



## Land and exile: revisiting the case of Burundian refugees in Tanzania

Amelia Kuch

To cite this article: Amelia Kuch (2018) Land and exile: revisiting the case of Burundian refugees in Tanzania, *Critical African Studies*, 10:1, 108-125, DOI: [10.1080/21681392.2018.1495087](https://doi.org/10.1080/21681392.2018.1495087)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/21681392.2018.1495087>



Published online: 08 Aug 2018.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 6



View Crossmark data [↗](#)

## Land and exile: revisiting the case of Burundian refugees in Tanzania

### Terre et exil: Revisiter le cas des réfugiés burundais en Tanzanie

Amelia Kuch<sup>a,b\*</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*International Development, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, Scotland, UK;* <sup>b</sup>*Anthropology, Aarhus University, Aarhus, Denmark*

(Received 5 May 2017; accepted 24 April 2018)

In 2007, the Government of Tanzania and the Government of Burundi in partnership with the UNHCR adopted the Tanzania Comprehensive Solutions Strategy (TANCOSS). TANCOSS offered a choice between repatriation and naturalization to 220,000 Burundian refugees who had been living in three rural settlements in Western Tanzania (Ulyankulu, Katumba and Mishamo) since 1972. It was an unprecedented intervention and it garnered international attention and support (Milner 2014). Initially, obtaining citizenship was meant to be conditional on relocation away from the refugee settlements. This plan, however, was renounced, and ultimately those who opted for citizenship were permitted to remain on the land of the settlements. Following naturalization, new citizens' relationship with the land they occupy in Tanzania has changed – both in legal and symbolic terms. This article explores how former Burundian refugees were able to access land in exile and how, following naturalization, they seek recognition of their land rights. In the existing literature, scholars have highlighted the prominence of discourses of autochthony in the ways that both citizenship and land rights have come to be defined and asserted in contexts of migration. There is a risk that this emphasis hides other instances, in which autochthony is not the dominant trope through which citizenship or land rights are claimed, as this article demonstrates in the case of Burundian refugees in Tanzania.

**Keywords:** forced migration; exile; durable solutions; land access; autochthony; Burundian refugees; Tanzania

En 2007, le gouvernement de Tanzanie et le gouvernement du Burundi en partenariat avec l'UNHCR ont adopté la Stratégie de solutions globales en République-Unie de Tanzanie (TANCOSS). La TANCOSS a proposé à 220 000 réfugiés burundais qui avaient vécu dans trois colonies rurales de l'Ouest de la Tanzanie (Ulyankulu, Katumba et Mishamo) depuis 1972, de choisir entre une rapatriation et une naturalisation. Cette intervention sans précédent a attiré l'attention et le soutien international (Milner 2014). Initialement, l'obtention de la citoyenneté n'avait lieu qu'à condition d'un départ des colonies de réfugiés. Ce plan a cependant été abandonné et en fin de compte, les personnes ayant opté pour la citoyenneté ont eu le droit de rester sur les terres des colonies. Suite à leur naturalisation, la relation des nouveaux citoyens avec les terres qu'ils occupent en Tanzanie a changé – aussi bien en termes légaux que symboliquement. Cet article explore comment d'anciens réfugiés burundais ont pu avoir accès à des terres en exil, et comment, suite à leur naturalisation, ils ont cherché la reconnaissance de leurs droits fonciers. Dans la littérature actuelle, les chercheurs soulignent la prépondérance de discours natifs dans la façon dont la

---

\*Email: [amelia.kuch@ed.ac.uk](mailto:amelia.kuch@ed.ac.uk)

citoyenneté tout comme les droits fonciers en sont venus à être définis et affirmés dans des contextes de migration. Le risque est que cet accent cache d'autres circonstances dans lesquelles le caractère local n'est pas le maître-mot à travers lequel la citoyenneté ou les droits fonciers sont revendiqués, comme cet article le démontre dans le cas des réfugiés burundais en Tanzanie.

**Mots-clefs:** Migration forcée; exil; solutions durables; accès aux terres; caractère local; réfugiés burundais; Tanzanie

## Introduction

In 1972, an uprising against the ruling regime took place in Burundi and it was followed by a systematic ethnic extermination, during which at least 100,000 Hutu were killed and hundreds of thousands fled to the neighbouring countries (Uvin 2009). Over 150,000 refugees ended up in Tanzania, where they were offered assistance in three rural refugee settlements: Ulyankulu, Katumba and Mishamo.<sup>1</sup> In the settlements, each household received land for cultivation, and the refugees quickly became self-sufficient. Their experiences of exile, exclusion, and integration in Tanzania have been documented in Malkki's (1995) well-known book *Purity and Exile*. At that time,<sup>2</sup> a collective hope of return to the 'homeland' shaped the identities and narratives of the refugee population in the settlements. Two decades later, however, when the same group of Burundian refugees was given a choice between repatriation and naturalization, 79% (171,629) of people opted for naturalization, whereas 21% (45,547) decided to return to Burundi (TCRS 2012). Clearly, people's priorities and concerns changed over time and integration at the level of naturalization in Tanzania became an attractive choice.<sup>3</sup>

The policy of naturalization was implemented under the Tanzania Comprehensive Solutions Strategy (TANCOSS), which was an agreement initiated in 2007 between the Government of Tanzania (GoT) and the Government of Burundi in partnership with the UNHCR (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees). TANCOSS was an unprecedented intervention and it marked the first time that any state has naturalized in a single move such a large group of refugees under the protection of UNHCR (Milner 2014). Initially, obtaining citizenship was meant to be conditional on relocation away from the refugee settlements to other designated regions of Tanzania (Milner 2014).<sup>4</sup> This programme was suspended in 2011, and ultimately the new citizens were permitted to remain in the area of the settlements where they have lived since the 1970s. As Tanzania's Home Affairs Minister, Mathias Chikawe, emphasized in 2014: 'The new citizens are meant to enjoy all citizenship rights[,] including land ownership' (IRIN 2014).

Access to land played a central, and largely unacknowledged, role in the implementation of TANCOSS policy and it continues to be a central issue in the aftermath of naturalization. To an extent, the design of the policy was only viable because the refugees have access to land – they cultivate, sell their products for profit, participate in local markets, and contribute to the local and national economy (SA3 2007). Moreover, research with former refugees indicates that people's decision to opt for Tanzanian citizenship was often motivated by their inability to access land in Burundi and the perceived abundance of land in Tanzania (Hovil 2016).<sup>5</sup> Because of the naturalization process, the new citizens are now legally allowed to remain on the land they have occupied 'temporarily' for the past 40 years.

Contemporary work on land and migration in Africa is saturated with narratives of conflict and exclusion (Comaroff and Comaroff 2001; Jackson 2006; James 2007; Geschiere 2009; Bøås and Dunn 2013; Lentz 2013). Studies of land in contexts of migration are heavily focused on the subject of autochthony. Autochthony literally means 'emerging from the soil', and thus implies local forms of belonging constructed on a supposedly indisputable historical link between specific people and a territory (Ceuppens and Geschiere 2005). The discourse of autochthony involves claiming to have been the first people in a particular location and thus

excluding others from collective entitlement to land and other rights (Ceuppens and Geschiere 2005). The visibility and urgency of conflicts and violence rooted in the discourse and practice of autochthony (both on the ground and in academia) make invisible the quiet cases of integration and the existing practices of establishing land access in exile. In other words, scholars have highlighted the prominence of the discourses of autochthony in the ways that both citizenship and land rights have come to be defined and asserted in contexts of migration. However, this emphasis may hide other instances, in which autochthony is not the dominant trope in which citizenship or land rights are claimed. The case of naturalization of Burundian refugees in Tanzania creates an opportunity for discussing other modes of accessing and claiming land and citizenship in exile.

This article explores the ways in which Burundian refugees assert access to land rights and conceptualize land's value in exile. The article uses this specific case to make two contributions to the scholarship on land and migration in Africa. First, it demonstrates a case where autochthony is not the primary discursive tool for asserting rights to land and citizenship. Second, it confronts the normative depiction of Burundian refugees in Tanzania that has pervaded academic discourse since Liisa Malkki's seminal text. The article is divided into four parts. The first section outlines the methods underlying the research. The second part situates the arguments in the broader literature on land and autochthony. Next, the main fieldwork site, Ulyankulu settlement, is introduced with a focus on the initial land distribution and governance of the area. Building on the literature and data collected, factors that have an impact on asserting and valuing land access in the settlement are discussed. The conclusion brings the various elements together, proposing a framework for examining the processes and strategies of establishing land access in the context of migration.

## Methods

The arguments presented in this article are based on extensive anthropological fieldwork. The empirical material was collected during three visits to Tanzania: the first one took place when the process of relocation was suspended (March–April 2014); the subsequent study followed the majority of the former refugees receiving their citizenship certificates (April–June 2015); the final stage of fieldwork traced changes since the distribution of citizenship certificates (July–November 2016). The areas of data collection included eight villages in Ulyankulu Division, the nearby Urambo Town, Tabora Town, and the city of Dar es Salaam. The long-term scope of the project allowed repeated visits to the sites pre-and post-naturalization and follow-up interviews with the key participants. A total of 213 individual interviews and 15 focus group discussions with 76 participants were conducted with people living and working in and near Ulyankulu and Katumba settlements, as well as with academics at the University of Dar es Salaam, local and international NGO staff, government officials, and UNHCR staff working both in Tanzania and Geneva.<sup>6</sup>

The qualitative methods employed included living with the community,<sup>7</sup> observation of key sites and arenas (markets, churches, schools, village assemblies, court proceedings, farming plots), attendance at important events (graduations, weddings, etc.), as well as individual interviews and focus group discussions. Extensive anthropological fieldwork, which involved visiting people multiple times, sharing meals, walking across the settlements' land, and many formal and informal conversations, lends insight into how land access has been established and expanded and how ideas about the value of land in exile have changed over time. In the qualitative research, I also employed a method of tracing families' histories through the lens of mobility and land transactions from 1972 until the present day. In the process, I documented former refugees' narratives about the land they occupy in Tanzania, visited their farms, and discussed land disputes. Next, I analysed how people's approach to cultivation, sale, and investment on the land has transformed over time. The people living in the settlements experienced war and terror in Burundi, followed by years of anxiety

about their future in Tanzania. Their experiences, insights, and concerns about land in exile, which they have generously shared with me, shaped the content and direction of this article.

### Revisiting the literature on land and autochthony

In the literature, the debates about migration and land are often set in the context of conflict (Manby 2009; Bøås and Dunn 2013), exclusion (Jacobsen 2001; Chimni 2004) and autochthony (Jackson 2006; Geschiere 2011). Cases of local and national integration and discussions of refugees' access to land, however, are less prevalent and less researched.<sup>8</sup> The existing studies of land in contexts of migration focus heavily on the theme of autochthony, which limits attention to cases where migrants and refugees successfully establish access to land.<sup>9</sup>

The contemporary literature on autochthony has been shaped primarily by Ceuppens and Geschiere (2005), Geschiere (2009), Jackson (2006), and Geschiere and Nyamnjoh (2000). These works explore and try to account for the intensification of the politics of belonging and exclusion, especially in Francophone Africa. Autochthony is introduced as a trope that enables people to claim they are descendants of the first inhabitants of a particular location (Geschiere and Nyamnjoh 2000, 448). It is crucial to stress that it is the discourse of autochthony rather than autochthony *per se* that is the crux of the debate. Autochthony is a strategy, not a fact – it is an attempt to reify claims about identity and obscure the dynamic processes of identification (Bøås and Dunn 2013). In *Politics of Origin*, Bøås and Dunn (2013) bring attention to the function of land and landlessness in the making of contemporary identity in Africa and observe how, because of its ambiguity and plasticity, the discourses of autochthony are employed to validate claims of citizenship and ownership across the continent.<sup>10</sup> The discourse and practice of autochthony also creates an ever-deepening uncertainty over who are to be considered as the 'real' sons of the soil (Espeland 2011). One of the dangerous consequences of this development, as Daley (2013) argues, is that 'indigeneity', however, defined, becomes the *de facto* basis for access to citizenship rights in Africa (2013).

The case of Burundians in Tanzania, who over the years established access to land in exile and recently received citizenship, stands as a counterpoint not only to the dominant narrative of autochthony but also to the specific literature on Burundian refugees.<sup>11</sup> In her book, *Purity and Exile*, Malkki advances an argument that for the overarching purpose of constructing a collective identity, Hutu refugees in Tanzania wanted to remain in a categorical state of displacement, both 'legally and socially' (Malkki 1995, 209). Drawing on fieldwork, and the subsequent correspondence with her informants, Malkki maintains that assimilation at the level of naturalization was resisted and refused by most of the Burundians living in the camps as it signified abandoning the hope of a collective return to the 'homeland'. At that time, naturalization was seen as detrimental for the construction of deterritorialized Hutu identity in-exile, which was constructed through notions of 'purity' and 'marginality' (Malkki 1992, 35).

In her study, Malkki contrasts the purist notion of identity constructed in the camps with the pragmatic processes through which Burundian refugees assimilated and established livelihoods in Kigoma town. She discusses elements such as intermarriage with citizens, obtaining documentation and seeing a return to Burundi as undesirable, and shows how these stand in contrast with the priorities and desires of the population living in the camp (Malkki 1995, 154). The narrative of protecting a refugee identity against naturalization is a common thread in Malkki's analysis, and it recurs also in two other studies focusing on Burundian refugees in Tanzania (Sommers 2001; Turner 2010). Here, I argue that the decision of an overwhelming majority of refugees to eventually opt for Tanzanian citizenship and assert land access in Tanzania is evidence that, over time, refugees in the camps moved away from the purist notion of refugee identity towards a more pragmatic conceptualization of belonging.

This shift is in line with the writing of Gaim Kibreab (1999, 2003), who argues that in contemporary Africa access to resources (i.e. land and citizenship) is critical in conceptualizing belonging and shaping people's desire to repatriate or remain in the host state. He maintains that it is the exclusionary nature of the contemporary state and the subsequent inability to access rights and membership in exile, rather than a primordial connection to the homeland, that determines people's mobility choices (Kibreab 1999, 387). Burundian refugees' decision to opt for naturalization reinforces Kibreab's argument, as for many people the choice to remain in Tanzania was determined by inability to access land and create sustainable livelihoods in Burundi. This case opens space for asking further questions about how exactly land access is established in exile, what value people attach to it, and how this changes over time.

When trying to examine the ways in which people establish land access and conceptualize its value, it is helpful to ask what land is. As Li (2014) persuasively writes, land as a resource does not have essential or intrinsic quality. Land is assembled (Hacking 1986) and constructed; it always includes a discursive element, and it can 'wax and wane, or morph as technologies are added, values change and material qualities shift' (Li 2014, 589). Acknowledging the elements assembled in 'making up' land and the processes that stabilize the assemblage gives us tools for approaching the question of land's value in a more systematic way. Examining how land is 'made up' and what elements join in its constitution sheds light on the ways in which people conceptualize land's value. Inspired by Li's typology and following the data collected, this article sees the value of land as changeable over time, and defined both in material terms (land as an asset that can be sold and purchased), as well as a tangible proof of naturalization and the right to remain in Tanzania (land as a relational marker of the newly acquired citizenship). This perspective is discussed and explored further in the article; first, however, the main fieldwork location, Ulyankulu settlement, is introduced.

### **Origin of Ulyankulu settlement and initial land distribution**

Burundian refugees were brought to Ulyankulu settlement in several large groups between 1972 and 1975 (TCRS 1985). The immediate reason for their flight had its roots in the exclusionary and violent nature of the post-colonial Burundian state, in which an alliance was established between the ruling Tutsi-dominated party and the military (Daley 2007; Uvin 2009). Every attempt made by Hutu leaders to overthrow the government – in 1965, 1969, 1972 – ended in failure and brutal repression. In 1972, Hutu militias organized an uprising and attacked Tutsi civilians. In response, the army exterminated all individuals suspected of being involved in the assassinations (Lemarchand 1996). It is estimated that at least 100,000 Hutu were killed and hundreds of thousands fled to the neighbouring states, with the majority ending up in Tanzania (Uvin 2009). After the massive flight of over 150,000 people in 1972, Burundian authorities redistributed their property (van Leeuwen 2010). This ethnicized episode of state-sanctioned land grabbing set the stage for future conflict, which continues to stir up violence in Burundi today and prevents many refugees from repatriation.

Refugees who fled Burundi in 1972 were welcomed in Tanzania under the 'Open Door' refugee policy of the then President, Julius Nyerere (Chaulia 2003). Throughout the 1960s and 1970s Tanzania hosted tens of thousands of refugees fleeing both wars of national liberation in Southern Africa as well as post-colonial conflicts in the neighbouring states. Several authors have attributed the 'Open Door' policy to both ideological and pragmatic considerations, pointing to Nyerere's genuine commitment to Pan-African ideals, as well as the opportunities that refugees provided for attracting resources for development of remote and under-populated regions (Armstrong 1991; Kweka 2007). According to these priorities, the 1972 group of Burundian refugees was allocated land to farm and live on (Chaulia 2003).<sup>12</sup>

Allocating land to refugees was possible for two reasons. Firstly, in postcolonial Tanzania, the new government decided to nationalize all land, making the state the ultimate trustee (Hyden 1980, 70). As Boone (2015) argues, Tanzania provides a unique example of a sub-Saharan country in which postcolonial rulers have ‘deliberately dismantled neo-customary land tenure institutions throughout virtually all the national space’ (176). She explains how land administration in Tanzania is largely secularized and ‘there is de jure legal and administrative non-recognition of ancestral (and ethnic) land rights, and non-recognition of neo-traditional local leaders with land powers’ (Boone 2015, 182). Thus, the statist land tenure regime existing in Tanzania, where the state can confer ownership of land, is what made the establishment of rural refugee settlements possible in the first place.

Secondly, according to Abrahams (1981), the Nyamwezi people who had inhabited the area of Ulyankulu until 1958 were evicted due to colonial interventions to fight the spread of tsetse flies as sleeping-sickness vectors. In the 1970s, the area of Ulyankulu was supposedly still sparsely populated and overgrown with bush, and therefore it was designated to become a settlement. In their stories, former refugees as well as local Tanzanians often emphasized how wild and untamed the environment was before the refugees arrived. As one elderly fisherman told me:

When refugees came here, our living standards increased. We were included in the new services provided. This place would not have been developed if not for the refugees. (R9 2016)

This narrative, and many other similar stories I collected from both former refugees and Tanzanians, assert that (i) the area of the settlement was sparsely populated, infected with disease, and marginalized prior to the refugees’ arrival and that (ii) local Tanzanians appreciate the developments and business opportunities which came with the establishment of the settlements. Due to this very specific political and historical context, assertions of autochthony have not emerged here in opposition to the refugees on a large scale.<sup>13</sup>

In the years 1973–1975, approximately 54,000 refugees were settled in Ulyankulu (TCRS 1985). The Tripartite Agreement between the Government of Tanzania, UNHCR and TCRS (Tanzanian Christian Refugee Services) shared the initial costs and administration of the settlements and the humanitarian agencies provided basic infrastructure such as roads, schools, water points and administrative centres. A grid street structure was designed, in which all the streets were connected to the main roads and assigned numbers. Refugees who arrived together were situated on the same roads, which meant that they often knew their new neighbours from Burundi or at least came from the same areas. The camp administrators measured and distributed approximately 5–7 hectares per household.<sup>14</sup> Refugees had to clear the land and build their own houses. The village governments were given custody over additional plots of land, which were distributed over the years as the families expanded. The year 1978 marked a crucial point in land distribution in Ulyankulu. That year, due to floods, a total 30,000 people were resettled from Ulyankulu to Mishamo (TCRS 1985). The plots they vacated were distributed to the remaining family members, neighbours or the village government. Today, families that own larger fields for cultivation usually highlight that they obtained them in 1978 when people were relocated to Mishamo or in 2008 when other people repatriated to Burundi.

Today, Ulyankulu is made up of eleven villages and 63 roads and covers an area of 1200 square kilometres (TCRS 2009). It is located 90 km from Tabora town and connected by a dirt road, which is passable most of the year. The main economic activity in the area is farming, and tobacco is the primary cash crop. Other crops such as maize, beans, sweet potatoes and cassava are grown for subsistence and cash (SA3 2007). Over the years, people gained access to additional plots of land beyond the planned villages both within and beyond the area of the settlement. These newly acquired plots are mostly used for rice cultivation. Due to an

overwhelming reliance on agriculture, questions of land access and land governance are a key concern for the newly naturalized population.

### ***Land governance in transition***

The settlement was initially governed by the Refugees (Control) Act 1965 (GOT 1966), which was replaced at a later stage by the Refugee Act 1998 (GOT 1998). Both 1965 and 1998 Acts made a provision for the appointment of a Settlement Officer,<sup>15</sup> whose role is to ‘preserve orderly conduct and discipline in the settlement’ (Paragraph 18 of the 1998 Act). As a legal representative of the Ministry of Home Affairs, the Officer does not answer to the district or regional commissioners. Effectively, his presence places the camp outside of the normal jurisdiction of the Tanzanian state (Turner 2010, 312). The 1998 Act also stipulates that refugees are required to reside in the designated areas; it puts restriction on the freedom of movement, and permits deportation in case an offence is made against the Act. In terms of land governance, the 1998 Act indicates that all the land and buildings within the settlement are under the custody of the Ministry of Home Affairs (Paragraph 16 of the 1998 Act). These regulations remain in place until today, despite naturalization, and it is common to overhear in Ulyankulu that ‘all the land here belongs to the Settlement Officer.’<sup>16</sup>

In late 2017, governance in the settlement remains in transition. On the one hand, legally, Ulyankulu has the status of a designated area under the Refugees Act 1998 (GOT 1998). On the other hand, former refugees received citizenship and are now allowed to move freely access education, and vote in national elections. The promises of naturalization, however, have not yet been completely fulfilled. The inhabitants of the settlement continue to question the presence of the Settlement Officer and the absence of local political representatives. In the current transitional period, the powers to administer the settlement are still vested in the Settlement Officer appointed by the Director of Refugee Department at the Ministry of Home Affairs. Additionally, large parts of the settlement fall under gazetted forest reserves. As such, they are also governed by the Forests Act 2002 (GOT 2002). There are several consequences of this double designation (GOT 2016). Firstly, the status of the settlement as a designated area results in overlapping mandates and conflicts between the Settlement Officer and other government authorities. Moreover, it leaves the new Tanzanians with insecure land access as the authorities can take away the land that people occupy at any time. Even more far-reaching are the implications of the status of the settlement as forest area. According to the regulations of the Forest Act 2002, development of any kind is prohibited once an area has been declared a forest reserve.<sup>17</sup>

The change of the legal status of the land in Ulyankulu is planned under the 2016 TANSPLI (Tanzania Strategy for Local Integration Programme for the New Citizens) scheme. According to the stipulations of TANSPLI, two actions will be undertaken regarding changing the status of the settlement area. The first is the removal by the Minister for Home Affairs of the refugee-designated status over the settlement areas. The second action will be the removal of the forest reserve status in accordance with the Forest Act 2002 (GOT 2016). Furthermore, the plans stipulate the creation of a master land use plan for the settlement and the surrounding areas, followed by the registration of villages in each settlement, provision of preliminary documentation for land rights, and, finally, issuance of Certificates of Village Lands and Certificates of Customary Rights of Occupancy (GOT 2016). Therefore, in addition to changing the status of the land (de-gazetting of lands), a key aspect of the local integration programme will be to secure land rights for the new citizens (GOT 2016 Par 3.2). Yet, the timeline for de-gazetting of lands is unclear, and the settlement is supposed to remain under the supervision of the Ministry of Home Affairs until at least 2020. This, however, hinges on the availability of funding for the planned development projects. According to the Settlement Officer, because the funds could run out, ‘We might stay here for the



next 10 or 15 years or more' (R1 2016). For the people concerned, this means a prolonged period of waiting and uncertainty.

Nonetheless, despite the administrative limitations, political challenges, and anxiety surrounding land ownership, people have developed a strong sense of entitlement to the land and the settlement is abundant in land transfers and transactions. As discussed earlier, TANCOS offered Burundian refugees a choice between naturalization and repatriation. From 2008 onwards, more than 5000 people repatriated from Ulyankulu to Burundi. Prior to their departure, many gave or sold their houses and land to their relatives or to Tanzanians from the neighbouring villages or other regions. The refugees never obtained formal titles to the land they occupy, and as an employee of TCRS who worked in Ulyankulu for over 15 years remarked: 'In Tanzania the President has a right to distribute land. He leased it to the refugees. But they are not permitted to administer it freely' (R2 2014). The stipulations of the Refugee Act 1998 (GOT 1998), however, have been widely disregarded by the inhabitants of the settlement. Land transactions between the refugees and the incoming Tanzanians led to the development of an informal land market, and at this point the number of Tanzanians settled in Ulyankulu is estimated at 12,000.

In November 2016, the inhabitants of the settlement (both former refugees and Tanzanians) were told that they are not supposed to build permanent structures or make any improvements to their houses unless they obtain permission. The reasons given by the Settlement Officer are that people need to wait until the area is de-gazetted and should not build randomly because the state might want to implement a town plan in the centre of Ulyankulu. The new citizens, as well as Tanzanians living in the settlement, fiercely contest this ban, and land transactions and construction of houses continue. I argue that former refugees' outspoken engagement in debates that confront the authorities reveals the degree of their integration in Tanzania and a strong sense of entitlement to land in the settlement. The strategies employed by former refugees suggest that people are trying to convert land access, which they have enjoyed for decades, into land rights. Land rights, in essence, are synonymous with citizenship rights, and by seeking recognition of their land rights former refugees are also seeking recognition of their new citizenship in the fullest sense. In the following section, I turn to elements and processes that illuminate how inhabitants of Ulyankulu developed and strengthened their access to land in exile and how it has been changing since naturalization.

### **Valuing and accessing land in Ulyankulu**

The next part of the article sheds light on the social and political factors that come together in the processes of accessing and valuing land in Ulyankulu. During the research, it became clear that people do not occupy only the plots they were allocated in 1973–1975. Many moved within and beyond the settlement, expanded their fields for cultivation, and sold and purchased land. Tracing families' stories through the lens of land offered insight into how people conceptualize what is valuable in terms of access to land in Tanzania and how that has changed over the years. An in-depth analysis based on over 200 interviews helped to identify the main turning points and factors in the development of people's relationship to land in Tanzania. These variables include (i) time spent in exile, (ii) deteriorating security and economic situation in the country of origin, (iii) population movement to and from the settlement, (iv) the structure of local governance and (v) land disputes and conflict resolution mechanisms. The following sub-sections are structured around these themes.

### ***Between Burundi and Tanzania: thinking about the symbolic value of land in exile***

The year 1993 marks the most important turning point in former refugees' narratives about how they began to perceive their place in Tanzania as something other than temporary. In a

conversation with an elderly teacher and his wife, whom I visited multiple times, they recalled that: ‘The hope to go back to Burundi was out of our mind after 1993 when the first Hutu President was assassinated. When Ndadaye was killed. Since then we started to hope for citizenship here’ (R4 2016). This sentiment was shared by most of the people with whom I spoke. A teacher at a vocational school confirmed that people’s attitudes towards the idea of permanently staying in Tanzania began to change at that time: ‘People started to lose their hope of going back to Burundi ... the imagination of repatriation progressively declined’ (R3 2016). He explained that since the assassination and the return of civil war in Burundi, people became more cautious about their plots and competition for securing farming plots has intensified. The perceived increasing value of land in the settlement became directly proportional to the increased insecurity in Burundi.

This link became even more pronounced in 2015 when the distribution of citizenship certificates coincided with the eruption of election violence in Burundi, followed by months of insecurity, economic decline, and food shortages across the country (Hovil 2016, 1). The people I met in the settlement frequently discussed the issue of land-related violence that repatriates faced upon their return to Burundi. Burundian law acknowledges a person as a rightful owner after cultivating a plot for more than 30 years, implying that many occupants now became legal owners (van Leeuwen 2010, 756). Nonetheless, in situations when the government felt that it served useful political purposes, it expelled those who occupied land and granted it to the repatriates. In other contexts, land sharing agreements were enforced. When the repatriates from the Old Settlements returned to Burundi, many of them became involved in land conflicts and became both victims and perpetrators of violence. The way in which former refugees think about land in the settlement is influenced by the struggles that their relatives and friends are facing in accessing land in Burundi. In other words, inhabitants of Ulyankulu conceptualize the value of their land in exile in an antagonistic relation to land in Burundi. Thus, insecurity and lack of land access are associated with Burundi, whereas lack of violent conflicts over land and the perceived abundance of land in the country are attributed to Tanzania.

Scholarly research on access to land in Burundi accentuates the intimate connection between a *specific piece of land* and people’s understanding of identity (van Leeuwen and Haartsen 2005; IRRI 2009; van Leeuwen 2010; Fransen and Kuschminder 2014).<sup>18</sup> Hovil (2009) underlines that for many in Burundi, identities are quite literally rooted in the soil. The extensive IRRI (2009) study of the repatriates brings attention to people’s desire to recover the land they fled from and where their ancestors were buried:

Land connects the current generation to their ancestors ... Land, and especially family land, is priceless; it is a gift you get from the ancestors and it is a gift you have for your descendants. Land keeps the extended family together and as such it is like a clan umbilical cord. (IRRI 2009, 37)

Apparently, when people were asked if they would accept an alternative piece of land, their responses were negative.

These findings become more problematic if we consider that the people on which the studies focus are part of the same families that opted for Tanzanian citizenship and secure access to land in Tanzania. It is vital to understand that people can have a strong sense of attachment to their land in Burundi and at the same time choose to remain in Tanzania. Due to the continuous instability in their country of origin and the lack of prospects for sustainable livelihood opportunities, many people decided to remain in Tanzania. Here, they strive to establish secure access to land (within and beyond the designated areas) and make claims to Tanzanian citizenship.

Acquiring and losing land combines symbolic and material concerns, and an extensive body of literature deals with the importance of land as both a symbolic factor and a site of production of belonging and identity (Shipton 1994, 2009; James 2007; Lentz 2013; Geschiere 2009). The

symbolic tends to be understood as stemming from an ancestral link with the land (or a narrative of one), which imbues specific plots of land with meaning significant for the community's identity. This trope underlies both the general debate on autochthony as well as the specific studies of an interrelation between soil and identity in Burundi. The case of Burundian refugees in Tanzania, however, destabilizes these assumptions. Not only has a migrant population been able to establish access to land in exile without making claims to ancestral links, but also new notions of the symbolic value of land have developed.

My findings indicate that many of the former Burundian refugees (especially the younger generation) would sell their land in the settlement and move to another part of the country if they only had *nguvu* (a Kiswahili word understood as strength or capital). Their attitude towards the land they occupy in the settlement defies the established understanding of material and symbolic values. Access to land has for them a symbolic value. It signifies the permission to remain in Tanzania – it is a proof of their citizenship in a material and tangible form. On the other hand, however, they do not have a spiritual and transcendental feeling towards *specific* plots of land in Ulyankulu, and if conditions were favourable, they would not mind settling in another region. In fact, many of the successful business people and tobacco farmers from Ulyankulu have moved to Tabora, Mwanza, Morogoro and other regions. Therefore, for the former refugees, land indeed bridges both the material and the symbolic notions of land, but it does so in a way specific to their migration experience. This way of thinking about the value of land is accentuated by people's experiences of mobility.

### ***Land transactions and mobility***

Migration to and from Ulyankulu figures as another important factor that has shaped how former refugees access and value their land in the settlement. Families that have access to larger plots of land always begin their narratives from the year 1978, when thousands of refugees were resettled in the Mishamo refugee settlement.<sup>19</sup> According to the settlement office's narrative, upon resettlement their plots were returned to the village government and then distributed equally to the inhabitants of the village. People's stories, however, reveal that usually neighbours of those who were resettled to Mishamo received their plots for a minor payment. As Richard, a market leader in Kaswa village explained: 'The floods took long ... After people left, you would give money to someone who lived nearby the flooded plot. In that way, you got land in these places, I did that myself' (R4 2016). The 'Mishamo move' marks the beginning of land transactions in the settlement and it accounts for many of the differences in plot sizes between the families. According to people's narratives, at that point, there was no competition for the land. The village government was still in custody of vacant plots, which were distributed to refugees as families grew.

The situation changed dramatically in 2008, which marks the second major wave of movement from the settlement, when over 5000 refugees repatriated to Burundi. This major migration juncture set in motion many overlapping land sales and transactions. As explained before, initially the TANCOSS agreement stipulated that upon naturalization refugees would be resettled from the settlements to other regions of Tanzania. According to John, a teacher at the secondary school in Ulyankulu:

The sales of land were happening before, but they significantly increased when the process of naturalization started. We were told we will be moved away from here and so people started selling. Also, people repatriated then and that opened possibilities for land sales. (R6 2016)

It is crucial to understand that none of the sales were permitted by the settlement's administration, although many officials were benefitting (and continue to benefit) from these transactions.

The land sales in the settlement follow various patterns, depending on the relationship between the buyer and the seller. Within families and among close friends, usually no agreements are signed and if money is paid for land the amount is very small. When the two parties are less familiar with each other, a standard procedure is followed. The buyer approaches the seller; they agree on a price, and afterwards they bring in witnesses and include the street leader (sometimes the village leader is informed as well, but usually the sales happen without informing him or her).<sup>20</sup> Next, an agreement is formulated, which is then copied and signed by all the parties involved. Despite the underlying legal regime that actively discourages people from developing a sense of land ownership in the settlement, refugees continue to engage in land transactions between themselves as well as with the incoming Tanzanians. Apart from the direct benefits of acquiring and selling land, these land transactions also have another function: they operate as a recognition by Tanzanians of former refugees' rights to land access.

### ***Migration of Tanzanians into the refugee settlement***

The implementation of TANCROSS policy gave rise to two migration channels. The first one, supervised by the UNHCR and sanctioned by both the Tanzanian and Burundian state, was the process of repatriation of the families and individuals who opted to return. The second, less anticipated and less structured, was the movement of Tanzanians into the settlement. Over the years, Tanzanians came into the settlement as civil servants, teachers, nurses, policemen, administrative officials, pastoralists and businessmen. Many retired and settled in Ulyankulu. However, they constituted a small percentage of the population. Following the implementation of TANCROSS, thousands of Tanzanians began to move into the area and today their number is estimated at around 12,000. This is only an estimate, as Tanzanians do not register with the settlement administration or the village government, and they usually settle clandestinely (although legally they are required to report to the Settlement Officer). Many come for business, claiming that money circulation is higher in the settlement than in any of the neighbouring towns, which creates profitable business opportunities. Moreover, according to the incoming Tanzanians, since the refugees obtained citizenship, they are more inclined to invest in improving their living conditions in Tanzania, which further increases their spending capacity. However, the key pull factor that motivated many Tanzanians to come to Ulyankulu was the availability of 'cheap' land.

Henry, a bicycle *fundi* (repairman) from Shinyanga town, told me one afternoon: 'I came here because I heard that fertile land was being sold cheaply' (R7 2015). We were sitting in the shadow of his house, drinking soda, as he explained how he bought the house and the land that we were looking at from a Burundian family that repatriated a few years ago. When he came to Ulyankulu in 2010, he first stayed at a hostel and the next day met with a man who helped him to locate refugee families interested in selling their land. People's stories indicate that while coming to the settlement they usually had friends or family members living there, or they used the services of a fixer – someone who knew the area and could help them to access land. In the process of buying land, the incoming Tanzanians would first approach the seller and then inform only the authorities at the lowest level – 10 cell<sup>21</sup> leaders or street leaders. An agreement, as described in the previous section, was usually formulated and signed. Neither the village leader nor the Settlement Officer were informed about these transactions. The willingness of Tanzanians to engage in land transactions in the settlements functions as an indication of their recognition of former refugees' customary rights to land based on shared cultural notions of the importance of long-term occupation and productive use of land.

I saw Henry again another day, and as we continued talking he exclaimed:

I regret I did not buy more land here, ha! We paid 200, 000 TZS in 2010,<sup>22</sup> and now this place is worth almost 1mln TZS!<sup>23</sup> But you see, we did not know if this naturalization would happen, if people would stay or go, it was very unclear. (R7 2015)

Clearly, the processes of migration from and to the settlements generated a surge in sales of land in Ulyankulu and consequently an increase of the monetary value of land. This increase cannot be easily pinned down to one explanatory factor. It is a result of a combination of variables, including: permission for the former refugees to permanently remain in the area, purchases of land by Tanzanian citizens, as well as the anticipated transformation of the settlement's governance system. Moreover, the TANSPLI plan has introduced many development promises into the popular imagination. An anticipation of development projects such as improved roads, a new bus stand, and a proper market structure all have an impact on the monetary value of land in the settlement.

In people's narratives, migration (to Mishamo, Burundi or inward migration of Tanzanians) functions as an important element in shaping how people talk about and conceptualize the value of land in the settlement. Beginning with the resettlement to Mishamo and the first land transactions, land in Tanzania was viewed as an important but still temporary resource. This has changed over the years as people's presence in Tanzania became more established and the prospects of repatriating to Burundi faded away. The rupture created by the implementation of TANCOS policy revealed the changes in people's thinking about land in Tanzania. From a temporary asset, the land was reconceptualized, and today figures as a resource for acquiring cash and securing future livelihoods, as well as a tangible expression of the newly obtained citizenship. This change is evident in the expansion of land sales and the emphasis on securing written agreements. Since former refugees obtained permission to remain in the settlements, and the population of Ulyankulu grew (due to internal growth and inwards migration of Tanzanians), market forces became more prominent in the settlement's land economies and the monetary value of land has increased.

### ***Land conflicts and conflict resolution dynamics***

It might seem counterintuitive to speak about land conflicts in the context of a case that is challenging the usual scholarly emphasis on discourses of autochthony. I want to argue, however, that in Ulyankulu, people's engagement in land disputes is a conscious way of gaining official recognition of one's access to land. As it is firmly established in the literature (Berry 1993; Moore 1978; Sikor and Lund 2009), struggles over land are as much about recognition of rights and institutional authority as they are about control of property *per se* (Lund and Boone 2013, 1). Following naturalization, former refugees are making efforts to gain recognition of their rights to land by the authorities. Rather than a sign of trouble, land conflicts and new conflict resolution dynamics in Ulyankulu are a way of making claims to land. Moreover, I suggest that people's active engagement in land disputes is evidence of an increasing sense of value that they assign to the land in the settlement.

Currently, despite naturalization, when land conflicts occur in the settlement, the Settlement Officer remains in charge of adjudicating all cases. In line with the established chain of authority, first a case in question is mediated on the local level through the 10 cell and street leaders. If the local authorities fail to reach a resolution, the case is brought to the village government and presented to the Land Committee. When the parties involved are unable to reach a compromise, the case is brought to the Settlement Officer. Next, he schedules a visit to survey the plots and makes the final judgement. According to the records provided by the local magistrate, the number of land disputes brought to the local court has increased by over 20% since naturalization. Moreover, since naturalization, many inhabitants of the settlement began to bring their cases to the Land

and Housing Tribunal in Tabora town and the relevant district authorities in Kaliua. Their cases, however, are dismissed, and people are repeatedly told that the land in the settlement is still governed by the Ministry of Home Affairs, and thus they should seek resolution at the office of the Settlement Officer. There is a continuous disjunction between having obtained Tanzanian citizenship and remaining excluded from national channels of land governance.

In Taba, one of the villages in Ulyankulu, I had an opportunity to witness a case being resolved by the Settlement Officer. The Officer was instructed to visit the village by the District Commissioner, who received a land conflict complaint at his office. The district Commissioner advised the Settlement Officer to make sure these types of issues did not reach the district office again. The Settlement Officer first met with the village chairman of Taba and reminded him multiple times that conflicts in the village, if unresolved, need to be brought to his office. Then, the case in question was brought by an elderly man who expanded his fields for cultivation into the land which allegedly belonged to a dispensary. When he was told to leave the area, he wrote a letter to the District Commissioner to ask for legal assistance. The man was very outspoken and complained that since he is a citizen now he has a right to do that. In response, he was told that although it might seem to him that he owns the land, it still belongs to the Ministry of Home Affairs. In a later conversation, the Settlement Officer explained: ‘People here believe they have land rights here but they don’t yet. But they don’t. It belongs to the government’ (R8 2016). Ultimately, the man was told to leave the land he was cultivating and claimed as his property. His case is representative of many similar disputes that occur frequently across the settlement.

Marx (2016) differentiates between land conflict related to distributional inequalities and conflict emerging from the inherent nature of property rights. His focus is on the difference between conflict understood as a (re)distributional struggle over (already) defined property rights and conflict that occurs because of the inherent, contested nature of property rights themselves (Marx 2016, 2779). The idea that the nature of property rights can be a source of conflict is derived from a recognition that property rights are relational, constructed, contingent on social context and must be continually ‘produced’ (Marx 2016, 2780). These insights illuminate the situation in Ulyankulu, where the inherent insecurity of property rights remains at the core of many conflicts.

Despite the inherent insecurity of their rights, former refugees continue to engage in land disputes, challenge Settlement Officers’ authority, and seek conflict resolution at the district and regional level. These are all disruptive actions through which the new citizens assert their rights to land against the state. Their engagement in these practices implies that people have a strong sense of entitlement to the land in the settlement. This sense of entitlement is further supported by the willingness of incoming Tanzanians to engage in land transactions with the former refugees. Therefore, on the one hand, former Burundian refugees view land in Ulyankulu as an essential source of livelihood to which they feel they have a right due to their long-term occupancy, cultivation, and the recent process of naturalization. On the other hand, however, they are aware of the adverse *de jure* regulations that still govern the area, and a strong sense of insecurity continues to dominate daily conversations about land access in the settlement.

## Conclusion

The logic of autochthony, which holds that people can only claim belonging and ownership in places where they can demonstrate some ancestral affiliation, dominates the existing literature on the nexus of land and migration. This article challenges this paradigm by exploring how Burundian refugees in Tanzania establish access to land and how the value they attach to the land has changed over time. Initially, the land was perceived as an important, but

temporary asset. Over time, the value of land in Ulyankulu was reconceptualized, and today land figures as a key resource for acquiring cash and securing future livelihoods, as well as a tangible expression of the newly obtained citizenship. Therefore, what is observed is a process, where the following naturalization, former refugees are trying to convert land access, which they have enjoyed for decades, into land rights. The reasons for this are partly pragmatic, as land is their main source of livelihood, and partly symbolic, because by asserting rights to land access, inhabitants of Ulyankulu are seeking recognition of their new citizenship rights in the fullest sense.

As Malkki has shown, in the 1980s, a desire for naturalization was absent from the collective narratives of Burundian refugees in Tanzania and asserting access to land was not their primary concern (Malkki 1995). On the contrary, at that time, maintaining a refugee identity and devising plans for a collective return to the ‘homeland’ were prioritized. This was in line with constructing a deterritorialized Hutu identity, which necessitated remaining in a state of purity, isolation and marginality. According to Malkki (1992, 35), refugees extracted meaning and power from the social location they inhabited, and an insistence on retaining the refugee status functioned as a symbol of the ultimate temporariness of exile. However, as the prospects for a return to Burundi faded away, and citizenship in Tanzania became accessible, people’s attitude towards access to land in exile began to transform. In that process, a more pragmatic perspective on land in the settlement has developed that disrupts the normative assumptions about this refugee population. Today, instead of subverting the national categories, former Burundian refugees devise strategies for securing rights to land and reinventing their place in Tanzania as citizens.

Although the scale of the process of naturalization in Tanzania was unique, refugees’ practices and strategies of accessing land are not,<sup>24</sup> and they require more rigorous academic attention. Considering that the majority of the refugees in the region rely on subsistence farming, and that land access remains a key determinant for successful local integration, developing an understanding of how refugees access and value land is necessary. Drawing on the data collected, this article identified processes and variables that influence the dynamics of accessing land in a migratory context. These elements include temporality and time spent in exile; security and economic situation in the country of origin; mobility to and from the area in question; structure of local governance; and mechanisms of land conflict resolution. The processes and markers of establishing and valuing access to land in exile will differ from context to context; however, attention to these elements can provide an entry point into further debates and comparative studies.

### **Acknowledgements**

I would like to thank Issaya Mtasha, Daniel Msonge, and Benjamin Dickson for outstanding research assistance. The professional support and emotional encouragement received from them over the years cannot be emphasized enough. I would also like to thank Lotte Meinart and Liz Watson for their insights and feedback on the early drafts of this article.

### **Disclosure statement**

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.

### **Funding**

The fieldwork for this project has been made possible thanks to Excellence in European Doctoral Education (ExEDE) scholarship and was conducted as part of doctoral work.

## Notes

1. Over time these three settlements became known as ‘The Old Settlements’.
2. Malkki’s fieldwork was conducted in 1985 and the book includes also insights from later correspondence with the informants.
3. For detailed account of what aspects motivated people’s choice between naturalization and repatriation see Hovil and Kweka (2008).
4. For more details on the political negotiations behind the naturalization scheme see Milner (2013, 2014).
5. This trend has already been observed by Daley (1989) and it has intensified since.
6. The interviews with senior government officials and international actors were conducted in English. The interviews in the settlements were conducted by myself in Kiswahili. Interviews in Kirundi were conducted with support of a local research assistant.
7. During the three stages of fieldwork, I have lived in a local boarding school, with a host family and in a rented room on the premises of a Catholic church.
8. Exceptions include for example the case of Angolans in Zambia (see Bakewell 2002); Guatemalans in Mexico (Long 2013), and studies of local integration of various refugee groups in Uganda (Dryden-Peterson and Hovil 2004).
9. I use the word *access* as denoting *all* possible means by which a person is able to benefit from land (Ribot and Peluso 2003).
10. Their case studies include the Democratic Republic of Congo, Côte d’Ivoire, Liberia, and Kenya.
11. There is a limited, though influential, body of literature on Burundian refugees in Tanzania including the work of Malkki (1995), Rose (2001) and Turner (2010).
12. Van Hoyweghen (2001, 16–17) puts forward an argument that the resettlement villages constructed in the mid-1960s for Tutsi refugees from Rwanda and later in 1972 for Hutu refugees from Burundi functioned as a pilot project for the *Ujamaa* villagisation programme launched in 1974.
13. In it important to highlight that this is not the case in other refugee hosting locations in Tanzania. For example, contestations over alienation of land for refugee camps have emerged in 2017 around the expanding Nyaragusu camp in Western Tanzania, Kigoma region.
14. The settlement office in Ulyankulu holds a registry that lists all the plots distributed in 1970s. The registry, however, was never updated, and it does not include any of the later land transfers.
15. The use of terminology has changed from Settlement Commandant to Settlement Officer in 1998 Refugee Act. In Kiswahili, however, it remained the same, and people refer to the Settlement Officer as *Mkuu wa Makazi* or just *Mku* (literally the head of the settlement or simply head).
16. It is important to note that claims to land are also often insecure for Tanzanians in other parts of the country (Askew et al 2013). Where former refugees’ situation differs is that their land is not recognised under the Village Land Act and they do not even have customary village land ownership.
17. Tanzania’s Land Act classifies land as: (1) reserved land; (2) village land; and (3) general land. Tenure types and development regulations depend on the category under which the land falls.
18. It is important to highlight that these studies were written recently and are framed by the discourse of post-conflict reconstruction. For 40 years now no significant research has been done on customary land law, tenure security and local land management outside conflict situations in the Burundian context (Kohlhagen 2011)
19. Another of the three settlements housing the group of 1972 Burundian refugees. It is located in Mpanda District, Rukwa Region.
20. Ten cell (10 household) and street leaders are the lowest authority in the Tanzanian local government structures
21. Ten cell (10 household) leaders are the lowest authority in the Tanzanian local government structure.
22. Approximately 147 USD
23. Approximately 455 USD
24. e.g. Liberian and Sierra Leonean refugees in Guinea (Fielden 2008), Liberian refugees in Ghana (Dick 2002), or South Sudanese refugees in Uganda (Kaiser 2006).

## References

- Abrahams, R. G. 1981. *The Nyamwezi Today: A Tanzanian People in the 1970s*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.
- Armstrong, A. 1991. “Resource Frontiers and Regional Development: The Role of Refugee Settlement in Tanzania.” *Habitat International* 15 (1): 69–85.



- Bakewell, O. 2000. "Repatriation and Self-Settled Refugees in Zambia: Bringing Solutions to the Wrong Problems." *Journal of Refugee Studies* 13 (4): 356–373.
- Berry, S. 1993. *No Condition is Permanent : The Social Dynamics of Agrarian Change in sub-Saharan Africa*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Boone, C. 2015. "Land Tenure Regimes and State Structure in Rural Africa: Implications for Forms of Resistance to Large-scale Land Acquisitions by Outsiders." *Journal of Contemporary African Studies* 33 (2): 1–20.
- Bøås, M., and K. C. Dunn. 2013. *Politics of Origin in Africa: Autochthony, Citizenship and Conflict*. Edited by K. C. Dunn. London: Zed Books.
- Ceuppens, Bambi, and Peter Geschiere. 2005. "Autochthony: Local or Global? New Modes in the Struggle Over Citizenship and Belonging in Africa and Europe." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 34: 385–407.
- Chaulia, S. S. 2003. "The Politics of Refugee Hosting in Tanzania: From Open Door to Unsustainability, Insecurity and Receding Receptivity." *Journal of Refugee Studies* 16 (2): 147–166.
- Chimni, B. 2004. "From Resettlement to Involuntary Repatriation: Towards a Critical History of Durable Solutions to Refugee Problems." *Refugee Survey Quarterly* 23 (3): 55–73.
- Comaroff, J., and L. Comaroff. 2001. "Naturing the Nation: Aliens, Apocalypse and the Postcolonial State." *Journal of Southern African Studies* 27 (3): 627–651.
- Daley, P. 1989. "Refugees and Underdevelopment in Africa: The Case of Burundi Refugees in Tanzania." DPhil thesis, Oxford University.
- Daley, P. 2007. "The Burundi Peace Negotiations: An African Experience of Peace-making." *Review of African Political Economy* 34 (112): 333–352.
- Daley, P. 2013. "Refugees, IDPs and Citizenship Rights: The Perils of Humanitarianism in the African Great Lakes region." *Third World Quarterly* 34 (5): 893–912.
- Dick, S. 2002. *Responding to Protracted Refugee Situations: A Case Study Of Liberian Refugees in Ghana*. Evaluation and Policy Analysis Unit (EPAU). Geneva: UNHCR.
- Dryden-Peterson, S., and L. Hovil. 2004. "A Remaining Hope for Durable Solutions: Local Integration of Refugees and their Hosts in the Case of Uganda." *Refuge* 22, 26–38.
- Espeland, R. 2011. "Autochthony, rumor dynamics, and communal violence in Western Uganda." *Social Analysis* 55 (3): 18.
- Fielden, A. 2008. "Local integration: An Under-Reported Solution to Protracted Refugee Situations". *New Issues in Refugee Research*, Research Paper No. 158, Geneva: UNHCR.
- Fransen, S., and K. Kuschminder. 2014. "Lessons Learned from Refugee Return Settlement Policies: A Case Study on Burundi's Rural Integrated Villages." *Refugee Survey Quarterly* 33 (1): 59–76.
- Geschiere, P. 2009. *The Perils of Belonging : Autochthony, Citizenship, and Exclusion in Africa and Europe*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Geschiere, P. 2011. "Autochthony, Citizenship, and Exclusion – Paradoxes in the Politics of Belonging in Africa and Europe.(Symposium)." *Indiana Journal of Global Legal Studies* 18 (1): 321.
- Geschiere, P., and F. Nyamnjoh. 2000. "Capitalism and Autochthony: The Seesaw of Mobility and Belonging." *Public Culture* 12 (2): 423–452.
- Government of the United Republic of Tanzania. 1966. *Refugees (Control) Act*, 1965, Dar es Salaam.
- Government of the United Republic of Tanzania. 1998. *The Refugees Act*, 1998, Dar es Salaam.
- Government of the United Republic of Tanzania. 2002. *The Forest Act*, 2002, Dar es Salaam.
- Government of the United Republic of Tanzania. 2016. Tanzania Strategy for Local Integration Programme for the New Citizens (TANSPLI) [draft]. Unpublished.
- Hovil, L. 2009. "Citizenship and Land: A Potent Relationship." *African Arguments*. Accessed March 31, 2016. <http://africanarguments.org/2009/12/14/citizenship-and-land-a-potent-relationship/>.
- Hovil, L. 2016. *Refugees, Conflict and the Search for Belonging*. Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- Hovil, L., and O. Kweka. 2008. "Going Home or Staying Home? Ending Displacement for Burundian Refugees in Tanzania." Citizenship and Forced Migration in the Great Lakes Region Working Paper 1.
- Hyden, G. 1980. *Beyond Ujamaa in Tanzania: Underdevelopment and an Uncaptured Peasantry*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- International Refugee Rights Initiative (IRRI). 2009. "Two People Can't Share the Same Pair of Shoes: Citizenship, Land and the Return of Refugees to Burundi." Citizenship and Forced Migration in the Great Lakes Region, Working Paper No. (2).
- IRIN. 2014. "Tanzania's New Citizens to Get Land, Voting Rights". Accessed March 31, 2016. <http://www.irinnews.org/report/100725/tanzania%E2%80%99s-new-citizens-get-land-voting-rights>.

- Jackson, S. 2006. "Sons of Which Soil? The Language and Politics of Autochthony in Eastern D.R. Congo." *African Studies Review* 49 (2): 95–123.
- Jacobsen, K. 2001. "The Forgotten Solution: Local Integration for Refugees in Developing Countries." *New Issues in Refugee Research* (45).
- James, D. 2007. *Gaining Ground? 'Rights' and 'Property' in South African Land Reform*. New York, NY: Routledge-Cavendish.
- Kaiser, T. 2006. "Between a Camp and a Hard Place: Rights, Livelihood and Experiences of the Local Settlement System for Long-Term Refugees in Uganda." *The Journal of Modern African Studies* 44: 597–621.
- Kibreab, G. 1999. "Revisiting the Debate on People, Place, Identity and Displacement." *Journal of Refugee Studies* 12 (4): 384–410.
- Kibreab, G. 2003. "Citizenship Rights and Repatriation of Refugees." *International Migration Review* 37 (1): 24–73.
- Kohlhagen, D. 2011. "In Quest of Legitimacy: Changes in Land Law and Legal Reform." In *Natural Resources and Local Livelihoods in the Great Lakes Region of Africa*, edited by A. Ansoms and S. Marysse, 83–103. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kweka, O. L. 2007. "The Impact Of Structural Adjustment Program on the Refugee Policy in Tanzania: Implications for Survival Strategies of Burundian Refugees in Camps." PhD, University of Minnesota.
- Lemarchand, R. 1996. *Burundi: Ethnic Conflict and Genocide*. New ed. Cambridge: Woodrow Wilson Center Press and Cambridge University Press.
- Lentz, C. 2013. *Land, Mobility, and Belonging in West Africa*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Li, T. 2014. "What is land? Assembling a Resource for Global Investment." *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 39 (4): 589–602.
- Long, K. 2013. "When Refugees Stopped Being Migrants: Movement, Labour and Humanitarian Protection." *Migration Studies* 1 (1): 4–26.
- Lund, C., and C. Boone. 2013. "Introduction: Land Politics in Africa – Constituting authority over territory, property and persons." *Africa* 83 (1): 1–13.
- Malkki, L. 1992. "National Geographic: The Rooting of Peoples and the Territorialization of National Identity Among Scholars and Refugees." *Cultural Anthropology* 7 (1): 24–44.
- Malkki, L. H. 1995. *Purity and Exile: Violence, Memory, and National Cosmology among Hutu Refugees in Tanzania*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Manby, B. 2009. *Struggles for Citizenship in Africa*. London: Zed Books.
- Marx, C. 2016. "Extending the Analysis of Urban Land Conflict: An Example from Johannesburg." *Urban Studies* 53 (13): 2779–2795.
- Milner, J. 2013. "Two Steps Forward, One Step Back: Understanding the Shifting Politics of Refugee Policy in Tanzania." *New Issues in Refugee Research*, Research Paper No. 255.
- Milner, J. 2014. "Can Global Refugee Policy Leverage Durable Solutions? Lessons from Tanzania's Naturalization of Burundian refugees." *Journal of Refugee Studies* 27 (4): 553–573.
- Moore, S. F. 1978. *Law as Process: An Anthropological Approach*. London: Routledge.
- Ribot, J. C., and N. L. Peluso. 2003. "A Theory of Access." *Rural Sociology* 68 (2): 153–181.
- Rose, C. 1994. *Property and Persuasion: Essays on the History, Theory, and Rhetoric of Ownership*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- SA3 Team. 2007. *Study of Tanzania's Old Settlements Hosting the 1972 Refugees From Burundi*. Dar es Salaam: SA3 Team.
- Shipton. 1994. "Land and Culture in Tropical Africa – Soils, Symbols, and the Metaphysics of the Mundane." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 23: 347–377.
- Shipton, P. 2009. *Mortgaging the Ancestors: Ideologies of Attachment in Africa*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Sikor, T., and C. Lund. 2009. "Access and Property: A Question of Power and Authority." *Development and Change* 40 (1): 1–22.
- Sommers, M. 2001. *Fear in Bongoland: Burundi Refugees in Urban Tanzania*. New York: Berghahn Books.
- Tanganyika Christian Refugee Service. 1985. The Annual Report. Unpublished.
- Tanganyika Christian Refugee Service. 2009. Ulyankulu Settlement Annual Report for the Year. Unpublished.
- Tanganyika Christian Refugee Service. 2012. The Old Settlements Project. Unpublished.
- Turner, S. 2010. *Politics of Innocence: Hutu Identity, Conflict, and Camp Life*. New York: Berghahn Books.
- Uvin, P. 2009. *Life After Violence: a People's Story of Burundi*. London: Zed.

- Van Hoyweghen, S. 2001. "Mobility, Territoriality and Sovereignty in Post-Colonial Tanzania." *New Issues in Refugee Research*. Working Paper No. 49.
- van Leeuwen, M. 2010. "Crisis or Continuity? Framing Land Disputes and Local Conflict Resolution in Burundi: Framing Land Disputes and Local Conflict Resolution in Burundi." *Land Use Policy* 27 (3): 753–762.
- van Leeuwen, M., and L. Haartsen. 2005. *Land Disputes and Local Conflict Resolution Mechanisms in Burundi*. Bujumbura: CED-Caritas.

### Interviews cited

Code	Respondent	Place	Date
R1	Settlement Officer	Ulyankulu	7/11/2016
R2	Former TCRS employee	Dar es Salaam	14/4/2014
R3	Teacher and a farmer	Ulyankulu	7/10/2016
R4	Elderly couple	Ulyankulu	25/10/2016
R5	Market leader	Ulyankulu	2/8/2016
R6	Teacher	Ulyankulu	25/10/2016
R7	Repairman	Ulyankulu	12/5/2015
R8	Settlement Officer	Ulyankulu	19/10/2016
R9	Fisherman	Tabora	11/11/2016