



CoRMSA

**Consortium for
Refugees and Migrants
in South Africa**

**Submission by the Consortium for Refugees and Migrants in
South Africa (CoRMSA) and Lawyers for Human Rights (LHR)
to the Special Rapporteur on Refugees, Asylum Seekers, IDPs
and Migrants at the 45th Ordinary Session of the African
Commission on Human and People's Rights**

May 2009



Introduction

Migration to South Africa has a long history dating far beyond South Africa's democracy of 1994. With the advent of a democracy, the new government was quickly forced to manage new challenges posed by migration including refugee flows from then war-torn Mozambique. South Africa's passed its first refugee legislation in 1998 and replaced the restrictive Aliens Control Act with the Immigration Act of 2002. As a result, policy and implementation around migration and refugee protection is relatively new.

Migration offers a valuable tool to reach the goals the South African government has set, of increased regional integration, cooperation and development. Yet in South Africa, the benefits of migration are consistently overshadowed by political concerns and administrative fears of the impacts of planning for a greater number of people.

Recent events regarding aspects of migration in South Africa including xenophobia have made international headlines. They were also the subject of discussion at the 43rd Ordinary Session of the African Commission on Human and People's Rights held in Swaziland in May 2008. This report intends to raise some concerns for the attention of the Commission, correct some misperceptions, and help to provide a framework for greater cooperation between the African Commission and the Government of the Republic of South Africa to assist in ensuring the security of all in South Africa, including non-nationals. This shadow report is also a response to the progress report made by the South Africa government to the African Peer Review Mechanism in January 2009. It highlights continuing areas of concern and issues that the government has not addressed adequately in its report, or in practice.

This submission will focus on three areas of key concern regarding migration to South Africa: xenophobia, Zimbabwean migration to South Africa and the detention of non-nationals in South Africa. This report also requests the Special Rapporteur to urgently reschedule his visit to South Africa and engage with the South African government on the issues of concern raised.

1. Xenophobia in South Africa

It has been one year since the xenophobic violence which started on 11th May 2008 in Alexandra in Johannesburg and spread across the country. The violence resulted in 62 deaths, hundreds being injured and over one hundred thousand people being displaced in the worst violence South Africa has experienced since the 1994 elections. Since the violence, very little has been done to prevent future attacks from taking place. Threats of violence against non-nationals in some poorer communities are common and attacks on non-nationals traders and business owners continue across the country. South Africa's progress report to the African Peer Review Mechanism in January 2009 provides a shallow analysis of the causes of the xenophobic violence and provides no insights as to the mechanisms it is to put in place to prevent further violence. It is for this reason that this report brings the ongoing threat posed by xenophobia to the attention of the Special Rapporteur.

At the 43rd Ordinary Session of the African Commission on Human and People's Rights held in Ezulwini, Kingdom of Swaziland in May 2008, the African Commission on Human and People's Rights passed Resolution 131 (XXXIII) 08 (Resolution on the Situation of Migrants in South Africa). The resolution:

1. Condemns the attacks and violence perpetrated against migrants in various townships in South Africa.
2. Calls on the South African government to investigate and prosecute those responsible for the attacks, and to institute further measures to ensure the protection of foreign migrants in South Africa, and their property.
3. Urges the South African government to which the African Commission had sought authorization for the Special Rapporteur to conduct a fact finding mission on the situation of migrants in that country, to grant the said authorization.

The South Africa government has not conducted through investigations of those who instigated and fueled the attacks and those facing charges in connection with the violence appear to be only a fraction of those who participated. In addition, no new measures have been announced or developed to protect non-nationals in the country.

The 2008 Violence

Despite suggestions to the contrary, the 2008 violence was not wholly unexpected. Non-nationals have long been the targets of xenophobic violence. The 2008 attacks simply marked a difference in scale, for which the earlier incidents served as a warning. A list of xenophobic attacks on non-nationals since 1994 is attached as an appendix to this submission. The government consistently failed to respond to these attacks in any effective manner, or in any manner whatsoever. Rather, in many cases non-nationals targeted by xenophobic violence have later alleged that police refused to intervene and provide protection during the violence and it has largely been left to non-government actors to assist those displaced by violence. One notable exception was the high-profile intervention of the Office of the Premier of the Western Cape alongside non-governmental actors following xenophobic violence in Masiphumelele near Cape Town in 2006.

While the 2008 attacks were not wholly unexpected or unusual, their scope was unprecedented as they spread across Gauteng and then other parts of South Africa. In March of 2008, mob attacks on non-nationals had spread across Pretoria displacing people from areas such as Itireleng, Atteridgeville, Mamelodi and Soshanguve. The extent of the violence caused the Mayor of Pretoria to intervene and meet with community members to try to prevent further violence.

The violence of May 2008 spread rapidly across Gauteng province and then to six more of the country's nine provinces. The South African National Defence Force was eventually deployed and assisted in bringing the violence under control but not before at least 62 people were dead, over a hundred thousand displaced and hundreds of businesses looted and destroyed.

Responses to the Violence

The Report of Activities for the Intersession period from May to November 2008 by the Special Rapporteur on Refugees, Asylum Seekers, IDPs and Migrants commends the South African authorities for their quick response to the violence. In truth, the response was mixed. Some police forces did commendable work in trying to bring the violence under control. But the restructuring of the Crime Combating Units – trained in public order policing - in 2006 made it difficult to mobilise the necessary resources effectively. Moreover, some police officers openly encouraged looting of property owned by non-

nationals and refused to prevent the mobs from continuing their attacks rather than seeking to bring the situation under control. The South African government has failed to address these failings by the police in order to ensure a more effective response in the event of future violence.

When thousands of non-nationals sought shelter at police stations, government was slow to respond and instead it was civil society and private citizens that provided immediate relief in the form of food and blankets. On the positive side, the Minister of Home Affairs decided not to deport displaced persons who were without legal documentation. While those who sought shelter at the Atteridgeville police station following the March 2008 violence were arrested and deported, the Minister provided temporary legal status in the form of a permit issued in terms of Section 31(2)(b) of the Immigration Act to those displaced by the May violence.

Unfortunately, the Department of Home Affairs (DHA) did not adequately communicate the terms of the new permits. As a result, many recognised refugees and asylum seekers with legal documentation worried that the new permits would take away their existing rights and refused to register for the new permits. Because the Gauteng Provincial Government required possession of a permit for access to the temporary safe sites established to accommodate the thousands of displaced non-nationals, those who had not registered were expelled from the sites. The Government also attempted to deport these individuals, a direct violation of the international *non-refoulement* principle.

Following the setting up of temporary safe sites for the displaced, concerns were immediately raised about the standards of humanitarian service provision in the sites. These concerns were the subject of court action in the Western Cape province where a civil society organisation argued for the standards in camps to be in line with international SPHERE standards.

Despite numerous statements from government officials asserting government's role in reintegrating those displaced by the violence back into society, the Gauteng Provincial Government decided at the end of July to close the camps within two weeks, leaving the 6 000 residents with no place of safety. Efforts by the Consortium for Refugees and Migrants in South Africa (CoRMSA) to negotiate with the Gauteng Provincial Government and pressure from the South Africa Parliament to extend the deadline for the closure of the camps were not successful and CoRMSA took the matter to South Africa's highest court, the Constitutional Court. CoRMSA asked the court to compel the Gauteng Provincial Government to develop a comprehensive reintegration strategy.

Although the Court compelled the disputing parties to engage meaningfully to address the various concerns, the Gauteng Provincial Government refused to do so. The Constitutional Court ruled that the camps in Gauteng were to remain open until further notice while legal arguments continued. In direct contravention of the Constitutional Court ruling, the Gauteng Provincial Government closed the camps on 30th September, leaving thousands of non-nationals homeless.

Investigations

Despite the widespread condemnations of the violence from various leaders across the country, little has been done in to prevent further attacks from taking place. The government has failed both to investigate the root causes of the violence and to hold

those responsible accountable. The National Prosecuting Authority reported in March 2009 that 1627 suspects were initially arrested resulting in 469 cases. Of these cases only 70 had then been finalized with a guilty verdict, 35 with a not guilty verdict, 208 cases had been withdrawn and 156 cases remained outstanding. The most common charges were public violence, assault and housebreaking which indicate that those facing charges were simply those arrested on the scene rather than the instigators of the violence. There has therefore been no accountability for many of the instigators and perpetrators.

Research conducted by the Forced Migration Studies Programme of the University of the Witwatersrand indicates that local leaders were responsible for instigating violence in many of the areas where violence occurred. Such local leaders include ward councilors, business leaders, and self-appointed 'community leaders'. These individuals have faced no legal action stemming from their actions and remain in leadership positions.

The lack of investigations into those responsible for the violence as well as the low number of arrests and successful prosecutions means that there is little accountability for those who committed or instigated the xenophobic violence. This directly contravenes Point 2 of Resolution 131 (XXXIII) 08 and increases the chances of further violence.

Protection

South Africa's First Periodic Report on the African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights in 2001 acknowledged that "foreigners are disproportionately victims of crime... [as] local criminals take advantage of the often vulnerable and insecure status of migrants and perceive them as soft targets."¹ Yet since then, no strategies have been developed by police to counter such vulnerability and ensure the protection of the most vulnerable and marginalised groups in South Africa.

Little has also been done to address the root causes of the violence since the attacks. As a result, non-nationals in South Africa find themselves facing similar if not increased risks of violence. Since the 2008 violence, attacks on individual non-nationals living in poorer communities have continued unchecked and threats of violence targeting non-nationals on a larger scale have still occurred. In January 2009, a mob allegedly led by a ward councilor forced two non-nationals to jump to their deaths from a high-rise building in Durban. Further threats of violence have been made in Diepsloot, Atteridgeville, Erasmia, Potchefstroom and elsewhere since the 2008 violence.

No government institution has taken direct responsibility for ensuring that such attacks do not reoccur and little is being done by government to address tensions towards non-nationals. No department is currently taking responsibility for addressing tensions in communities and preventing the outbreak of violence. Instead it is largely left to the police to intervene yet police intervention is unlikely to address the root causes of conflict. Politicians have intervened in some instances but this is usually when an incident of violence has been given extensive media coverage.

¹ Republic of South Africa. 2001. *First Periodic Report on the African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights*.

The Counter-Xenophobia Unit of the DHA has made efforts to intervene when it has received reports of threatened violence. Unfortunately, these efforts have been severely limited by the fact that it has a staff of only six people. The Counter-Xenophobia Unit also has been limited by its mandate, as some within the DHA have argued that its role extends only to xenophobic attitudes within government rather than to intervening in violence in communities.

There is currently no comprehensive incident monitoring or reporting mechanism to track trends in violence against non-nationals. In addition, many non-nationals are unable to seek protection from the police. Often, members of the police force themselves harass non-nationals over their immigration status, both as a result of xenophobia and corruption. Illegal practices by the police in some areas include arresting those with legal documentation on charges of 'loitering' to induce a bribe.

Additionally, a number of non-nationals have reported being refused assistance on the basis of their non-national status when they approach a police station. Where this occurs, it makes it extremely unlikely that members of the police who harbour such prejudice towards non-nationals can be trusted with effectively providing protection for non-nationals. Little is currently being done to address this.

2. Zimbabwean Nationals in South Africa

The ongoing humanitarian crisis in Zimbabwe has resulted in large migration flows to South Africa. The government has been slow to respond to the challenges posed by the sudden increase in Zimbabwean migration, fueling xenophobic sentiment as media reports show pictures of Zimbabweans crossing the border fence illegally and grossly exaggerate the numbers of Zimbabwean nationals in the country.

Legal Documentation

Until recently, no additional measures were provided to cater for the legal status needs of Zimbabwean nationals. Most relied on an already overwhelmed asylum system to obtain legal status. As a result, the office in Johannesburg, equipped to accept 350 new applications a day, faced a queues of around 5000 applicants per day. The office's lack of capacity to process all these new applications meant that many remained undocumented and thus vulnerable to arrest and deportation.

The lack of legal status for many Zimbabweans also exposed them to other risks including labour exploitation and physical and sexual violence. With many too afraid to report abuses to the relevant authorities for fear of being arrested and deported, a culture of impunity developed with regards to the abuse of undocumented migrants in the country. During the xenophobic violence of 2008, many sought to legitimize their actions by stating that the victims of the attacks 'were illegally in the country anyway' (although no efforts were made by the perpetrators to determine their victims' immigration status beforehand).

The DHA in April 2009 announced a plan to issue Zimbabwean nationals in South Africa with a temporary immigration status document provided in terms of Section 31(2)(b) of the Immigration Act. This document will provide legal status, the right to work and study and rights to access basic services such as primary health care. It is a welcome response from the DHA as this has been called for since 2007 by a variety of actors

including CoRMSA, Human Rights Watch and the United Nations High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR). The new permit has not yet been implemented and but indications from DHA are that the permit will be implemented shortly.

Assistance to Vulnerable Zimbabwean Nationals

The government has done little to respond to the challenges brought about by the increase in Zimbabwean migration and the needs of a potentially vulnerable population. Instead there seems to be a widespread perception by government departments that the welfare of non-nationals in South Africa is the responsibility of civil society. Yet, in terms of the provisions of the South African Constitution, this is not the case.

Border Regions

In Musina near the border post of Beitbridge, thousands of Zimbabweans began to congregate in a dirt parking lot outside the temporary Refugee Reception Office established at the Musina Showgrounds. The threat of arrest if they moved beyond 100 metres from the site resulted in many sleeping on the ground at the site which did not have the necessary infrastructure to cater for their needs. Doctors without Borders (MSF) warned of the risks of cholera and other diseases and established several mobile clinics to assist those who were confined to the site and thus unable to access services at the local hospital. When cholera broke out, intervention efforts from government concentrated on access to treatment but did not address the risk factors where the living conditions of around 4 000 Zimbabwean nationals at the Showgrounds vastly exacerbated their risks of contracting the disease.

In February 2009, CoRMSA submitted a report to various department of the South African government listing severe human rights challenges to Zimbabwean nationals in the area such as sexual or gender-based violence (SGBV), lack of access to health care, lack of access to food, extremely poor living conditions and threats to general security of person. Efforts by some departments to develop a coordinated intervention were frustrated by the forcible closing of the Showgrounds site by the police and the dispersal of those who had stayed at the site. The effect was that although the problem became less visible and thus posed less of a political risk, the challenges facing Zimbabwean nationals remained as acute.

There has been recent development in Musina with the local municipality displaying a willingness to allow non-governmental actors to provide some accommodation for Zimbabwean nationals in the area. As a result, basic shelter has been established for a small number of people at three churches but the numbers assisted are minimal compared to the needs and the shelter conditions remain far below acceptable humanitarian standards.

Urban Areas

Equally, in urban areas there has been no effective intervention to assist Zimbabwean nationals with basic humanitarian needs despite the challenges becoming more visible and posing political challenges. Some in government has justified their lack of intervention given the acute needs of many South Africans but no intervention programmes have been designed to address the needs of both poor South Africans and Zimbabwean nationals.

In Johannesburg, the Central Methodist Church has provided shelter for thousands of Zimbabwean nationals for more than two years. Whilst conditions in the church are far from ideal, the lack of an alternative means many resort to seeking shelter there. Whilst many poorer South Africans find accommodation in informal settlements, the threat of violence against non-nationals means that many do not feel safe establishing shelter in such areas.

In March 2009, shelter at the Central Methodist Church became the subject of political debate as, following the closure of the Musina Showgrounds, large numbers of Zimbabwean nationals migrated to Johannesburg and resorted to sleeping outside the Church as it was already too full to accommodate them. A local legal firm took government departments to court and this prompted government to finally look to intervene in the shelter crisis that had already been in crisis state for more than two years. UNHCR and a number of non-governmental actors are currently working with local government departments to assist a small number of the most vulnerable people be relocated from the Church.

In other cities, similar crises have emerged as the lack of intervention from government has resulted in Zimbabweans and other non-nationals seeking assistance from non-governmental actors that simply do not have the capacity to cater for the large needs. In Cape Town, the extent of the crisis was exposed in 2007 when a Zimbabwean asylum seeker waiting in the queue at the DHA Refugee Reception Office died of starvation after not being able to access food for an extended period. Civil society actors have stepped up efforts to provide assistance but the ongoing lack of a coordinated response from the government of South Africa to assist vulnerable Zimbabweans remains of critical concern.

3. Detention of Non-Nationals

Detention of non-nationals remains one of the major concerns to human rights organisations in South Africa. Currently two facilities are the primary detention facilities used to house detainees prior to deportation – the Lindela Repatriation Centre outside Johannesburg, and the Musina detention facility, near the Zimbabwean border. Both are the subject of major human rights concerns and require ongoing monitoring. The Musina detention facility is also the subject of litigation by Lawyers for Human Rights (LHR).

Lindela Repatriation Centre

There is currently no regular monitoring of the conditions at the Lindela Repatriation Facility. CoRMSA and its members are in discussions with the South African Human Rights Commission to begin regular monitoring as provided for in its mandate. LHR visits the facility on a weekly basis in order to consult with its clients.

The report of the Special Rapporteur on Prisons and Conditions of Detention in Africa dated June 2004 lists a number of concerns regarding conditions in the Lindela Repatriation Centre. The Special Rapporteur's report notes that:

At the Lindela Repatriation Center it was noticed that sufficient safeguards still needed to be put in place to avoid the unnecessary deprivation of the rights of persons legally in the country, especially South African citizens. Some South

Africans with South African passports were found detained in the facilities. There were other detainees who claimed to have valid documents but were not in possession of them at the time of arrest and did not have persons to contact to bring those documents. The authorities should be in a position to assist such persons to collect their documents from wherever they have kept them.

Detainees continue to be held without due process, verification of status, or access to immigration officers in order to make asylum applications. The DHA also has begun to continue detaining arrested asylum seekers until their applications have been finalized. Given the extensive delays in this process, this results in asylum seekers being detained for periods far exceeding the maximum allowed for immigration detentions.

General lengths of detention for non-nationals - both asylum seekers and other migrants - is also cause for extreme concern. Records supplied by BOSASA, the private company that manages the facility on behalf of the DHA, indicate that some detainees have been in detention far longer than the maximum period of 120 days. In addition, although the law states that all detentions in excess of 30 days be authorized by a warrant of the court, this procedure does not seem to be followed, and most are held for longer periods without legal process. In statistics dated 3rd April 2009 supplied by the DHA to LHR, 79 detainees had been in detention for more than the maximum period of 120 with a number having been in detention for more than two years.

Musina Detention Facility

The Musina detention facility is a disused warehouse located at that the Soutpansberg Military Grounds on the outskirts of Musina, near the Zimbabwean border. The facility has been used to hold primarily Zimbabweans nationals arrested on immigration charges by the police or the South African military forces.

Following the decision by the DHA to issue Section 31(2)(b) permits to Zimbabwean nationals, it is likely that this facility will not be heavily utilised but concerns remain regarding the possible detention of non-Zimbabwean migrants who in the past have been held at the facility for several weeks pending deportation. In September 2008, a group of Malawian nationals were detained for over three weeks at the facility.

Conditions in the facility have been appalling. Detainees are not guaranteed access to toilets and as a result, during site visits by CoRMSA and other organisations, faeces and urine have been evident on the ground. There is also no proper provision of bedding in the facility as well as a lack of ventilation. These conditions make the facility not suitable for habitation.

The facility has been operated by the South African Police Service (SAPS) without the supervision of the DHA. In terms of the Immigration Act, only the DHA has the legal right to operate an immigration detention facility.

In the past, Zimbabweans with documentation proving their legal status have been found to be in the facility thus illustrating that there are insufficient mechanisms to verify the immigration status of detainees. Some claiming to be South African citizens have not always been afforded the opportunity to prove their status as the facility is not well equipped to conduct such verification exercises.

Despite the detention of children alongside adults being expressly forbidden by South African law, the Convention on the Rights of the Child and the African Charter on the Rights and Welfare of the Child, the detention of unaccompanied children from Zimbabwe was a common occurrence at this facility. During the visit of the South African Human Rights Commission to the facility on 11th February 2009, 53 unaccompanied were found to be in the detention facility and were due for deportation later in the day.

4. Requested Course of Action

Given the serious nature of these concerns, LHR and CoRMSA request that the Special Rapporteur on Refugees, Asylum Seekers, IDPs and Migrants urgently reschedule the visit to South Africa that was initially planned for 29th September to 3rd October 2008. The need to avoid a repeat of the xenophobic violence of 2008 as well as the need to provide increased assistance to Zimbabwean nationals requires diplomatic engagement from the Special Rapporteur in order for South Africa to take greater heed of its domestic and regional responsibilities. CoRMSA and LHR hereby request intervention by the Special Rapporteur to encourage the Government of the Republic of South Africa to develop clear and coordinated inter-departmental strategies to prevent xenophobic violence, ensure greater protection of non-nationals, provide greater assistance to Zimbabwean nationals in South Africa, and address the numerous concerns regarding the detention of non-nationals.

Appendix A:

List of Incidents of Mob Violence against Non-Nationals in South Africa since 1994

23 Dec 1994	Alexandra (Gauteng): armed youth gangs destroy foreign-owned homes and property and demand that foreigners be removed from the area.
Sept 1998	Johannesburg (Gauteng): Two Senegalese and a Mozambican are thrown from a moving train by a group of individuals returning from a rally at which migrants and refugees were blamed for the levels of unemployment, crime and AIDS in South Africa.
Oct 2000	Zandspruit (Gauteng): Fighting breaks out between South African and Zimbabwean residents.
Aug 2005	Bothaville (Free State): Zimbabwean and Somali refugees are beaten.
Dec 2005	Olievenhoutbosch (Gauteng): Groups of South Africans chase foreign Africans living in the township's Choba informal settlement from their shacks, shops and businesses.
July 2006	Knysna (Western Cape): Somali shop owners in a township outside Knysna are chased out of the area and at least 30 spaza shops are damaged.
Aug 2006	Cape Town (Western Cape): During a period of just over a month, between 20 and 30 Somalis are killed in townships surrounding Cape Town.
Feb 2007	Motherwell (Eastern Cape): Violence triggered by the accidental shooting of a young South African man (by a Somali shop owner) results in the looting of over one-hundred Somali-owned shops in a 24 hour period.
May 2007	Ipelegeng Township (North West): Shops owned by Bangladeshi, Pakistani, Somali and Ethiopian nationals are attacked, looted and in some cases torched.
Sept 2007	Delmas (Mpumalanga): After a service-delivery protest by residents, 41 shops owned and staffed by non-nationals are attacked and looted. One death and two serious injuries are reported, and 40 non-nationals take refuge at mosques and with friends.
Oct 2007	Mooiplaas (Gauteng): After a clash between a Zimbabwean and a South African family went awry, the local population retaliated by attacking the migrant community, killing two people, brutally injuring 18 and looting 111 shops.

- Jan 2008 **Duncan Village (Eastern Cape):** Two Somalis are found burned to death in their shop. Police later arrest seven people in connection with the incident after finding them in possession of property belonging to the deceased.
- Jan 2008 **Jeffrey's Bay (Eastern Cape):** After a Somali shop owner allegedly shoots dead a suspected thief, a crowd of residents attack Somali-owned shops, and many Somali nationals seek shelter at the police station.
- Jan 2008 **Soshanguve (Gauteng):** One foreign national is burned to death, three others killed, 10 seriously injured and 60 shops looted after residents apprehend the suspects and attack foreign residents in retaliation for the alleged robbery of a local store by four non-nationals. Subsequently, residents call for foreigners to leave, and many non-nationals flee the area.
- Jan 2008 **Albert Park (KwaZulu-Natal):** The community forum holds a meeting to address the issue of non-nationals living amongst them, during which the community indicated that they wanted foreign nationals living in the area to leave.
- Feb 2008 **Laudium (Gauteng):** At a community meeting in the informal settlement of Itireleng some members encourage residents to chase non-nationals out of the area. Violent clashes take place. Shacks and shops belonging to non-nationals are burned and looted.
- Feb 2008 **Valhalla Park (Western Cape):** Residents of Valhalla Park forcefully evict at least five Somali shop owners from the area, injuring three people after having apparently 'warned' the shop owners to leave three months before.
- Feb 2008 **Kroonstad (Free State):** One person is seriously injured and 80 shops ransacked after a Somali shop owner retaliates with force against two drunken locals who attempt to rob him. Police arrest 39 people.
- Mar 2008 **Atteridgeville (Gauteng):** At least seven lives are lost in a series of attacks that take place over a week. The deceased include Zimbabwean, Pakistani and Somali nationals as well as a South African who was mistaken for a foreign national. Approximately 150 shacks and shops are burnt down, destroyed or vandalised. Approximately 500 people seek refuge elsewhere.
- Mar 2008 **Worcester (Western Cape):** A large group of Zwelethemba informal settlement residents go on a rampage, destroying foreign-run shops and leaving a large number of foreign nationals

homeless.

April 2008

Mamelodi (Gauteng): In a similar pattern to the attacks in Itireleng and Atteridgeville, residents of Mamelodi go from house to house, attacking non-nationals and setting alight the shops and houses abandoned by non-nationals. This was again violence on a major scale, resulting in large numbers of displaced non-nationals.

Source: Forced Migration Studies Programme. 2009. *Towards Tolerance, Law, and Dignity: Addressing Violence against Foreign Nationals in South Africa*. Available from www.migration.org.za.