. This framework will be used as a guide when understanding and detecting uneven power distribution between nationals and refugees, which might help to improve the implementations of local integration policies.
1.5 Methodology

Based on the objective of the study and to be able to find answers to the research questions stated above, a field study was conducted in the Nakivale refugee settlement. The study was particularly inspired by ethnographical guidance from Aspers (2007) and Mikkelsen (2005) through participation and observations with semi-structured interviews. In accordance with Danermark et al (2002), the process followed the pattern of a hermeneutic method and was based on abduction. Due to the lack of written material and research regarding the subject, a field study was deemed necessary. Furthermore, the ethnographic method in the research contributed to a better foundation for understanding the phenomenon and situations in Nakivale, with a focus on interpersonal relations. The key stakeholders in the study were the refugees and nationals, and primary sources were interviews with representatives from international organisations and the Ugandan state. The findings from these interviews were then analysed in relation to the analytical framework presented in the third chapter.

1.6 Limitations and Delimitations

Firstly, one of the strongest limitations was the language barrier since the interviewees represented seven different nationalities, most of whom did not speak English. Hence, we used translators without any relevant education for our purpose, which most likely contributed to important information being lost or misunderstood during our interviews. Secondly, access to primary sources and material concerning Nakivale, such as reports from international organisations, was limited and problematic to obtain.

As delimitations, only one area within the refugee settlement was studied rather than several. This was primarily due to time constraints and the vastness of Nakivale. Additionally, tough terrain and lack of transportation limited us to conducting the study in a smaller area, thus our findings only holds true in the specific case of Nyarugugu, an area within the settlement. We also chose not to use statistical data or any quantitative methods in our study since it would not contribute to the findings. Furthermore, the interviewed nationals were limited to those living within the refugee settlement, since they were the relevant nationals for our study.

1.7 Structure

This study is divided into eight chapters. This first chapter, Introduction, begins by presenting the research topic, problem, objective and the formulated research questions. It briefly
explains the analytical framework and methodology used in this study and finally, it discusses the relevance of the study and underlines its limitations and delimitations.

In the second chapter, *Methodological Framework*, the methodology and method used in this study are explained. It also goes into more detail on which types of sources have been used.

Chapter three, *Analytical Framework*, begins with a literature overview, which presents a more in-depth review of the existing literature related to the topic and outlines the analytical framework used in the study. It continues with describing Norbert Elias’ study of Winston Parva and his theory with an explanation of the most important concepts from his book *The Established and the Outsiders*. These concepts have been used as analytical tools in the study. Finally, it ends with a discussion of the use and choice of the analytical framework.

The fourth chapter, *Background*, gives an overview of Uganda’s refugee policies and a brief history of the Nakivale refugee settlement. It goes into details about the Nakivale refugee settlement today regarding the management, the host community and the refugees, infrastructure and social services, and IGOs and NGOs working within the settlement. It ends with a description of the structure of leadership and positions within the settlement.

In the fifth chapter, *Findings*, the empirical material from the interviews and observations is presented. The headlines are categorised according to Norbert Elias’ most important concepts; established, outsiders, social power and social cohesion, each divided into nationals and refugees. It ends with a summary of the findings.

In chapter six, *Analysis*, the findings are analysed in relation to Elias’ theory used as an analytical framework. A section where the research questions are answered is included.

The seventh chapter, *Conclusion*, summarises the main results of the study with a discussion that ties back to the research problem and the objective. It also contains a modification of Elias’ framework and suggestions for further research on the topic.
2. Methodological Framework

2.1 Methodology
This research has been conducted in the form of a field study with a qualitative approach, in accordance with John W. Creswell who claims that a research problem that explores a concept or phenomenon is best understood through a qualitative study method (Creswell, 2009:98). The study looks at the interpersonal relation between two groups and therefore an ethnographic approach was most suitable.

An ethnographic study, explained by Aspers, is based on an interpersonal approach through participation in interviews and observations. For a successful study, the perceptions of the participants must be understood through social interaction and integration and the culture of the local area needs to be understood (Aspers, 2007:30-35). Data from the field consists mainly of primary sources in the form of interviews. There is no previous literature departing from the perspective of uneven power distribution that further justifies the choice of interview based data collection. The interview form used in the study was semi-structured with prepared questions and the possibility for follow-up questions. In accordance with Aspers, semi-structured interviews are suitable when interviews are the key source of data (Aspers, 2007:137). The questions were constructed in order to avoid influencing the answers and data collection was made in a chain of interviews with different key individuals, groups and organisations (Mikkelsen, 2005:89).

The paper follows the pattern of a hermeneutics process with two core elements, the pre-understanding based on the theory of Elias, such as social power and its mechanism, and “the interplay between the whole and the parts” (Danermark et al, 2002:159). The study is abductive and will interpret a phenomenon within the framework of Elias (Danermark et al, 2002:80). In other words, the concepts of Elias will be described in order to identify and present them in the findings that will later be interpreted into a larger context in the analysis.

2.2 Method
The aim of the study method was to explain our findings, analysis and conclusions based on an understanding and insight of the people involved (Aspers, 2007:33). The study process was based on the theory and theoretical concepts of Norbert Elias that were recontextualised for a refugee settlement (Danermark et al, 2002:91). Furthermore, an ethnographic coding was
conducted of the interviews and observations in order to see tendencies or patterns between the various perceptions of realities, such as arguments and descriptions.

In order to obtain a better understanding of the settlement, the chain of interviews involved local governmental officials, UNHCR staff, Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs), International Governmental Organisations (IGOs) and local leaders working and living in Nakivale. The main targets and key individuals for our interviews were refugees and nationals living in Nakivale (Mikkelsen, 2005:89) and a strong focus was placed on understanding the problems they face with each other and daily life.

The research was conducted on location in Nakivale during November and December 2012 and was more specifically concentrated in Nyarugugu and Base Camp. Moreover, both nationals and refugees inhabit Nyarugugu, where other areas mainly consist of either refugees or nationals. Hence, the contact between nationals and refugees is more apparent in this area. Furthermore, this zone is located in between the centre of the refugee base camp and a large national village, which makes the tensions between them more distinct.

The officials, leaders and organisations that were interviewed are a Refugee Desk Officer from Uganda’s Office of the Prime Minister (OPM), the Isingiro local district officials, Nakivale Camp Commandant, UNHCR Mbarara, German Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ), Samaritan’s Purse, Windle Trust administrators and teachers, a doctor from Medical Team International (MTI) at Nyarugugu local health centre and a church leader from Day Star Church. These actors were chosen to be part of the study in order to show a broader and more objective picture of the relationship between nationals and refugees, as well as to detect any conflicting or substantiating statements from the individual interviews. In total, 44 interviews were conducted, of which fourteen were with refugees, twelve with nationals, four with chairpersons comprised of one national and three refugees, and nine with officials and leaders including staff from organisations. Moreover, three women from a choir and women's group, pupils from a Windle Trust school and a community worker were also interviewed. The individual interviews with refugees have been of five Congolese, three Rwandese, one Burundian, one Kenyan, one Somali and three Eritreans. All of the interviewed chairpersons are men and our only focus group with refugees consisted of Congolese women. Sixteen women and ten men comprised the 26 key interviews. All individual interviews with refugees and nationals were chosen based on the location of their residence because of the more frequent contact between the groups in this specific area. The

1 For more information see Appendix 1
interviewees were subsequently picked at random, in order to give the most accurate picture. Most of the interviews lasted between 45 minutes to one hour and were carried out with the help of a translator and when agreed to the interviews were recorded.

All of the interviews with the refugees and nationals involved questions regarding their background, livelihood, social activities, and relation and interactions with the other group. The chairpersons were asked about common issues in the communities and the contact with nationals/refugees. The interviews with the IGOs, NGOs and governmental officials addressed issues regarding their operations and presence and other concerns in Nakivale. The main focus of all interviews concerned the relationship and contact between nationals and refugees as well as the available social activities and programs for both groups.

The outlining of the questions and observations were formed in order for the interpretation of the findings to be based on a first order construction. For example, observations were made in a local church in order to observe the participants.

2.3 Sources and Validity

The paper’s primary sources were interviews of stakeholders, presented above, and the Ugandan refugees law, the Refugees Act 2006. The limited access to primary sources from relevant organisations led to the study relying heavily on the interviewed key persons rather than published material. The study followed a process of triangulation and multiple sets of methods in order to strengthen the validity of the collected material (Creswell, 2009:191) when sampling, organising and analysing the findings. Hence, a combination of semi-structured interviews, focus groups, observations and secondary sources were used. In order to gain background information on the topic and the area of study, secondary sources in form of books, Internet pages and articles were collected. Peer-reviewed articles were found using Linnaeus University’s library resources and OneSearch databank while trusted unpublished articles and reports were sourced from the Refugee Law Project and databank of the UNHCR with additional material obtained from the websites of the IOM and the UNHCR.

Furthermore, Norbert Elias’ book *The Established and the Outsiders* constituted the only source for the analytical framework. The main concepts by Elias were identified, analysed and integrated throughout the field study and writing process.

A more thorough description of the content of the secondary sources can be found under Literature Overview, incorporated in the *Analytical Framework* chapter below.
2.4 Ethical Considerations
The purpose of this study, to portray a general picture of the refugees’ and nationals’ situation, is explained to the interviewees in the beginning of the interview in order for them to feel comfortable with the topic of the study. Additionally, the situation of some of the interviewees in the Nakivale refugee settlement might be influencing the answers due to social conflicts and fear of repercussion as a consequence of their reply. With this in mind, the nature of some of the questions, especially to the refugees and the nationals, are such that they might be perceived as sensitive, therefore it is carefully explained in the initial phase of the interview that the respondents are entitled to remain anonymous. Finally, we as researchers are very well aware that we are there to learn from the people and their life experience, and not the other way around. The culture of the involved subjects and of the settlement’s surroundings is considered throughout the process of our case study.
3. Analytical Framework

This chapter begins with a description of the existing literature and research on the topic. The analytical framework used in this study is based on Norbert Elias’ (1965) findings from his study on the relationship between neighbourhoods that contributed to the book *The Established and the Outsiders*. Further this chapter presents Elias’ study of an English suburban community called Winston Parva. Secondly, his analysis and conclusions are further explained as an analytical framework with an explanation of his most important concepts. Thirdly, the use of Elias’ analytical framework on the situation in Nakivale is clarified. Lastly, an explanation is given of why Elias’ analytical framework is preferred for this study, and how it is adapted.

3.1 Literature Overview

The existing literature and research on tensions between refugees and host populations in refugee settlements are extremely limited and, as mentioned above, focus on conflicts over the use of natural resources (Martin, 2005:329ff; Berry, 2010) rather than related to uneven power distribution between two groups. Moreover, literature regarding local integration in settlements’ environments is mainly published by the UNHCR and mostly focuses on refugees rather than both refugees and host population, although the UNHCR has published a report, *The Benefits of Belonging*, that highlights the benefits of implementing local integration for the host country. This report brings up the many advantages the approach can generate, such as economical, legal and social opportunities. Moreover, the UNHCR promotes the local integration approach and argues that it can be used to break down barriers between refugees and host populations through community projects such as agricultural activities, language schools and community bakeries. Nonetheless, the report does not aim to examine the relationship between refugees and nationals and the tensions that the policies might fester. It is also important to mention that the report focuses on prolonged refugee situations and not on confined refugee settlements or camps (Malik *et al*, 2011).

In line with the UNHCR, the research by Byrne (2013) focuses on local integration and was conducted as a case study in a refugee camp in Ghana, however it focused solely on the national identity of the refugees. Furthermore, research can be found on the subject of how to handle prolonged refugee situations and when refugees do not repatriate post-conflict, which focus on the consequences for the refugees, rather than both groups (Gale, 2008; Essuman-Johnson, 2011). The most relevant research that was found was written by the
author Samuel Agblorti (2011) and published through the UNHCR. It examines local integration from the perspective of the host population with an objective to identify socio-cultural issues within the host community and had a strong focus on the evaluation on the refugees’ policies.

In summary, the existing research brings up issues regarding the use of natural resources and the conflicts it generates, the promotion and evaluation of refugee policies and generally focuses on one group or the other, rather than both. A gap of research can thereby be identified and this study will seek to incorporate both groups and gain a greater understanding of possible tensions between the refugees and nationals by focusing on uneven power distribution as a source of tension.

3.2 Elias’ Study of Winston Parva

The study by Norbert Elias, conducted between 1959 and 1960, was set to understand the relationship between neighbourhoods within a community. The objective of the study evolved during the research and was first meant to identify why one of the neighbourhoods had a higher ranking of youth criminality compared to others. However, the difference in youth criminality between the neighbourhoods eventually disappeared but the perception of specific neighbourhoods being more criminal persisted (1965a:9). This finding intrigued Elias who then focused on the relationship between the neighbourhoods and community problems.

3.2.1 The Neighbourhoods

Elias identified three zones within the community, which he named zones I, II and III. However, it was zone II and II that were of interest in the study since they were both working class areas, while zone I was a middle-class area. Zone II was referred to as the village and zone III was constructed at a later stage and called the new neighbourhood. It is important to point out that the land of zone III had earlier been dismissed by the founder of Winston Parva as wetlands and a haunt of rats (1965a:69). With World War II creating a great population influx from London to Winston Parva, most settled in zone III and hence the population of zone III was primarily newcomers from outside of Winston Parva while zones II consisted of families from two to three generations back, referred to as the old residents (1965a:82?). Elias describes zones II and III in equal terms with regards to social class, income level and occupation. However, the old residents of zone II perceived themselves as superior in social
status over zone III. This created an *Us and Them* relationship between the inhabitants of zone II and zone III (1965a:69).

### 3.2.2 The Old Residents and the Newcomers

The newcomers from London were seen as a threat to the norms and values of the village and thereby treated as outsiders. The old residents expected the newcomers to adapt to the norms and values of their community rather than continue to behave as they had in London. The newcomers however did not act in accordance to the will of the old residents. Elias gives the example of two pubs in Winston Parva with visitors from both zones II and III. According to the old residents, the newcomers behaved in a disturbing manner and occupied one of the two pubs. This led to the old residents separating themselves from the newcomers and making any newcomers trying to make contact feel excluded and unwelcomed in the other pub (1965a:84f). In other words, the newcomers did not behave appropriately or consider the norms of the village, which had consequences for their relationship.

The old residents were highly united while the newcomers were more isolated and extraneous from both the old residents and other newcomers. The newcomers’ lack of social cohesion contributed to isolation and in turn created problems. For example, the lack of family members and friends made it difficult for working mothers to find someone who could look after their children while they were at work. Opposingly, the old residents had close and strong family ties within the community and had a large extension of family and friends that could support the working mothers (1965a:136).

### 3.2.3 Power Differential

The old residents were able to maintain their strong powerful position within the community through social control and three structural advantages. First, widespread stigmatisation through gossip, prejudices and discrimination of the newcomers was practiced in order to maintain their low status. Additionally, the stigmatisation created shame amongst the newcomers and made them avoid each other within the outsider group, further making them weaker. The old residents were promoted while the newcomers were discriminated, which also controlled the old residents’ interactions with the newcomers and thereby kept the two groups separated. Second, the old residents’ strong maternal family networks worked as a security hub for families, which gave them several social advantages (1965a:109-114). Third, the old residents dominated the leading positions in social clubs and institutions, which were
all focused on the old residents. The strong family ties and networks made it hard for the newcomers to contribute or fully participate in organisations (1965a:138).

3.3 Elias’ Theory

The analysis and conclusion of the uneven power distribution between the old residents and the newcomers can be used as an analytical framework. This specific constellation is referred to as the Established and the Outsiders, where the established are perceived by both groups as more powerful than the outsiders. In the case of Winston Parva, the old residents represent the established and the newcomers symbolise the outsiders.

3.3.1 Explanation of Concepts

3.3.1.1 The Established and the Outsiders

The division between the established and the outsiders is explained through Elias’ observation of the two neighbourhoods. Based on the observation, he came to the conclusion that one group had more social power than other interdependent groups and thereby perceived itself as superior. A marked difference between the groups was the social cohesion, with one being closely integrated while the other was not. In other words, the group division was based on either being well established in the community or being new arrivals (Elias, 1965b:xxii).

The members of the established group described themselves as having superior qualities and were characterized by having higher social cohesion that produced their ability of social control and thereby worked as a mechanism for securing their superior position, which reflected on their participation in local organisations, churches and activities. The outsiders were generally defined by the established as untrustworthy, undisciplined and lawless, which shaped the outsiders’ self-image (Elias, 1965b:xvif).

3.3.1.2 Social Power

Elias observed that members of the established group were, in terms of social power, stronger than the outsiders and perceived themselves as better. Social power is defined and discussed by Elias to be constructed by the established’s perception of their own self-image. Furthermore, they think of themselves as superior while the less powerful people, the outsiders, believe they lack certain qualities. Hence, self-image, both for established and outsiders, and their behaviour towards each other is crucial in the established-outsider constellation (Elias, 1965b:xvff). The power differential is maintained through the
established’s social control and the exclusion of the outsiders. Elias outlines factors that work as mechanisms for creating and keeping a certain distance between the two parties. The established exclude the outsiders from their community in order to strengthen their own power identity. They use different social weapons in order to keep their social superiority, for instance by labelling the outsider group as lower valued and stigmatising them through gossip and rumours. This is effective since it shapes the self-image of the outsider group and weakens them. While the members of the established group are given pre-eminent qualities, the outsiders eventually accept their subordinate position in the society. Any relation that an established has with an outsider that goes beyond a professional relation is seen as taboo and is socially controlled through vituperative rumours, a behaviour that is rewarded. Elias defines it as praise-gossip or the threat of blame-gossip (Elias, 1965b:xvi ff).

The asymmetric power differential is justified when the outsiders themselves accept the stigmatisation. If the outsiders’ self image alters, meaning when the outsiders no longer accept the image the established have of them, the established group’s view of themselves as superior then becomes challenged. Elias claims that a change in the balance of power between the groups could be managed through increased integration; such as assimilation of the outsiders, or creation of the outsiders’ own territory (Elias, 1965a:85).

3.3.1.3 Social Cohesion

The degree of internal unity and collective control are vital when distinguishing the power differential between the established and the outsiders. Elias observed that the established had a much higher cohesion, and this difference contributed to increased social power for them. The cohesion was identified as being built on a strong relation between families who had known each other for a longer time, in contrast to the newcomers who were strangers to both the long-term residents and to each other. In other words, these relations are based on memories, values, long-term friendship or enmity, which constitute security networks that take care of their members, unlike the outsiders who have no or few family ties or long-term friendships within the community and thereby lacks social networks and social cohesion. Furthermore, a high degree of cohesion enables the members of the established to obtain and earmark powerful positions within the community, which further strengthens its cohesion and excludes members of the outsider group. At the same time, the established’s high participation and leading positions in the community strengthen their cohesion, which turns into a virtuous circle (Elias, 1965b:xxiii ff). The cohesiveness makes it possible for the established to stand as a united front and sustain their own social norms, values and traditions.
in the community. If the outsiders do not follow the social norms, the established perceive this as threats to their way of living. The fact that the outsiders do not have the same degree of social network impedes on their cohesiveness, which decreases their social control and power (Elias, 1965b: xxiv).

3.3.2 Summary

The point of departure of the theory by Elias is the relationship between two distinct groups, the established and the outsiders. Elias explains that the distinction of the groups is based on the socially constructed power imbalance, which is linked to the degree of internal cohesion and communal control of the established. The first group have a greater power ratio and thereby are seen as superior to the outsiders, which is maintained through social control such as stigmatisation and holding leading positions in the community. One of the core elements in the success of the established is their strong social cohesion as a group, which additionally gives them social power and social control.

3.4 Use of Analytical Framework

This study will, through the analytical glasses of Elias, try to detect tendencies for power differentials between the nationals and the refugees in the Nakivale refugee settlement. The framework will help to understand and interpret the collected material of this study and guide the research when observing the relationship and possible tensions between refugees and nationals. The analytical point of departure will be taken through Elias’ four concepts; established, outsiders, social power and social cohesion.

As previously mentioned, one of the distinctions between the two groups is their social cohesion, which in the case of Winston Parva relates to the period of time the specific groups have lived in the community. With this in mind, the assumption of this study is that most of the nationals have lived in the area for a longer time than the refugees, which might have given them greater possibilities to be united. Thus, the nationals constitute the framework’s group of established and the refugees constitute the framework’s group of outsiders.

The groups’ social power will be identified by observing local leaders and powerful positions of the concerned groups and possible inclinations for favouritism towards one of the groups, in terms of focus or objective of the institutions. In order to find indications of social control through social weapons like stigmatisation, the use of language in their descriptions
and perceptions of themselves and each other will be observed. This will also identify whether their self-image is felt to be superior or inferior.

The social cohesion of both groups will be compared through observations of social interactions within the groups, such as social security networks or extended family networks used for job opportunities, elderly care or childcare etc. The identification of social networks will also help to discover possible tendencies of social control or social advantages. Focus will be put on the social interactions between and within the groups, how, why and whom they interact with. Activities and organisations in the settlement will be scrutinised in order to generate a picture of its participants and their cohesion and a possible trend of exclusion of the outsider group.

3.5 Choice of Analytical Framework

According to Elias, the established and the outsider relation can be seen and detected in several different contexts and situations. The findings of his study are explained to be universally applicable in other communities and can therefore be used when there is a need to understand structural conditions and the reason why two similar groups develop in different directions (Elias, 1965b:xvii). The reason for choosing Elias’ theory as an analytical framework is that it focuses on understanding community problems between groups that are possibly created from an imbalanced power distribution. Through the glasses of Elias, tendencies of unequal power distribution between refugees and nationals might be detected. Elias points out that it can be an advantage to do this kind of study on a small-scale society since it is then easier to study it in more detail. Furthermore, his theory is based on the interest of the collective communities. The point of departure is the relation between groups and not the action of the individual (Elias, 1965b:xvii). The culture of the region where the study will be conducted is often defined as collective, thus this framework will be suitable.
4. Background

This chapter includes a short introduction of Ugandan refugee policies followed by a brief description of the history of the Nakivale refugee settlement and lastly a portrayal of present-day Nakivale. This information is mainly collected from the Refugees Act 2006 and through interviews with a Refugee Desk Officer at the OPM, representatives of UNHCR Mbarara and the President of Base Camp.

4.1 Uganda’s Refugee Policies

Uganda gained independence in 1962 from British colonial power, which constructed the first refugee policy, the Control of Alien Refugees Act, in 1960. This act was widely criticised due to its violation of human rights, such as restrictions on freedom of movement. It was also a common phenomenon that the Camp Commandants in the different settlements confiscated the belongings of the refugees, leaving them with no valuable possessions. The human rights violations in settlements around Uganda created a need for new legislation. Hence, the Refugees Act 2006 was implemented in order to give refugees in Uganda greater freedom of movement and security. Uganda experienced many conflicts and internal tensions that postponed the implementation of new legislation and so the Refugees Act 2006 was introduced 46 years after the first refugee policy (A1, Nov 20, 2012).

4.1.1 The Refugees Act 2006

The Refugees Act implemented in 2006 focuses foremost on providing refugees with human rights protection, shelter and food, and security and public order. The act puts strong emphasis on providing land for the refugees since the majority of the refugees are farmers. The Ugandan government aims for a form of local integration for the external refugees and provides them with land for shelter and cultivation with the objective of promoting and assisting the refugees towards eventual repatriation. The government also provides social services such as school and health care. It is important to point out that they do not recognise the objective of integration as obtaining citizenship and living together as equals with the host community. The three main policies presented in the act are Freedom of Movement and Right to Residence, Right to Earn a Livelihood and Right to Public Relief and Education. The first policy guarantees freedom of movement to refugees in Uganda, however, the aid provided by the UNHCR and OPM is limited to those living in settlements. Furthermore, the act gives the recognised refugees the same right to work and freedom to establish businesses as nationals.
without requiring any sort of permit. Unlike nationals, they do not receive social security, unemployment, or disability insurance by the Ugandan state, nor do labour legislations protect them. Lastly, the policy states that refugees have the same access to free primary education as nationals (The Refugees Act, 2006).

4.2 History of the Nakivale Refugee Settlement

The Nakivale refugee settlement was established and declared refugee land in 1960, when the conflict in Rwanda became more intense and many Tutsis who needed to flee from the new Hutu regime crossed the border and settled down in the Nakivale area. Before the establishment of the settlement the area was owned and occupied by the Ankole kingdom. In order for the settlement to become official, the colonial government exchanged the land of Nakivale for another land area with the kingdom. The location was chosen due to its proximity to the border with Rwanda and its low population of nationals (Bagenda et al, 2003:4). Today, Nakivale, with 182 km², is one of Africa’s largest and oldest refugee settlements. Nakivale is continuously expanding and today consists of 56 000 refugees from ten different nationalities, primarily from Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), Rwanda, Somalia and Burundi, and around 10 000 nationals (High Commission for Refugees Australia, 2012).

4.3 Nakivale Refugee Settlement

4.3.1 The OPM and the Isingiro District

The OPM is the main management of the Nakivale refugee settlement and is the legal owner of the land and in charge of the legal aspects. It is responsible for the distribution of land plots for shelter, cultivation and business to the refugees. Their jurisdiction of the Isingiro district is limited; hence, they do not have much influential power within the settlement. The local district is involved in areas of health, education, community development and critically, of environmental restoration, in this case of lake Nakivale. They protect the rights and needs of the host community within the settlement and only allow the nationals to fish in the lake. The cooperation between OPM and the Isingiro district is based on consultation, with the district invited to participate in meetings by the OPM in order for them to give their opinion on specific issues. However, the OPM has the final decision on all matters (A1, Nov 20, 2012; A3, Nov 27, 2012; A8, Dec 7, 2012).
4.3.2 Host Community

The nationals living within the settlement are a minority and are scattered all around Nakivale. On the one hand, the government claims that before the establishment of the settlement there were very few nationals living in Nakivale due to fly infestations. On the other hand, many nationals claim to have been living on the land for generations. The Ugandan government accuses the nationals of living illegally inside the settlement. The OPM systematically tries to make the nationals move by placing the refugees on their land or giving their land plots for cultivation to refugees without substitution. The nationals strongly believe they are entitled to the land since they originate from Uganda, unlike the refugees. However, the government does not take stronger actions against the nationals since this could harm their political agenda and generate greater opposition. Even before the establishment of the settlement, the fertile land and the lack of set boundary or division of land have contributed to an inflow of nationals (A1, Nov 20, 2012; A2, Nov 23, 2012; A8, Dec 7, 2012).

4.3.3 Refugees

After obtaining refugee status, refugees receive privileges such as food ration cards and are provided with land to live on. If they desire land for cultivation or business, they must inquire about it. The OPM settles the refugees in accordance to nationality, hence the division of the villages in the area. One village might mainly consist of Rwandan refugees and another of Congolese refugees. There is a mix of nationalities in some villages, but in general the villages reflect one specific nationality. Often they have to build their own houses, but in some cases a family can take over an empty house from another family that has repatriated or moved somewhere else within the settlement (A8, Dec 7, 2012; C1, Nov 30, 2012). The refugees in the settlement do not have the right to own land, they may only use it for as long as they are living in Nakivale, nor are they allowed to build permanent houses with tin roofs and bricks. Furthermore, they are not allowed to engage in political activities or organise militias with the intent of committing violent conflicts, since there could then be a risk of rebellion movements inside Uganda or in the country of origin (A1, Nov 30, 2012).

4.3.4 Infrastructure and Social Services

In Nakivale, social services such as health care, education, water and sanitation, forestation and environment are provided by organisations, further explained below, and the Ugandan government. In order to prevent any unnecessary encounters such as clashes based on unfair
access to services between the nationals and refugees, these services are provided to both groups (A2, Nov 23, 2012).

4.3.5 IGOs and NGOs Working in Nakivale

The main organisation in the settlement is the UNHCR, which primarily focuses on the wellbeing of the refugees and supporting pre-existing facilities, such as schools and health care centres. GIZ is the implementing organisation in Nakivale whose main objective is to protect and develop the communities of the refugees and provide several programs of support. For example, they provide legal support and protection of human rights. Preventive work is also part of their agenda, such as distribution of information about domestic abuse and its consequences. These two organisations only focus on the refugees due to lack of funds, although facilities are available to both groups. The formation of the programs and activities, designed and implemented by the organisations, are based on joint assessment plans. These plans are carried out by all organisations in the settlement and focus on the needs and wants of the refugees, through interviews of refugees of all ages (A2, Nov 23, 2012; A6, Dec 4, 2012). Windle Trust works primarily with education for youth and children in cooperation with UNHCR, and is in charge of eight schools in Nakivale, including training and employment of teachers (A4, Nov 28, 2012). Other organisations operating in the settlement are MTI, which handles some of the local health centres, and Samaritan’s Purse, which has the main responsibility for distribution of food.

4.3.6 Local Structures

Nakivale consists of three areas named Juru, Rubondo and Base Camp. It is divided into three areas due to the size of the settlement and the difficulties of being under the management of a single office. Each area has its own office so that their inhabitants have easier access to them. However, this chapter will only focus on describing the structure of Base Camp. The nationalities of Base Camp are Eritreans, Ethiopians, Somalis, Congolese, Rwandans, Sudanese, Kenyans, Liberians, Burundi and nationals. Base Camp is therefore the most international area of the three in Nakivale (C1, Nov 30, 2012; A8, Dec 7, 2012).

4.3.6.1 The Structure of Leadership

The refugee communities have social structures like any other society and elect their leaders and representatives, which also applies to the community of nationals. The three areas of Nakivale have their own presidents, who together are called the Refugee Welfare Committee
(RWC) III and are the spokespersons for their area. The area of Base Camp is divided into seven zones (see figure 1) with each one having their own chairperson, referred to as RWC II. Zones are comprised of mixed nationalities and consist of three to six villages, which are mostly divided by nationality. In total there are 25 villages in Base Camp of varied population size and each village has their own chairperson, who is called RWC I. Each chairperson on each level has a committee, which is represented by both men and women.

For example, Nyarugugu zone contains three villages: Nyarugugu A, Nyarugugu B and Nyarugugu C. Nyarugugu zone has a chairperson, RWC II, who is responsible for the three villages. Each one of these villages has their chairperson, RWC I. The nationals have their own leadership with a similar structure but not to the same extent, due to a smaller population (C1, Nov 30, 2012).

4.3.6.2 Positions within the Structure

In the committees all nationalities in the village are represented, so if the chairperson is Congolese, then the vice-chairperson will be from another nationality. If the chairperson is a man, then the vice-chairperson will be a woman. The treasurer and secretary are normally women since they are given more trust. However, it is worth mentioning that there is no mandate limit for how long a chairperson or committee member can stay on a post.
The tasks of the RWC I are to mediate conflict and solve problems within the village. If there is a problem that the RWC I cannot handle, then the issue is raised with the RWC II. The task of the RWC II is to mediate conflicts within the zone. However, if RWC II fails to achieve a solution this continues on to RWC III and if the problem fails to be solved on this level is it brought to the OPM (C1, Nov 30, 2012).

The role of the chairman of the nationals is to keep good relations between nationals and refugees as well as to solve any problem that may arise. He also calls general meetings for sanitisation awareness, food security and to discuss the fish quotas in the lake (C4, Dec 2, 2012).

Problems and issues of both nationals and refugees are discussed during meetings and concern security, poor living standards, poor health services and general issues such as theft and destruction. Issues such as crime, rape and serious theft however are not handled in any of the levels but brought straight to the police. Additionally, nationals also discuss how to develop further within the community, such as by improving and diversifying their livelihoods (C1, Nov 30, 2012; C4, Dec 2, 2012).
5. Findings

In this chapter, findings from the field study and its interviews are presented and related to the research questions stated above. The material is based upon a total of 44 interviews, including 26 key interviews of which fourteen were with refugees and twelve with nationals. The chapter is divided into five categories inspired by Elias’ theory; background, established, outsiders, social power and social cohesion. Each category will present the findings from the refugees directly followed by the findings from the nationals.

5.1 Background

5.1.1 Refugees

Of the fourteen interviewed refugees who live in Base Camp, ten reside in Nyarugugu and had done so for different lengths of time, the longest having lived there for ten years while the shortest for two months. Most of them were received by UNHCR and provided with accommodation within their national village. Their occupations before coming to Nakivale varied from farmers, cattle keepers and musicians to law students and business owners. Five of the interviewed refugees had successfully requested land, which gave them the possibility of earning their livelihood while others did not since some had been given land by other family members or had chosen not to work in farming. Today, five of the refugees work as farmers and one of the families has additional income contributed by the wife and daughters who work as housekeepers for Somalis. Five other refugees opened up businesses, such as a restaurant or a vegetable stand while one man is a community worker within Base Camp. Lastly, two women are not able to work due to health issues. Many refugees expressed a desire to be resettled in another host country and feared repatriation while others would like return to their country of origin if possible.

5.1.2 Nationals

Of the twelve interviewed nationals living in Nyarugugu, nine were born in Nakivale to parents who were themselves born there, with some having grandparents born there as all. Three moved to Nakivale in order to find fertile land and bought their plot from other nationals, with one having moved from one village to another within Nakivale. All of the interviewees work as farmers, three of whom are also fishermen. Nine of them cultivate for self-consumption and sell the surplus to both nationals and refugees while three only farm for
The chairman of the nationals explains that in the area of Nyarugugu the majority of the Ugandans generally work within cultivation and fishing. The nationals continuously seek to improve their livelihood and describe that the fish supply is decreasing and therefore look for alternatives, such as honey production (C4, Dec 2, 2012).

5.2 Established

The social power of the nationals is primarily connected to their cohesiveness as a group since many of the households have lived in Nakivale for generations and therefore have the social networks that support them when in need. The interviewed nationals live together in a village on the outskirts of Nyarugugu, which is mainly inhabited by nationals. Many of them are active in collective groups, which only consists of nationals. The possibilities to fish in the lake and grow banana plantations as well as the permission to build permanent houses with tin roofs in the settlement are only available to nationals.

However, the social power can also be found within the community of the refugees, and is mainly related to the perception the nationals have of them as well as the privileges provided to them by the IGOs, NGOs and OPM. Many nationals describe that refugees receive better treatment in school, at health centres and in general; such as scholarships and access to livelihood groups sponsored by GIZ. Furthermore, according to Samaritan’s Purse the refugees are provided with food rations every month and given free access to land, unlike the nationals (A7, Dec 5, 2012). The water points provided within the settlement are placed in areas mainly populated by the refugees.

There are two women, R1 and R6, who stand out among the interviewed refugees when it comes to social power. R1 is a 40 year-old woman from Eritrea, who came to Uganda in 2008 but has been in Nakivale for one year and three months. Before arriving in Uganda she had studied law for one year and owned a restaurant in Eritrea. She has a leading position within the Eritrean community as the owner of a coffee shop in her community and as the unofficial chairwoman. R1 gives a very critical description of the official chairman, who lives in Mbarara, and she has taken over many of his official tasks, such as helping other Eritreans in their dealings with the UNHCR. She describes the Eritrean community as exceptionally strong, hard working and caring for its own people by stating “It is our tradition to help each other, even far away relatives will help if they know you are in need”. R1 prefers the division of nationalities in the settlement in order to protect Eritrean values and traditions, and readily shares her thoughts on the characteristics of each nationality, for example stating that the
Rwandans are “… really scary and can kill even their own mother” (R1, Nov 29, 2012). A similar description is made for Congolese, while she identifies the Somalis as uncivilised.

R6 is a 35 year-old woman from Kenya who has been in Nakivale for three years. She is a businesswoman who owns a restaurant and is also employed at the health centre. R6 participates in the community by being engaged in two groups, a livelihood group and a Refugee United Project. The livelihood group is called the Bright Star and has two functions. First, the members of the group financially contribute every month in order to help a member in need. Second, the group has a collective business where they sell juice, receiving a blender and fridge donated by the UNHCR (R6, Dec 2. 2012).

5.3 Outsiders

The interviewed refugees do not have any extended family in Nakivale and came to the settlement alone or with some of their closest family. However, the ones that have been there for a longer period of time live in larger families but as observed their social power is not necessarily stronger. The majority of them explain that they are discriminated in the health centre because they are refugees. Furthermore, the chairpersons of all levels, who are supposed to raise and solve these issues, are identified by many of the refugees as being corrupt. The discrimination and lack of social cohesion will further be described in this chapter.

A distinct example of a family that lacks social power is a Rwandan family, with woman R9 as the head of household. They live in the middle of the national community farthest away from the core of Base Camp. R9 describes the family’s relationship with the nationals as very tense. She expresses the inequality received as a refugee and explains their defencelessness towards nationals and the OPM. She states, “You are in their country and you are nothing to them”. This was made evident before the interview when there was an aggressive argument between the family and a group of nationals. R9 explains that the son in the family cut down a tree on land not belonging to anyone when some nationals came and took the tree from him since they claimed its ownership. Due to all these problems R9 and her family wish to be resettled within the settlement. She says “I would like to live with more refugees because the refugees can help me with food. No national can help me, they just laugh at me and I feel discriminated”. Furthermore, she does not want anymore contact with nationals because she feels like they do not want any contact with her (R9, Dec 3, 2012).
R1 and others describe the Eritrean community as having a very well established unity and social network. However, observations show this is not always the case. An Eritrean woman, R3, who moved to the community two months ago with her children and Ethiopian boyfriend, explains that she experiences discrimination from the Eritrean community. She continues to explain that the gossip and prejudices are based on the fact that she is in a relationship with and Ethiopian man. The rumours, created by the chairman, resulted in the whole community turning against her and her family (R3, Nov 30, 2012).

Further observations in the case of the Kenyan woman R6, described above, show that she does not have as much social power within the Somali community as one is led to believe. She lives with her Somali husband and as a Kenyan woman within the Somali community she experiences ostracism. She describes, “I feel discriminated mostly by the Somalis … Hence, I cannot ask for their help. They do not like that a Somali man has married a black woman because they see themselves as white … they want a Somali to marry a Somali” (R6, Dec 2, 2012). The livelihood group she is active in consist of R6 and four Somali women, who are either not married or widows. Even though the women are from Somalia they do not discriminate R6 since she was the one who came up with the idea for the group.

However, tendencies related to outsiders can also be found among the nationals. Many of them feel discriminated and ill-treated compared to the refugees, for example by not receiving identical treatment at the health centre. This was clarified by a man, N1, who explains “here we are like refugees but not treated as good” (N1, Dec 1, 2012) meaning that he believes that the nationals are more vulnerable than the refugees while having equal needs. Furthermore, in some cases nationals express that they are not even allowed to collect water at the water points since there is a refugee who guards and unofficially charges nationals for the water. Therefore they have to use the water of the lake that is contaminated, which nationals have claimed negatively affects their health. Furthermore, a representative from Windle Trust explains that in the schools supported by them and the UNHCR, the nationals are a minority, which contributes to their needs being overshadowed by the needs of the refugees. She continues to say, “No one cares about the nationals. It is only refugees that are the persons of concern” (A4, Nov 28, 2012). However, the main problem for most of them is that they live under pressure from the OPM. The nationals have either already been deprived of land or feel that the OPM can come at anytime and either evict them outright from Nakivale, or as the nationals describe, the OPM can take their land to give to the refugees with the intention of forcing the nationals out of the settlement.
5.4 Social Power

5.4.1 Refugees

The structure of Nakivale is organised so refugees have the possibility of turning to the community’s chairpersons, who are in charge of raising and solving issues between and within communities. The refugees in Nyarugugu describe a critical view and a lack of trust for the chairpersons. This mistrust was explained by one female refugee from Rwanda, R8, “The chairman helps the one who has the most money. If for example two people are in a conflict and go to the chairman, the chairman lets the one win who gives him the most money” (R8, Dec 3, 2012). The same criticism is directed to the OPM, with one woman from Rwanda, R9, stating “I can go to the OPM but they say that I should come back tomorrow … The OPM can help, but they do not wish to help me” (R9, Dec 3, 2012).

All refugees have access to health clinics but do not feel they receive the treatment they need or are entitled to. According to the interviews, the health centre does not charge for treatment but if they are out of a specific medicine patients must then go to a pharmacy and pay for it themselves. One Congolese woman, R7, states “They cannot charge money since they do not treat you” (R7, Dec 6, 2012). The negative comments about the health centre concerned the long waiting line and that they sometimes waited all day without being helped as well as the lack of appropriate medicine. As one Rwandese woman, R12, explains it, “People do not get help and sometimes it happens that people die because it takes too long time before they receive help” (R12, Dec 6, 2012). Additionally, a Burundian woman, R13, says that the health centre does not care for its patients. However, she believed that the treatment is the same for both refugees and nationals. She continued with “Maybe if you have some money and go to the doctor you will get good treatment” (R13, Dec 6, 2012). R8 says, “Nationals get better treatment because they have money and can pay for the drugs” (R8, Dec 3, 2012). The most radical opinion comes from a Congolese man, R10, with diabetes, who does not feel well treated at the health centre. He believes he is underprivileged due to the fact that he is a refugee and says, “I think that they want me to die because I am a refugee. We have no value” (R10, Dec 4, 2012). RWC I, one of the chairmen in Nyarugugu, says the nationals are excluding refugees from certain jobs as well as underpaying them, for example in the health centre and school, because of the very fact that they are refugees (C3, Dec 1, 2012).
Windle Trust explains that all schools in Nakivale are of mixed nationalities and the main challenge faced in the classrooms is due to language barriers. The official language in Uganda is English and as such it is the primary language used in schools, but many refugees in the lower classes only understand their local language, which makes it hard for them to follow and therefore feel excluded. A solution to the problem, suggested by Windle Trust, is to find teachers that originate from the same country and who speak the same language as the refugees. However, a problem that arises then is that the refugee teachers sometimes do not understand any English, which in turn makes them feel left out, segregated and powerless at work. Hence, the Windle Trust tries to involve the refugee teachers in a Finnish Refugee Council (FRC) program, which targets adult literacy, in order for them to learn English (A4, Nov 28. 2012).

Furthermore, GIZ and UNHCR provide support for livelihood groups that can contribute to improvements for the community. The officer at GIZ describes that their programs are based on community participation, which means that the community needs to take an active part in improving their surroundings, such as cleaning up roads for the food to come through. The GIZ officer further explains that the refugees have the possibility to influence implementations regarding their communities through joint assessment plans, which all of the organisations of Nakivale publish together (A6, Dec 4, 2012). However, none of the interviewed refugees mentioned being part of such a plan.

5.4.2 Nationals

When a problem arises within or outside the community, it goes through the chairperson that is also the contact person between the OPM and the chairpersons of the refugees. Eight interviewees state that they would turn to the chairman while one said they would turn to their neighbour in case of a problem. However, only a few have actually used the help of the chairman to solve their problems. Some interviewees mention their lack of trust for the chairman and accuse him of accepting bribes from the OPM and not having sufficient power and influence to improve the situation in the community.

All of the nationals visit the health centre in Nyarugugu when in need of medical assistance, except one who goes to a private clinic in Sangano. The health centre in Nyarugugu is free, while the private clinic in Sangano is not. However, the nationals need to pay for the drugs at the pharmacy if the health centre does not have that specific drug. Almost half of the nationals believe that the treatment of nationals and refugees differs, and feel they do not get as good treatment. The chairman of the nationals in Nyarugugu, who is also the
chairman of the management committee at the health centre, supports this claim by saying that he has tried to talk to the doctors about this problem but they refuse to discuss it. He explains that if refugees are really sick and need to get transferred to the Mbarara hospital they get transported by ambulance, while nationals have to go to Mbarara by themselves. Furthermore he claims that the doctors, who are nationals, treat compatriots differently from refugees since they think that the nationals have money and therefore want them to pay before getting treated even though it should be free (C4, Dec 2, 2012). One man, N4, expressed it in very strong words, “They [the health centre] do not consider nationals as people, they see them like animals” (N4, Dec 5, 2012). Many nationals believe the health centre is mainly for refugees and therefore feel discriminated because they are nationals. However, when interviewing a doctor from MTI he states that both nationals and refugees are treated the same at the health clinic (A9, Dec 7, 2012).

A common problem among the interviewed nationals is land, primarily the land where they cultivate. Three nationals, N3, N11 and N12, expressed frustration over their crops being destroyed by cattle owned by refugees. The issue has been taken up with the respective chairman but the destruction continues even though the damages are paid for in some cases. Furthermore, amongst the interviewed there are at least five cases where land has been taken and given to refugees. However, the nationals were mostly upset and critical of the OPM and in many situations even threatened by them. A man, N8, describes a situation where the OPM came and gave his land to refugees without warning or compensation. He continues, “Afterwards we kept silent since the Camp Commandant threatened us by saying that if we said anything, they would take away the remaining land” (N8, Dec 6, 2012).

There are many other examples where the OPM is described as the source of the problem and the ones who create the segregation between refugees and nationals. Several of those interviewed claim that these situations are often due to corruption. The chairman of the nationals explains that the camp commandant accepts bribes from refugees and gives them land that belongs to nationals. This then generates tensions and fights between nationals and refugees, which the chairman believes is an intentional tactic by the camp commandant. He continues to explain that the camp commandant’s behaviour is due to financial incentives and states, “our Uganda is all about money” (C4, Dec 2, 2012).

In order to solve the land issue several nationals mention that there should be clear borders between the land of the refugees and their own land. The nationals also want to be compensated for the land that has been taken but do not feel the OPM acknowledges their opinions. A couple, N9, describes the current situation with the OPM, “If the government
comes with an order we cannot change that. It is not possible to fight the government because they can even use weapons” (N9, Dec 6, 2012). There are examples where the OPM promised not to take the nationals’ land but years later came by surprise and occupied the land on behalf of the refugees. In the interviews several examples are given regarding the OPM and bribes, saying for example that if you give money to the OPM you can keep your land. There is a constant feeling amongst these nationals that they can be evicted from their homes and lands any day and would then not know where to resettle. This sentiment is confirmed by the Camp Commandant who says, “We are still drafting a program of how we can evict ALL nationals from the settlement”. Furthermore, he also says that the land in Nakivale is sufficient in order to continue the land policy, while many nationals report the opposite in the area of Nyarugugu (A8, Dec 7, 2012).

However, GIZ claims that the nationals have access to the same programs and activities as the refugees, including the livelihood support. An officer at GIZ explains that even though many of GIZ’s activities aim to support the refugees, many nationals benefit from the programs. She says that more than 3000 nationals have access to the health centres and all of the nationals can use the water points around Nakivale, even though some of the interviewees claimed differently. Moreover, she says that “What we can offer from the refugee programs we offer to the nationals” (A6, Dec 4, 2012).

5.4.3 Refugees’ Relation with Nationals

Amongst the fourteen refugees questioned, ten have some form of contact with nationals within Nakivale. The interaction mainly occurs in a work setting either by being employed by, employing, working together or having nationals as customers. The types of jobs refugees often do for a national are growing crops or housekeeping. When working together in community work such as construction of buildings or maintenance of roads organised by the different zones, a Congolese man, R4, explains that the cooperation between refugees and nationals is not so good since he feels that the nationals undermine them by making the refugees do more work (R4, Nov 30, 2012). Furthermore, an Eritrean man, R2, who works as a community worker together with nationals has experienced discrimination on several occasions at work and believes he does not receive the same treatment as the Ugandans (R2, Nov 29, 2012). R4 tells one specific event where refugees were given land by the OPM where nationals lived but were chased away by the nationals with pangas and weapons (R4, Nov 30, 2012). However, there are those who have good perceptions of nationals and are living as neighbours, as one Somali woman, R11, explains, “We stay well with the nationals. There is
no problem with them. They are humans as us … they are my friends. For example, when I am sick they come by and see how I am” (R11, Dec 4, 2012). Furthermore, some of the refugees describe the nationals as being rich. R13 explains that the nationals have large land plots of banana plantations and can therefore afford higher education for their children (R13, Dec 6, 2012). The President of Base Camp raises the issue of land and describes violent encounters with deadly outcomes between nationals and refugees. He believes that the problems between refugees and nationals are the fault of the OPM since the number of refugees is increasing while the nationals are there illegally (C1, Nov 30, 2012). The majority want to have more contact with the nationals since it is their country and would like to exchange knowledge. The most common response related to the language factor and many refugees valued the importance of being able to better communicate with nationals.

5.4.4 Refugees’ Relation with other Refugees

The refugees have contact with other nationalities in school, churches/mosques, and work, and as neighbours for those who live in mixed communities. Since most of the communities in Nakivale are divided by nationality their daily contact is mainly with their own countrymen. Moreover, ten households live within their respective national community; four of them prefer the current structure and six would like a mix within the communities. The four other households do not live alongside other countrymen but within a different nationality’s community. Two of the latter are satisfied with this arrangement while the other two are not. In other words, the majority of the interviewees would like to see a change in the structure. As R10 puts it, “It is bad because we have the same colours and we are all refugees. I think that they could mix us” (R10, Dec 4, 2012). One Congolese woman, R14, who has Somalis as neighbours prefers the mix since it makes it possible for her to study their culture and tradition (R14, Dec 6, 2012). However, R2 argues, “It [the division] is good so that the ethnicities and tribes can live together which keep the culture and traditions alive” (R2, Nov 29, 2012). On one side, some believed security concerns were the reason the divisions were made by the OPM and that the risk of conflict would be higher if there would be a greater mix. On the other side, R13 believes the division contributes to misunderstandings and thinks they should live all together. For example, two interviewed refugees and a GIZ representative describe an incident where young Congolese and Somalis fought aggressively over a football field because both laid claim to it. The fight resulted in one dead boy and hostilities that remained for a long time.
5.4.5 Nationals’ Relation with Refugees

The majority stated that they have refugees as friends, mostly through cultivation activities. Others only have contact through school meetings, community participation, church, trading and selling, which are mainly for refugee buyers. Moreover, two interviewees did not have any contact with refugees. One due to language barriers and the other did not want any contact and explained, “The refugees do not want to interact with me, and therefore I do not want to interact with them. I have heard it several times that they [the refugees] do not want us here” (N3, Dec 4, 2012). However, most of the interviewees want more contact with refugees to exchange knowledge and labour, or because they live in the same community. One young man, N11, expressed that it is good because it “prevent us to do badly against each other. It is impossible not to occur tension when people live together” (N11, Dec 6, 2012).

5.5 Social Cohesion

5.5.1 Refugees

5.5.1.1 Religion

All of the interviewees are religious, with twelve Christians and two Muslims, and attend eight different churches and two mosques while two women do not attend any church but pray at home; one does not due to lack of trust in the church leaders and the other is not allowed by her Muslim husband. According to the interviews, members of the religious institutions come from all different countries. Many use a mixture of languages with the two most common ones being Kinya-Ankole and Kinya-Rwanda but English and Swahili are also used. There are two churches that translate if needed, but primarily use Kinya-Ankole. In the mosques, Arabic is the language of prayer.

Church leaders from both sides can be found. Most Christians attend on Sundays together with their family members, friends, and neighbours while some go alone. The activities provided by the churches are cleaning, maintenance and construction of the church, bible studies, choir, music and youth groups and, church meetings where advice is given. Only two of the twelve Christians interviewed participate in the activities provided by the church. The ones who do not participate are unable to due to lack of time or poor health. For example, two single mothers need to take care of their babies and do not have time to participate in the activities. R13 states that “Most of the time I go there to talk to the ones that are maintaining, cleaning and constructing the church. I am weak and cannot work hard”
R2 says that he is not participating in the music group organised by the church due to the language barrier (R2, Nov 29, 2012). In other words, there are mostly Congolese who are attending, which means the activities are in Swahili, which he does not understand.

The majority of churches have activities or groups that can work as a security network for its members. For example, one specific church in Nyarugugu, where a focus group interview took place with three women in their choir as well as their church leader, provides its members with a variety of activities to strengthen their unity. This church has three different choir groups; for youth, women and mixed gender. The three women explain that they are fifteen members who meet three times a week to practise for Sunday mass. All of the choir members are Congolese women, even though all nationalities are welcome. Except from practicing singing they help each other if needed. For example, if one member is sick or has just given birth, the choir members collect enough money to buy one kilo of sugar or similar necessities to give to the person in question (G3, Dec 4, 2012). The same church provides meetings and seminars for men, women and youth with the topics ranging from love, being patient, and loving God to praying for their lost ones (A5, Dec 1, 2012). The same three women participate in the meetings for women and explain that they also discuss how to stay with their husbands and children and say that there can be up to 100 participants in one meeting. They also mention that if someone is not able to attend the other participants go to their home afterwards and discuss the seminar (G3, Dec 4, 2012). Except from the weekly activities, the church also provides a monthly workshop where the pastors teach and direct the members on how to sustain themselves and not solely depend on the UNHCR. The church leader explains that the church can help its members in need by gathering together and helping to build a house or grow crops in the garden if the person is not capable of doing so themself. The members who they are not able to help physically will instead help spiritually, by showing them how to pray for what they need and to God, as well as by teaching them how to use their own knowledge in order to improve their situation (A5, Dec 1, 2012).

The two Muslims attend the mosques in Base Camp five times a day. One of them attends together with her husband and children while the other one goes alone but meets up with friends there. The only activity mentioned by the interviewees is the Koran study for her children. She explains that the children go to the Koran studies early in the morning before school starts at seven and then they return to the mosque after school (R11, Dec 4, 2012). The other woman would like the mosque to provide lectures for women about their religion (R6, Dec 2, 2012).
5.5.1.2 School
Collectively, eight of the fourteen households have 48 children out of which 26 attend school, with most attending Nyarugugu primary school. Three households have children who are all too young to attend school. However, there are two families who have children in the right age but cannot afford to send them to school or have been in Nakivale for too short a time. According to the OPM and Windle Trust, primary education is free in Uganda, which also applies to Nakivale (A1, Nov 30, 2012; A4, Nov 28, 2012). Although six claim they have to pay a school fee that varies between 3500 to 5000 Ugandan Shilling (UGX) per student and term, in order for their children to be able to attend school. Four of them think it is for construction and expansion of the school, more specifically Nyarugugu primary school - a Windle Trust school. However, the interviewees have not yet seen any sign of initiating the expansion of the school. R9 describes that when she did not pay the school fees her children were punished and their report cards were taken away (R9, Dec 3, 2012). However, one of the nationals says that the refugees do not have to pay any school fees and also receive privileges such as free uniforms, books and scholarships for their entire education (N1, Dec 1, 2012).

According to three of the interviewees, the teachers in Nyarugugu primary school are nationals, while another thinks that there are two refugee teachers.

Pupils of mixed nationalities attend the majority of the activities, although the interaction between nationalities in Nyarugugu primary school are unknown by the parents in many of the cases. However, some say their children interact with their own nationality as well as the other nationalities and the language many children use in order to understand each other is English.

5.5.1.3 Social Networks
Eight of the refugees said that they have no one in the community to ask for help in case of sickness or other. One man with a sick son explains, “I do not feel I can turn to the community since they are also refugees who have nothing and can therefore not help me with my son” (R4, Nov 30, 2012). However, there are some cases where the interviewee does not have any family left. This response is given by R13, ”All my relatives are killed and I have nobody” (R13, Dec 6, 2012). Another example is one of a Congolese woman, R5, with a baby and no family who says, “I just survive by myself...I have no family” (R5, Dec 1, 2012), while another young Congolese woman in a similar situation claims, “The neighbours who feel sorry for me help me” and that she also goes to church where the church members contribute by giving her soap (R7, Dec 3, 2012). Even though some of the refugees have
heard of the livelihood groups, they do not participate. Many do not have the possibility due
to lack of money or poor health. R13 explains, “If I get better I would like to join and keep
animals with anyone that is willing regardless nationality” (R13, Dec 6, 2012).

5.5.1.4 OPM’s Influence on the Social Cohesion
As mentioned in the Background chapter, upon arrival the OPM places the refugees where
there is space, even though the OPM aims to provide land within the community of the
refugee’s nationality. R5 was given land in an area located far away from her desired
community area, which eventually led to her renting a house in the area she preferred but that
does not have land to cultivate. She was not able to request for a plot closer to her community
since all the land was filled according to the chairman (R5, Dec 1, 2012). Furthermore,
another concern that is not always taken into account by the OPM is the tribal differences and
ethnic diversities within the same nationality. For instance, the president of Base Camp
describes that if a Congolese gets located in a community with a different tribal background
he or she can be discriminated (C1, Nov 30, 2012).

5.5.2 Nationals

5.5.2.1 Religion
Ten of the interviewed nationals are Christians, one is Muslim and another does not have a
religion. The majority attend church service on Sundays together with their families. Almost
everyone wants to participate in the activities organised by the churches, but many do not
have the possibility to participate due to illiteracy, age or lack of time. A mix of nationalities
attends the services and activities and the languages used are a mix of Kinya-Rwanada,
Kinya-Ankole, Swahili and English. Three interviewees say their church leaders are only
nationals, four say they are of different nationalities and one says the church leader is
Rwandese. Moreover, eight mentioned that their church has Bible studies, four of whom
attend and one who would like to join. The churches of three interviewees have choir groups
but only one is a choir member. Many interviewees take part in cleaning and maintaining the
facilities of the church. Other activities that some of the churches provide are youth groups,
women’s group and workshops about daily life, which only a few or none participate in. The
Bible studies and its gender division in one church is described by a woman N6, “It is better
[that the groups are divided] because women talk about secrets amongst themselves and the
men talk about their secrets” and she continues to say that they are taught how to love their husbands and also how to live in harmony with neighbours (N6, Dec 5, 2012).

There is one Muslim man of the twelve interviewed nationals and he visits the mosque every Friday. The members of the mosque are from Uganda, Somalia, Rwanda and DRC. The mosque organises meetings about how to maintain cattle or if there is something specific to pray about (N4, Dec 5, 2012).

5.5.2.2 School
There are eleven interviewees who have children in school and ten of them attend Nyarugugu primary school. The nationals in the study claim that the languages used in Nyarugugu primary school are Kinya-Rwanda, Kinya-Ankole, Swahili, English and French. The children interact with nationalities from Rwanda, DRC, Somalia and Uganda. However, one mother says that her children only interact with nationals because they can only speak Kinya-Ankole. The teachers are both refugees and nationals. The activities provided by the school are football, athletics, singing, basketball and playing Kebo, and involves all nationalities. The majority pay around 3000 to 3500 UGX per child per semester, which is collected by the headmaster, while two interviewees say that there is no school fee. The fees go to contributions to the school and for the teachers’ lunches.

5.5.2.3 Social Networks
Four nationals are members of collective funds, which support its members in need, and one is part of a goat group, a livelihood group that collectively use goats as a means for supporting its members. Two used to be active in livelihood groups but are no longer members since one group collapsed and the other was not beneficial to the person. Group memberships consist of between three to forty members and are mostly divided by gender, although some are mixed. Only two groups receive sponsorship, in this case by the local government. Many of those who are not members would like to join but either do not have the money or believe it is only for refugees.

In case of sickness and difficulties with carrying out certain tasks, some nationals turn to neighbours or family members living in other households. However, there are others who do not have anyone to turn to. When lacking food some of the interviewees answered that they go and work for other nationals at banana plantations for example, since the nationals can offer more work than refugees. Others say that they always have food stored for difficult times or sell crops to businessmen. Two of the interviewees said that they have no one to turn
to and just survive by themselves. The interviewed nationals meet their friends of different nationalities, including nationals, after church at Sangano trading centre, at each other’s homes and at bars or cafés.

5.6 Summary of Findings

The interviewed refugees mainly worked in farming or had a business in the settlement and expressed a desire to eventually resettle in another host country or move back to their country of origin. The refugees are provided with food rations and land distribution for shelter, cultivation and business by NGOs and the OPM through programs and policies focused on refugees. Many nationals mentioned that they believe the refugees are given better treatment at the health centre and through scholarships for education. Two of the refugees stand out by having more social power than others through participation in the community and successful businesses. The interviewed refugees describe that their mistrust of the chairpersons and the OPM is due to corruption and that help is only received when money is involved. The majority of refugees lack an extended family network in Nakivale due to their background as refugees with relatives located in other countries or deceased.

Furthermore, the interviews and observations show that even those who have stayed in the settlement for longer periods lack these networks, and therefore need to seek help from outside their family when in need. Many of the refugees mentioned inadequate treatment at the health centre and believed it is due to the fact that they are refugees. The obstacles the refugees face in school are mainly due to language barriers for students and refugee teachers without any English language skills. Except for Mass, only two of the twelve Christian refugees attend any of the activities the churches provide due to lack of time, poor health or language difficulties. In relation to the refugees’ social cohesion, nine of the interviewed say they have no one in the community to turn to in case of sickness or other. Nonetheless, some refugees mention that they turn to the church for help. Moreover, none of the refugees in the study participate in any livelihood group even though some expressed their desire to join but are unable due to lack of money or poor health. The only activity the Muslim refugees mentioned was the Koran study for their children. The interviews and observations also describe the influence the OPM on the social cohesion when settling newly arrived refugees outside their preferred area of living or not considering tribal differences and ethnic diversities. The interviewed refugees interact with nationals when it relates to work and some have encountered discrimination from the nationals they are working with. However, the
majority of the interviewed refugees want more contact with other nationals in order to exchange knowledge. The refugees mainly have contact with other refugees since they are their neighbours and countrymen. Regarding the structure of the settlement, the majority of the refugees in the study would like to live in mixed communities.

The interviewed nationals worked as farmers and fishermen and nine of them were born in Nakivale while the three others had moved there to find fertile land to use for cultivation. The nationals obtain their social power through their cohesion as a group by supporting each other when in need, for example when sickness or when having difficulties carrying out certain tasks. Furthermore, the nationals are described as being rich since they have possibilities to plant bananas, fish in the lake and build permanent houses. However, they mention ill treatment and discrimination at the health centre and feel that these facilities are made for refugees and they therefore feel excluded as a group. Similar tendencies are described in the education system and are explained by a Windle Trust representative who says that since the nationals are a minority, their needs are overshadowed by the refugees’.

The main concerns for the nationals are connected to the OPM and land issues, primarily the land used for cultivation. Many nationals describe that they feel pressured by the OPM to be evicted or deprived of land, which is a threat to their livelihood and shelter. Most of the nationals claimed that they would turn to their chairperson when they encounter obstacles, however, only a few have used their help and some say that they do not trust the chairperson and accuse them of accepting bribes from the OPM in connection to land distribution. The international organisations, such as GIZ and the UNHCR, claim that even though they are there for the refugees’ sake, their programs reach out to nationals as well. However, none of the interviewed nationals mentioned referred to any of these programs, except facilities such as schools and health centres. The majority of the interviewed nationals want to participate in the activities provided by the churches but are not able due to illiteracy, age or lack of time. Unlike the refugees, four of the nationals attend collective funds. Some of the ones not in a group want to join but are not able to due to money or believe it is only for refugees. The interviewed nationals say they have many refugee friends they have met when working with cultivation. Other contacts with refugees happen during school meetings, community participation, in church, trading and selling. Two of the nationals did not have any contact due to language barriers and no desire to have contact. Generally speaking, most of the nationals would like to have more contact with refugees in order to exchange knowledge and labour.
6. Analysis

In this chapter the findings from the interviews and observations, together with the answers to the research questions will be analysed and elaborated in relation to the analytical framework formed by Elias’ theory in order to portray the impact the Ugandan refugee policies, the Ugandan government and international organisations have on the power relation between nationals and refugees in the Nakivale refugee settlement. A summary of the analysis and short answers to the research questions will follow.

6.1 Established and Outsiders

Elias makes a distinction between established and outsiders and when implementing these terms on the situation in Nakivale, more specifically on the refugees and nationals, is it harder to distinguish the two groups than first anticipated. Rather, the context and situation are much more complex.

First of all, the refugees in the settlement come from ten different countries with various tribes, ethnicities and languages. Hence, they represent a multitude of identities and do not in all cases identify themselves with other refugees, which makes it difficult to categorise them as one group.

Second, all refugees have their individual background, education and experience that influences their possibilities for social control. For example, R1 comes from an educated background and therefore has a greater chance of obtaining social power than an illiterate and ill woman or those who do not ask or strive for social power, which is most likely connected to their background. Moreover, the history the refugees bring with them from their country of origin, such as tribal differences, or differences in political opinions, may influence not only the possibilities towards social power but also on their social cohesion, with for example tensions that occur between groups within the settlement. Refugees who have been victims of oppression might have difficulties demanding more social power, such as requesting land for cultivation or business or participating in livelihood groups.

Third, the huge difference in the numbers of refugees compared to nationals also needs to be considered, which gives the refugees an advantage in many areas of the settlement. For instance, as mentioned by Windle Trust, the nationals are a minority and therefore their voices are not being heard. The pinpointed remarks make it hard to categorise and divide them into two separate homogeneous groups. Additionally, the complex group
dimensions aggravate the classification of established and outsiders in the specific context of Nakivale.

Elias defines a clear difference of social power between established and outsiders, where the former have a considerably higher degree of social power than the latter. The preconditions for the two groups, outside the scope of the refugee policies, are similar in relation to the vulnerability of their situations and their challenges. In other words, they both struggle for survival and are equally dependent on the social services provided by the Ugandan state and international organisations. Discrimination is reported from both groups and is based on their specific group belongings. Moreover, the majority of both groups are farmers and businessmen, and both interviews and observations show that the accommodations and living standards are within the same range. However, the fact that Nakivale is declared refugee land affects both groups to a very high extent in various ways explained further below. A recurring stance among the interviewed is a wish for reversed roles; the nationals want to be refugees in order to gain access to benefits provided by the organisations, while the refugees want to be nationals because they fear repatriation.

The often described dichotomic relation cannot be identified when observing the Eritrean community, where woman R3 had all the traits of an outsider but lived in the same community as R1, who was perceived as an established. Elias’ theory shows that the figuration of established-outsiders can be detected within one group, however the model explained by Elias does not consider smaller figurations within the two groups, as seen in the examples with the Eritrean community and the Kenyan woman. Furthermore, the Kenyan woman, R6, can be identified in both terms, established and outsider. The established traits of R6 are related to her active participation in the community and at the same time, she can also be identified as an outsider for the discrimination she faced from the Somali community. The findings present such a complexity of the refugees as a group that it is not possible to identify them as either established or outsiders. In other words, in the group of refugees people can be labelled as established, outsiders or a combination of both.

The findings show that most of the refugees who live outside their own nationality are more vulnerable than others, even though they are living with other refugees. Additionally, the most excluded and discriminated interviewed refugee, R9 from Rwanda, lives surrounded only by nationals. This shows that R9 is an outsider in relation to the established nationals and her low status and social power is related to where she lives. Furthermore, the two households of R9 and R3 were two of the poorest of the interviewed and would both prefer a change in their current living situation. This means that R9 would rather like to be surrounded by other
refugees, since she feels exposed where she currently lives, while R3 and her family, who live only with countrymen, would like to see a more diverse division because of the situation with her boyfriend and the exclusion from the Eritrean community. The conclusion that can be drawn from the findings is that one’s degree of social power depends on the personal situation, in terms of standards of living, vulnerability and their neighbourhood.

The nationals belong to a more homogenous group with similar backgrounds, since most of them have lived in Nakivale all their lives. The observations show that their neighbourliness is stronger and more cohesive than many of the refugees’ contact with their community, which will be identified under Social Cohesion.

6.2 Social Power

According to Elias, the power differential between established and outsiders is based on the social control exercised by the established, which can generate tensions and in the case of Nakivale, these mainly concern land issues. Elias describes that social control is expressed among other things through the stigmatisation of the outsiders, which increases the established’s social power. In contrast to the pre-understanding, when interviewing the nationals no tendencies of stigmatisation of the refugees or feelings of having a superior image of themselves could be seen. Furthermore, as presented in the findings, most of the refugees did not exercise any discrimination against other groups nor did the two groups describe the other as a threat to their traditions and values. Nevertheless, the only community that did do so was the small Eritrean community, which boasted its superiority and strongly stigmatised the other nationalities in the settlement. Hence, the social control must be found elsewhere. In other words, the power distribution between refugees and nationals is shaped by external factors that neither the refugees nor the nationals have the possibility to influence. The external factors that manage social control are the Ugandan refugee policies and the Ugandan government and international organisations. According to the interviews, both groups’ possibilities to influence their daily lives and to improve their standard of living are generally very restricted and many of them have no one to turn to when in need.

6.2.1 The Ugandan Refugee Policies

When looking at the refugee policies it is clear that they influence the power of the two groups by either providing social power or limiting it. On the one side, when arriving in Nakivale many of the refugees do not have anything; no home, no land and in some cases no
family. In accordance with the policies explained in the Background chapter, the refugees are provided housing and land, which strengthens their livelihoods and thereby their social power. This in turn limits the nationals’ livelihood since it is often their land that the OPM distributes to the refugees. In this aspect the Ugandan refugee policies are strengthening the position of the refugees while excluding the nationals, which directly influences the power distribution. Additionally, due to the fact that Nakivale is refugee land it makes the refugees a majority with more rights and also the group that the Ugandan government and international organisations aim to support and focus on. As a majority it is easier to influence decisions and gain more attention to one’s needs. Hence, this gives the refugees more social power than the nationals and the power differential lies in the benefit of the refugees.

On the other side, the complexity of the refugees as a group makes it more difficult for them to stand united and use the given power to their advantage. The observations and interviews show that not many refugees take the opportunity to take part in the benefits provided by the unique setting, for example by not participating in livelihood groups or using their right to request for land. The lack of refugees’ participation in the livelihood groups might be connected to how they perceive their future. Many hope to be resettled in a new host country or return to their country of origin, and therefore some might not feel the need to be involved and active in a group they later have to leave which can also be related to their lack of social cohesion.

This demonstrates that social control is maintained through the consequences of these policies, which mostly/mainly privilege the refugees. Additionally, without the specific policies of Uganda the power distribution would most likely take a different shape since the refugees would then not have the same possibilities.

6.2.2 The Ugandan State and International Organisations

The findings identify the OPM and the international organisations as the most influential and powerful institutions. These institutions exercise their social control through discrimination and distribution of social power. The social control that the OPM obtains directly impedes on the nationals’ access to social power, since they are identified as illegal residents and have no right to stay in Nakivale. As mentioned in Findings, part of their strategy is to allocate land for cultivation to refugees with land once occupied by nationals. It is important to mention that it is not the refugee policies that state which part of land should be given, but rather is at the sole discretion of the OPM. Many interviewed nationals described the eviction by the OPM as forceful and without consideration, which makes them vulnerable and powerless
against the OPM with no possibility to make their voices heard or influence decisions made about their land. Hence, the power distribution is controlled by the OPM.

Even though the international organisations primarily distribute support to refugees this benefits the nationals as well since, without this indirect support, they would have less access to education and health care. In the health centre both groups encounter and perceive discrimination and stigmatisation based on their group belonging and express frustration and powerlessness and believe it is corrupt in ways they cannot influence. In this aspect, both groups’ power distribution is equally low. However, the refugees become empowered by the international organisations through the livelihood programmes as well as by the assessments plans, where the refugees’ needs are considered and evaluated, which demonstrates the international organisations’ control on the power differential.

The power distribution in the school system can be seen from two angles. Both refugee children and teachers can encounter powerlessness and exclusion in school due to the language barrier. However, the nationals are a minority and therefore do not have as strong a voice as the refugees, which impedes on their social power and influence. On the grounds that education is free in Uganda, the fees that the headmaster collects are not supported by the OPM or other organisations.

Hence, it raises the question of whether the two groups know that the education should be free or if they have no power to influence the fee. It is most likely the latter case since refugees have explained during interviews that report cards have been taken and expulsions have occurred due to unpaid fees. It is important to point out that there is no difference between the two groups regarding the amount of school fees they have to pay, which gives a picture of equal treatment by the headmasters who thereby do not discriminate any of the groups, or if expressed differently, discriminate equally.

6.3 Social Cohesion

The main difference between the refugees and the nationals is their security networks outside the nuclear family with the refugees turning to the church and its members while the nationals firstly turn to their neighbours. On the one side, the refugees’ social networks within Nakivale are somewhat limited since they have not stayed in the settlement for generations and therefore do not share the same cohesion as identified by Elias: having long-lasting friendships and memories. Even though the refugees do not share the same history, all of them have experienced violence and conflicts. Hence, rather than sharing long-lasting
friendships and memories, they share similar experiences of fleeing their home country. The refugees without any family members in the settlement automatically become more vulnerable since the society and culture is seen as highly collective. This means that family and close friends who would often represent their security network are absent from their lives. In other words, the lack of cohesion disempowers them. However, religion is an important part of the refugees’ lives and the church becomes a place for them to seek comfort and pray for their lost ones and for a better future. The church is a natural meeting point for the refugees where they can exchange advice, knowledge and receive help from both the church and its members, thus it constitutes their social network. The OPM influences the refugees’ cohesiveness by placing them where there is space which in some cases impedes on the refugees’ possibilities to unite with their community, which lowers their social power, for example by dividing communities that would otherwise be strong together and making the individual more exposed and vulnerable without the support from their countrymen. Furthermore, the power and control the OPM has can generate conflict and tensions within the settlement when allocating a person to a community with a different ethnic belonging, which can further disunite ethnic groups.

On the other side, many of the nationals have lived in Nakivale for generations and share memories to a wider extent than the refugees. The interviews with the nationals indicate that their social networks are within their neighbourhood rather than the church even though most of the nationals do attend church services. Therefore, they have had time to establish successful networks and security hubs between themselves without any substantial support from organisations, which can be seen in their collective funds and meetings regarding improvements to their livelihoods, such as the honey production.

Moreover, the findings show that the leading positions within the school system and the religious leaders do not belong to a specific group and no group has more leading positions than the other even though the majority of the participants in both institutions are refugees. This shows that favouritism or exclusion conducted by the community leaders could not be found. However, it is rather the OPM and international organisations that carry out favouritism for the refugees, through policies and strategies. The school is both for the refugees’ and nationals’ children and is a meeting point for all nationalities where they are engaged in different activities provided by the school. However, this does not affect the groups’ cohesion in a notable way.
6.4 Answers to Research Questions

Based on the findings from interviews and observations it is evident that the relationship between refugees and nationals is more complex and influenced by outside factors to a higher degree than first anticipated. When looking through the glasses of Elias it is clear that both groups are vulnerable and exposed, however, the complex situation that was uncovered goes beyond the scope of the framework.

Considering the first research question; Through the glasses of Elias, what is the social power distribution between nationals and refugees in the Nakivale refugee settlement?, in all of the interviews with both refugees and nationals, it was observed and expressed directly or indirectly that the social power is given or limited by external factors rather than by the relationship between the groups. The greatest factors that can be identified are the Ugandan refugee policies that produce advantages or disadvantages, which in many ways affects and defines the power distribution between the nationals and refugees. The refugee policies in Uganda give the refugees right to residence and freedom of movement, which empowers them as a group. Many refugees state that they were provided with land at arrival and in some cases had the possibility to settle in a constructed house. This makes it possible for them to establish a new life and livelihood as a refugee with better conditions than it would have been without residence or livelihood possibilities. However, it must be mentioned that it is the OPM who allocates and decides the area of residence for the refugee, which does not always have a good outcome. For instance, the OPM does not in all cases consider ethnic diversities or tribal differences, which can generate in violence between groups. This can influence one group’s social cohesion through dividing groups and creating a larger distance between them, which impedes on their social power. Additionally, there is a complexity that arises when the nationalities are divided into communities because of the multitude of nationalities in the settlement and the fact that the power can alter depending on where they live. Most communities are divided by nationalities that have different values and norms and speak different languages. Hence, the interviewed refugees do not in all cases identify themselves with other refugees, which makes it difficult to categorise the refugees as one group. The findings show that most of the refugees who live outside their own nationality are more vulnerable than others, even though they are living with other refugees. However, the individual background of education and previous experience of the refugees also complicates the group constellation and gives the refugees different preconditions for obtaining greater power. The location where the refugees or nationals are settled also influences their
relationship and contact with each other. For example, this exchange can take the form of trade and generated income through the sale of vegetables. As mentioned above, Nakivale was declared refugee land in 1960, which makes it illegal for any national to settle within the borders of the settlement. If nationals have lived there before this date they need to provide evidence in order to stay or receive compensation for lost land. In other words, the policy of freedom of movement and residence does not apply to the nationals, which undermines them in relation to the refugees. Some nationals mentioned that they feel powerless and would have more possibilities and freedoms outside the settlement.

Moreover, the Ugandan refugee policies also state that the refugees have the right to earn a livelihood and establish businesses. The interviewed refugees who wanted land for cultivation and business were provided with plots by the OPM, which gave them more power and influence over their lives. However, the policies give the refugees the entitlement to land that in many cases belong to nationals, which directly affects their livelihoods and state of mind. Even though many nationals express their concern about the land issue and propose solutions to the problem such as clearer borders, the government has ignored this. In this regard, the refugees obtain a superior position towards the powerless nationals when the policy works in their favour. The policy regarding relief and education applies to both refugees and nationals. In the interviews all state that they had access to free health care, even though many refugees and nationals expressed discontent with the treatment. Both groups, who believed it was due to their group belonging, reported corruption and discrimination in the healthcare system. In other words, the nationals felt discriminated due to the fact that they were nationals and vice versa. All nationals and most of the refugees have their children in school; however, one refugee family could not afford the school fee. The power distribution between nationals and refugees is balanced in relation to the policy of public relief and education. However, the refugee policies in many ways shape the power differential by giving the refugees more access to land and livelihood possibilities, which gives them a more powerful position in Nakivale.

Answering the second research question *What are the external factors, if any, which might influence the social power distribution between the two groups in the Nakivale refugee settlement?*, the presence of the Ugandan government and the international organisations in the settlement have an immensely large impact on the power distribution between the nationals and refugees in Nakivale. To start with, the power constellation is very complex where in some cases the state and international organisations contribute to one group’s power strengthening and thereby weaken the other’s, and in other situations the roles are reversed.
On the one hand, all the international organisations focus on the support of refugees rather than nationals due to the land being declared refugee land. For instance, the ration cards and the support for livelihood groups are only provided to refugees. Even though some organisations claim their programs and activities are available for both refugees and nationals, this does not always correspond to the experience of the nationals. The water points, which are managed by the organisations, are installed to provide everyone with water. However, they are mostly placed in refugee-dense areas that give the refugees a sense of power that they exercise over the nationals. The refugees use their feeling of superior power by charging the nationals to collect water. Hence, many nationals do not use the water points but collect lake water. In reference to the tactics of evicting nationals and land distribution by the OPM, many interviewed nationals describe themselves as powerless against the OPM and feel that they have no possibility to influence land issues. This generates in an imbalanced power distribution between nationals and refugees, since through its policies the government recognises the refugees as the rightful holder of the land. However, in most cases where the interviewed nationals have been bereaved of their land they feel a stronger resentment against the OPM rather than against the refugees.

On the other hand, the Ugandan government allows nationals to fish in the lake, own banana plantations and in some cases build permanent houses, which is not possible for the refugees. This results in many of the interviewed refugees perceiving the nationals as rich and having greater prospects to expand their livelihood, which is created by the Ugandan government and law. It must be noted that the observations and interviews show that neither of the groups is richer than the other.
7. Conclusion

This final chapter aims to emphasise the results from the study and to relate them in connection with the research problem and objective. The results are also placed in a wider context to try to reach a deeper understanding of the tensions that can arise between refugees and host populations in a refugee settlement. Thereafter, based on insights gained from the study, recommendations for modifications of Elias’ framework will be explained. The chapter ends with suggestions for further research on the topic.

7.1 Discussion

The increased migration movement that is taking place in Africa generates issues for both the immigrants and the host community. The international debate that is taking place concerns the direction the refugee policies should follow, divided between repatriation, local integration or resettlement in a third country. The Ugandan refugee policies aim for local integration, with focus on freedom of movement and right to earn a livelihood.

The objective of this study was to gain a deeper understanding of the relationship between refugees and host populations in a refugee settlement and any tensions it might foster through uneven power distribution, in line with the research problem that points to a lack of research on considerations for both refugees and host population when the host country aims for local integration. The aim was also to see if and how their relationship constitutes a hindrance to a successful implementation of local integration. The key stakeholders of the study were refugees and nationals living in the Nakivale refugee settlement with a focus on their perception of unequal privileges in the community, which relates to access to public services and the possibilities to influence the community.

The findings from the collected material have been studied with Norbert Elias’ book *The Established and the Outsiders* as an analytical tool, which illustrates an interrelationship between the host population and the refugees based on a power differential between the two groups. In accordance with the framework, the pre-understanding was that they represented the established and the outsiders, respectively. Elias argues that the established have greater social cohesion that is based on long-term friendships, shared interests and memories. The host population have lived in the settlement for generations and would have greater social cohesion than the somewhat newly arrived refugees, which would imply that the host population is the superior group. Furthermore, the power differential constitutes the groups’
difference in social power that gives one group, in this case the established, more privileges and possibilities to influence one’s life.

The findings present a more complex group dimension than first anticipated, which goes beyond the somewhat simplistic established-outsider constellation and does not correlate to a high degree to the situation of Nakivale. In other words, the refugees are difficult to narrow down to one homogenous group since they have different backgrounds, represent a much larger group than the nationals and are influenced by the structure of the settlement. Additionally, the vulnerability of the individuals depends in part on where they live and whom they have as neighbours. The findings show that the refugees who live outside their own nationality and especially those who lived surrounded by nationals had less social power.

Furthermore, the social control that the established have in the community, which determines their powerful position, was not as compatible with reality as first thought. In the case of Nakivale the powerful position alters between the refugees and nationals depending on the context. The findings show that the power distribution between refugees and nationals are shaped by external factors that neither of them have the possibility to influence. These factors are the Ugandan state and international organisations, combined with the Ugandan refugee policies. In other words, the Ugandan state and international organisations have a great influence on the power distribution and were central in determining the power configuration between the refugees and nationals.

As mentioned above, the nationals were first anticipated to belong to the established, however the influence of the external factors written above generated a higher vulnerability and lower degree of power for the nationals living in the settlement.

The relationship between the refugees and host population constituted to some degree a hindrance in the implementation of the local integration approach, however the concern was foremost created by the Ugandan state, in this case the OPM. The Ugandan state distributed land to refugees that belonged to nationals, which generated great tensions between the two groups. Consequences could be that refugees are reluctant to receive land plots since it could create a threat against them and it could also interfere with the establishment of important trade relations, which in turn would impede on the development of Nakivale as well as the individuals’ livelihood.

In conclusion, three major points can be drawn from the study; firstly, the situation and group dimensions are more complex than first predicted, secondly, the Ugandan state and international organisations have a vital role in the power distribution between refugees and nationals and thirdly, the host population is more vulnerable than first anticipated. Hence, this
study shows that the influence of states and international organisations involvement play a large part of the tensions that can arise between refugees and host population in refugee settlements. Having this in mind when implementing local integration approaches could perhaps increase the chances of successful policy outcomes, both for refugees’ livelihood possibilities but also for the host population to be able to continue their livelihoods.

7.2 Modification of Elias’ Theory

The use of Elias’ theory as an analytical framework has been valuable in the initial phase when creating interview templates and when sorting and selecting useful material for the Findings chapter. Moreover, it has been very useful when analysing the relationship and power distribution between refugees and nationals in order to see the established and outsider constellation in the Nakivale refugee settlement.

Furthermore, when applying Elias’ theory it assumes that there is bipolarity between the two groups, however in reality this is not always the case. Within the groups of established and outsiders, different sub-groups can be found with various backgrounds, such as ethnicity and education, which influences their social power and subsequently their position in society and within their group. In other words, within the two groups there are subgroups that can be identified with the characteristics of the other group and vice versa, making the constellation even more complex. In order to understand the different group divisions based on their degree of power the theory needs to consider deeper levels of group categorisations.

Moreover, Elias focuses solely on the relationship between the two groups and does not take into consideration the external factors that can influence the power distribution. In order to understand the tensions that the power differential is creating the theory needs to be extended by looking outside the scope of the relationship.

Using his theory as a universal analytical tool showed us that there are established-outsider constellations creating tensions in a community, however, these tensions do not fully rely on the qualities of the relationship. This study shows that the uneven power distribution that generates tensions is also based on external factors and conditions, and more complex group divisions, which indirectly influence the relationship between the established and outsiders.
7.3 Further Research

This study demonstrates that the relationship between refugees and host population, and its tensions created by uneven power distribution in refugee settlements, are largely influenced by external factors, foremost the Ugandan state and international organisations. However, the study was conducted on a small scale, and therefore cannot present any general conclusion. It would therefore be interesting and rewarding to study this subject more in-depth, with a greater coverage that would thereby obtain a more profound picture of the state’s and organisations’ involvement in the tensions that arise between refugees and nationals. Additionally, this would also give a deeper understanding of how these external factors affect the everyday life of the refugees and host populations; psychologically, physiologically as well as sociologically.

Furthermore, the study was concentrated on the residents of a refugee settlement with regulations related to the area being refugee land and a great presence of international organisations. Hence, it would be interesting to conduct a similar study in a different environment, such as in an urban setting, with conditions varying from the ones in a refugee settlement. This could further give a deeper understanding of possible tensions between nationals and refugees, and thereby contribute to the debate and perhaps improve policies aiming for local integration.
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Appendix 1: List of Interviews

Individual Interviews with Refugees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Eritrea</td>
<td>Nov 29, 2012</td>
<td>Base Camp, Nakivale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Eritrea</td>
<td>Nov 29, 2012</td>
<td>Base Camp, Nakivale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Eritrea</td>
<td>Nov 30, 2012</td>
<td>Base Camp, Nakivale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>Nov 30, 2012</td>
<td>Nyarugugu, Nakivale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>Dec 1, 2012</td>
<td>Nyarugugu, Nakivale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R6</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Dec 2, 2012</td>
<td>Nyarugugu, Nakivale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R7</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>Dec 3, 2012</td>
<td>Nyarugugu, Nakivale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>Dec 3, 2012</td>
<td>Nyarugugu, Nakivale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R9</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>Dec 3, 2012</td>
<td>Nyarugugu, Nakivale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R10</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>Dec 4, 2012</td>
<td>Nyarugugu, Nakivale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>Dec 4, 2012</td>
<td>Nyarugugu, Nakivale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R12</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>Dec 6, 2012</td>
<td>Nyarugugu, Nakivale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R13</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>Dec 6, 2012</td>
<td>Nyarugugu, Nakivale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R14</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>Dec 6, 2012</td>
<td>Nyarugugu, Nakivale</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Individual Interviews with Nationals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N1</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Dec 1, 2012</td>
<td>Nyarugugu, Nakivale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N2</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Dec 4, 2012</td>
<td>Nyarugugu, Nakivale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N3</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Dec 4, 2012</td>
<td>Nyarugugu, Nakivale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N4</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Dec 5, 2012</td>
<td>Nyarugugu, Nakivale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N5</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Dec 5, 2012</td>
<td>Nyarugugu, Nakivale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N6</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Dec 5, 2012</td>
<td>Nyarugugu, Nakivale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N7</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Dec 5, 2012</td>
<td>Nyarugugu, Nakivale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N8</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Dec 6, 2012</td>
<td>Nyarugugu, Nakivale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N9</td>
<td>Male + Female</td>
<td>Dec 6, 2012</td>
<td>Nyarugugu, Nakivale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N10</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Dec 6, 2012</td>
<td>Nyarugugu, Nakivale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N11</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Dec 6, 2012</td>
<td>Nyarugugu, Nakivale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N12</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Dec 6, 2012</td>
<td>Nyarugugu, Nakivale</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group Interviews/Focus Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G1</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Nov 28, 2012</td>
<td>Base Camp, Nakivale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Pupils</td>
<td>Nov 29, 2012</td>
<td>Base Camp, Nakivale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3</td>
<td>Choir</td>
<td>Dec 4, 2012</td>
<td>Day Star Church, Nakivale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G4</td>
<td>Meetings for women</td>
<td>Dec 4, 2012</td>
<td>Day Star Church, Nakivale</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Individual Interviews with Chairpersons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>RWC</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>President of Base Camp, Refugee</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Nov 30, 2012</td>
<td>Base Camp, Nakivale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Chairperson Nyarugugu C, Refugee</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Dec 1, 2012</td>
<td>Nyarugugu, Nakivale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>Chairperson Nyarugugu B, Refugee</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Dec 1, 2012</td>
<td>Nyarugugu, Nakivale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>Chairperson Nyarugugu, National</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Dec 2, 2012</td>
<td>Nyarugugu, Nakivale</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Individual Interviews with all other Actors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Actor</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Refugee Desk Officer, OPM</td>
<td>Nov 20, 2012</td>
<td>Mbarara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>UNHCR</td>
<td>Nov 23, 2012</td>
<td>Mbarara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>Isingiro Local District Officials</td>
<td>Nov 27, 2012</td>
<td>Isingiro District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>Windle Trust</td>
<td>Nov 28, 2012</td>
<td>Base Camp, Nakivale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5</td>
<td>Pastor/Church Leader</td>
<td>Dec 1, 2012</td>
<td>Day Star Church, Nakivale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6</td>
<td>GIZ</td>
<td>Dec 4, 2012</td>
<td>Base Camp, Nakivale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7</td>
<td>Samaritan’s Purse</td>
<td>Dec 5, 2012</td>
<td>Base Camp, Nakivale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A8</td>
<td>Camp Commandant</td>
<td>Dec 7, 2012</td>
<td>Base Camp, Nakivale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A9</td>
<td>MTI</td>
<td>Dec 7, 2012</td>
<td>Base Camp, Nakivale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A10</td>
<td>Community Worker</td>
<td>Dec 7, 2012</td>
<td>Base Camp, Nakivale</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2: Map of Uganda and its Refugee Settlements