

Points of correction: Comment on Andrew Bank's 'Archie Mafeje'¹

Review: Bank, Andrew. (2010). *Archie Mafeje: The Life and Work of an African Anthropologist*.
Alice: Fort Hare University Press. ISBN 978-1-86810-731-5

Bongani Nyoka

*Intellectual Heritage Project
Department of Anthropology and Sociology
University of the Western Cape
E-mail: bonganinyoka@yahoo.com*

Andrew Bank's book on Archie Mafeje requires response and correction. Though Bank (2010: 4) writes that he is 'interested in trying to present an accessible, absorbing and *balanced* account of [Mafeje's] life history' (emphasis added), it may be questioned whether he is always scrupulously fair. There are very many distortions and inaccuracies in Bank's book which ought to be examined in detail. We shall go through them very nearly in the order in which they appear in the book. Over and above highlighting the said distortions and inaccuracies, this paper seeks to undermine, and be seen to be undermining, the whole study.

The subtitle of the book, 'The life and work of an African anthropologist', is, let it be said, misleading. As we shall see when talking about the aims of the book, Bank's aim is to write about Mafeje as a young man and about his writings of the 1960s. Why does Bank write a subtitle of this nature when his plan is merely to deal with a short period of Mafeje's life and only a fraction of his work? We return to this point later on.

It is our contention here that Bank's study is flawed both methodologically and theoretically. Indeed, we shall go as far as to say that quite apart from employing scholarly and scientific methods, the book is an exercise in journalism. In his introductory remarks, Bank avers that he has 'developed a keen interest in trying to understand Archie as a person so that [he] could work out how his ideas and approaches changed with changes in personal and social circumstances' (2010: 4). But, as we shall learn, Bank does not bring to bear Mafeje's 'personal and social circumstances' on the latter's scholarship. The claim that Mafeje's immediate and wider environment shaped his scholarship is to be demonstrated and not merely asserted. In this regard Bank fails dismally. As we shall make clear in what

is to follow, Bank does not engage with Mafeje's work in a systematic fashion.

Bank goes on to say that because he wanted to get a better understanding of Mafeje, he 'went on a quest for materials to learn more' about the latter. He began by 'reading in detail the surviving archival materials relating to his student years at UCT and the events surrounding "The Mafeje Affair of 1968"' (Bank, 2010:4). He then went on to interview his closest family and friends in South Africa. By family he means Mafeje's first wife, his sister and brother-in-law. By friends he is referring to Mafeje's erstwhile landlady in District Six (Cape Town), the son of his landlady, a woman named Margaret Green, Archie Nkonyeni an old schoolmate and fellow UCT graduate and Mafeje's former room-mate Fikile Bam. We may ask, in earnest, whether any of these interviewees have any thorough understanding of Mafeje's writings or whether their recollections of the latter have any bearing on his work. One might question, also, whether Bank has proven how it is that Mafeje's 'personal and social circumstances' influenced his work.

Bank states that his wish is to challenge 'numerous distortions' or 'myths' which were beginning to emerge and consolidate about Mafeje's early work. Yet on numerous occasions Bank invents these 'myths' himself and then attributes them to other people. I shall show later on how he does this. Furthermore, if Bank really wanted to present a 'balanced' account of Mafeje's life, why did he not interview Mafeje's wife Prof Shahida El-Baz (whom he mentions on more than one occasion in the book), Prof Kwesi Prah (Mafeje's close friend and colleague who lives in Cape Town) and possibly CODESRIA affiliated scholars? These are people who could have provided a 'balanced' account of Mafeje's life insofar as they knew him both personally and intellectually. We are of the view that writing an intellectual biography (or something like it) of Archie Mafeje is a task much bigger than Bank is willing to allow. Quite why Bank thinks a 45-page 'book' is enough to give an 'absorbing and balanced account' of Mafeje's life is beyond comprehension.

Bank states that the aims of the book are: '(1) to bring to life the story of Archie Mafeje as a young man; (2) to highlight the significance of Archie Mafeje's contribution to Social Anthropology especially during the 1960s; and (3) to further debate around the politics of memory in relation to Mafeje's intellectual legacy' (Bank, 2010: 4). As we shall see later on, Bank rather abandons all these aims when he (1) starts talking about Mafeje's days in Dar-es-Salaam and The Hague. In what ways can a university professor (with a wife and a child) be said to be a young man? (2) In making references (albeit superficially) to Mafeje's work of the mid-1990s he is no longer discussing a young man nor is he discussing his work of the 1960s. Bank just could not fulfil his objective of focusing on the young Mafeje and the latter's work of the 1960s, hence he was forced to make shallow references to Mafeje's work of the 1990s. (3) Bank does not grapple with Mafeje's work of the 1960s, despite his stated aim, save vague references to the latter's master's thesis and the use of the words 'tribe' and 'pagan'! Mafeje published only two

¹ I shall assume throughout this paper that the reader knows of Archie Mafeje and is familiar with his work.

accredited and sole-authored articles in the 1960s.² This is not surprising since he was a student during this period. To what extent are the said articles a significant contribution to social anthropology (and the social sciences generally) as opposed to his *oeuvre*? The reason why, I surmise, Bank is fixated with the 1960s is that he wants to present Mafeje as Monica Wilson's sidekick who had no critique of anthropology until he left South Africa. We return to this point later. Additionally, it may be asked, not unfairly: how is interviewing Mafeje's first wife (about, *inter alia*, the breakdown of their marriage) and former landlady a contribution to the 'debate' about 'Mafeje's intellectual legacy'? Doubtless scholarship is biographical, but it is questionable whether Bank chose a suitable sample and/or whether he asked the relevant questions to his interviewees.

The book is divided into eight chapters. In his opening chapter, 'Memorials', the author comments on the University of Cape Town's decision to honour Archie Mafeje posthumously and about the tributes paid to the latter by the Council for the Development of Social Science Research in Africa (CODESRIA). In the second part of this chapter, 'CODESRIA's Mafeje', Bank (2010:7) imputes to Adesina the false claim that Mafeje died of 'asphyxiation'! Yet Adesina makes no reference, in any of the papers he wrote on Mafeje, to the cause of the latter's death.³ All that Adesina says in the paper to which Bank refers is that Mafeje had been in 'poor health' (2008a:21). What makes this distortion a serious academic crime is that Bank puts the word 'asphyxiation' in inverted commas. In doing so, he gives the impression that Adesina actually used the word when in fact he did not.

The second chapter reads as follows: 'Challenging Mafeje Myths'. In it Bank purports to challenge some of the 'distortions' or 'myths' made by various scholars in their tributes to Mafeje. This chapter has a timeline which Bank uses, although superficially, to illustrate Mafeje's academic/intellectual development. He draws this timeline in an attempt to challenge the myths surrounding Mafeje. Curiously though, as stated earlier, Bank creates some of the said myths himself and then imputes them to others. Take, for example, myth number three in which Bank, yet again, attributes to Adesina the false claim that 'Archie Mafeje was never really a social anthropologist in the true sense. He was always at a sociologist who just happened to begin his career in social anthropology...' (Bank, 2010: 10). Yet nowhere does Adesina make such a claim in his paper on Mafeje. 'Myth 6' is also Bank's invention. In it he imputes to Adesina, once again, the statement that '[Mafeje's] thesis was not an anthropological ethnography which relied on the usual concepts like tribe and pagan, but a sociological study of power and authority in the Transkei' (Bank, 2010: 11). Adesina said nothing of a sort. Even

2 See Mafeje, A. (1963). *A chief visits town*. *Journal of Local Administration Overseas*, 2(2):88-99; and Mafeje, A. (1967). *The role of the bard in a contemporary African community*, *Journal of African Languages*, 6(2):193-223

3 See for example Adesina, J. 2008. *Against alterity – the pursuit of endogeneity: breaking bread with Archie Mafeje*, *CODESRIA Bulletin* (3&4)

if he did, surely anthropology does not stand or fall by the use of the concepts of 'tribe' and 'pagan'. Central to Mafeje's critique of anthropology is not necessarily the use of the foregoing concepts but what he calls the 'epistemology of alterity' (2001a); that is, the continued de-centring and othering of Africa and Africans in anthropological writings. That, of course, is not to say that he had no critique of the concept of 'tribe' – he did.⁴ However, such a critique cannot be viewed in isolation. 'Myth 7' is one which seeks to cast doubt on whether Mafeje actually obtained his master's degree with distinction or not. Monica Wilson, Mafeje's master's supervisor, constantly wrote, in her references, either for scholarships or academic positions, that Mafeje obtained 'first classes in the honours and MA degrees'.⁵ If Bank's claim that Mafeje never got his MA with distinction is true, it is not clear then why Mafeje's supervisor would tell lies about latter's performance.

The third chapter, 'Gubenxa to UCT via Healdtown and Fort Hare', deals with Mafeje's family and his childhood; his days at Healdtown College, his expulsion at the University of Fort Hare, due to political activism, and finally his days in Cape Town and at UCT. The fourth chapter is entitled 'Girlfriends and room-mates'. One must say, *en passant*, that some of these catchy titles are not necessarily worth the paper they are printed on. For example, while part of the title of the fourth chapter reads 'Girlfriends', only one out of the three women mentioned was romantically involved with Mafeje. The first woman mentioned here is Margaret Green, and the second is Deirdre Levinson. None of these women were Mafeje's girlfriend. They were only friends and political allies. Green did, however, admit, in her blog, that she was 'attracted' to Mafeje.⁶ But as we all know, attraction, or finding someone 'handsome', is not quite the same as, nor does it constitute, a relationship. So why feature Green and Levinson in this chapter? Despite the claim that Mafeje 'had a reputation as a ladies' man', Bank provides no evidence that this was indeed the case. Only in the concluding section of this chapter does Bank talk about Mafeje's actual girlfriend – Mafeje's first wife. The question remains, then: why write 'Girlfriends' and not 'Girlfriend' in the title of the chapter? Surely the only 'girlfriend' of that period which one can point to is Mafeje's first wife not Green or Levinson.

A minor point of correction: *pace* Bank, Mafeje's book, 'The Theory and Ethnography of African Social Formations', is not dedicated to Ganief Hendricks – son of his former landlady. The book is dedicated to 'Shahida, Xolani and Dana, for our tribulations, triumphs and emancipation'. Perhaps Bank has a different version of the book.

The fifth chapter is entitled 'The making of an African anthropologist'. Here Bank deals with Mafeje's relations with Monica Wilson, the research and production of the manuscript for 'Langa: A study of social groups in an African township'. In the first section of this chapter, Bank talks about Mafeje's switch from a BSc to a BA degree.

4 See Mafeje, A. (1971). *The ideology of tribalism*. *Journal of Modern African Studies*, 9(1): 252-261.

5 See Monica and Godfrey Wilson Papers, BC 880, 'Correspondence with Archie Mafeje, 1961-1962', K1.2, *Manuscripts and Archives, University of Cape Town* (hereinafter 'Wilson papers')

6 <http://beyond-trauma.blogspot.com/2011/02/archie-mafeje-exhibition.html>

He then talks about how indebted Mafeje was to Wilson for the role she played in his intellectual career. In a somewhat careless and patronising statement, Bank (2010: 25) says that Mafeje was 'a less explicit in his gratitude' when he criticised Wilson and other liberal social anthropologists in his later writings. Such a claim is uncalled for. What is the point of teaching critical reasoning in the social sciences if students are not permitted to criticise their (erstwhile) teachers? Scholarship is not about praising-singing no matter how indebted one may be to his/her teacher. Surely Bank is aware of this. Bank continues his patronising and condescending tone when he says: 'in the light of [Mafeje's] very poor student record and [Wilson's] considerable efforts at setting him up as an anthropologist, I am sure that being recognised as a full co-author of an Oxford University Press monograph with only an Honours degree behind him does seem very generous' (Bank, 2010:26). What has Mafeje's academic record got to do with the writing of 'Langa'? What does the level of his academic training got to do with anything? It is not at all clear why Bank decided to raise both of these issues. For he himself does question whether Wilson gave enough credit to Mafeje in the light of the latter's detailed field notes which led to the production of the manuscript for 'Langa'.

In the sixth chapter, 'An anthropologist in exile', the author talks about Mafeje's journey to the University of Cambridge. The author also writes about Mafeje's relationship with his Cambridge supervisor, Audrey Richards, and some 'myths' about 'The Mafeje Affair' (this section of this chapter can be interpreted as a response to Fred Hendricks' account of the 1968 incident).

The seventh chapter, 'From anthropologist to sociologist', talks about Mafeje's switch from being an anthropologist to being a sociologist. In this chapter, Bank seeks to undermine the alleged view that Mafeje has always been critical of anthropology. The author argues that Mafeje's combative Marxist writings began in the 1970s while he was in Dar es Salaam. He argues that it is not the case that Mafeje had always been critical of anthropology. This assumption misses a crucial aspect of Mafeje's *oeuvre*. To begin with, whether Mafeje was a liberal or a Marxist really cuts no ice. Secondly, the claim that he began questioning anthropology only in exile shows lack of familiarity with Mafeje's work. What is significant about Mafeje's writings is his notion of 'authentic interlocutors/interlocution' or 'authenticity in theoretical representation' (1981, 1991, 2000, 2001b).⁷ Roughly, this idea holds that social science researchers ought to take their research subjects on their own terms. In other words, the researcher must let the data speak for itself. Mafeje did this tirelessly and unfailingly throughout his career, from his first publication to the very last. His 'preference for the subjects' own self-definition – e.g., "homeboys" rather than "tribesmen" (Adesina, 2008b: 135) is a case in point. What he had not done in the early stages of his career, is to reconcile his political views with

7 To my knowledge, he used this concept for the first time in his 'On the articulation of modes of production', *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 8(1): 123-138, 1981

his intellectual views – this is a point made by Sharp (2008). Bank infers from this that Mafeje was uncritical of the categories used by anthropologists. That is not the case.

For that matter, Bank fails to make mention of the fact that Mafeje's first published paper, 'A chief visits town' was rejected by Julius Lewin then editor of the journal 'African Studies' which was based at the University of the Witwatersrand. In a letter to Wilson, Lewin argued that the paper did not quite fit the theme of his journal and suggested that Mafeje take it to the 'Race Relations Journal'.⁸ The relevant point here is that the paper was not a standard anthropology paper. Using anthropological methods to gather data is not the same as producing an anthropological paper. In the same way that using quantitative and statistical methods is not the sole preserve of the economist. Indeed the said paper was a spin-off of the Langa study but Wilson felt that it was best published on its own since it was not quite 'anthropological'.⁹ After the paper was rejected by 'African Studies', Mafeje took it to the 'Journal of Local Administration Overseas'. B.V. Davies, then editor of the said journal, stated that the paper would be published if it was reduced from 8000 to 4000 words, and that Mafeje had to remove the more 'political' aspects in it – this was a section criticising the apartheid government. In addition, Davies conceded that the paper was not 'too anthropological' and thus it was publishable in his journal.¹⁰ Bank assiduously ignores this crucial information even though correspondence between Wilson and, respectively, Lewin and Davies is in the very same Wilson file to which he constantly refers.

In the same chapter, Bank argues, in a slapdash fashion, that Mafeje's 'change of mind', may also have a lot to do with a near-tragic accident on 31 January 1971 in which Mafeje nearly lost his life. It is quite beyond me how a car accident can change one from being a liberal to being Marxist. Consistent with Bank's line of thought, if all the IMF and World Bank economists were to be involved in car accidents the world would be a better place. They would all convert to socialism! Importantly, though, I simply fail to see the nexus between a car accident and a change in one's intellectual views.

Bank also took the opportunity to publish the circumstances surrounding the end of Mafeje's first marriage. He claims that tensions in the said marriage began when Mafeje was discharged from hospital. Yet he fails to mention Mafeje's side of the story in a letter to Wilson which explains why the former divorced his first wife and left Dar es Salaam for The Hague. To the extent that he refers to the letter, he only selects irrelevant parts which do not give a clear account of what took place. In the letter, Mafeje comments thus: 'our life as husband and wife had come to a sad end. Several months together had shown that we had nothing in common and that we were unable to communicate with each other. This had already become apparent by the time of the accident. In fact, I attribute part of the absent mindedness that led to the accident to the strain I was

8 See Wilson papers

9 See Wilson papers

10 See Wilson papers

experiencing at that point in time. I was extremely worried about our marriage, her family and my parents.’¹¹ It is unfortunate that one has to write about this matter, and not Mafeje’s work. But there is a need to give a balanced account of the events.

The final chapter, ‘Politics of memory’, deals with the so-called ‘Mafeje Affairs’ of 1968 and 1993-1994 and the debate about academic freedom at UCT. There is, in my view, little to be said about this chapter.

In conclusion, one may object to my ‘laundry list’ approach by pointing out that here I have been nitpicking rather than grappling with the gravamen of Bank’s book. My step by step approach is justified because Bank does not deliver on his promises nor are his stated aims fulfilled. The only way to critique his intent, therefore, was to show that his *problematique* was badly formulated from the start. In highlighting all the inaccuracies, my attempt was to cast doubt on Bank’s study and his overall intentions. This book is a travesty and anybody who is interested in the life and work of Archie Mafeje must look to different sources or simply wait for an authorised intellectual biography.

¹¹ See Wilson papers

References

- Adesina, J. 2008a. Against alterity, the pursuit of endogeneity: breaking bread with Archie Mafeje. *CODESRIA Bulletin*, (3/4): 21-29.
- Adesina, J. 2008b. Archie Mafeje and the pursuit of endogeneity: against alterity and extroversion. *Africa Development*, XXXIII (4): 33-152.
- Bank, A. 2010. *Archie Mafeje: the life and work of an African anthropologist*. Alice: Fort Hare University Press.
- Mafeje, A. 1963. A chief visits town. *Journal of Local Administration Overseas*. 2(2): 88-99.
- Mafeje, A. 1967. The role of the bard in a contemporary African community. *Journal of African Languages*. 6(3): 193-223.
- Mafeje, A. 1971. The ideology of tribalism. *Journal of Modern African Studies*, 9(1): 252-261.
- Mafeje, A. 1981. On the articulation of modes of production: review article. *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 8(1): 123-138.
- Mafeje, A. 1991. *The theory and ethnography of African social formations: the case of the Interlacustrine Kingdoms*. London: CODESRIA Books Series.
- Mafeje, A. 2000. Africanity: a combative ontology. *CODESRIA Bulletin*, (1): 66-71.
- Mafeje, A. 2001a. Anthropology in post-independence Africa: end of an era and the problem of self-redefinition. In Mafeje, A. (ed.), *African social scientists reflections: part 1*. Nairobi: Heinrich Boll Foundation.
- Mafeje, A. 2001b. Africanity: a commentary by way of conclusion. *CODESRIA Bulletin*, (3/4): 14-16.
- Sharp, J. 2008. Mafeje and Langa: the start of an intellectual’s journey. *Africa Development*, XXXIII (4): 153-167.

Zimbabwe's Exodus: Crisis, Migration, Survival. Jonathan Crush and Daniel Tevera (Eds.) (2010) Cape Town: SAMP and Ottawa, Canada: IDRC. ISBN 978-1-920409-22-7

Godfrey Maringira

*Department of Anthropology and Sociology,
University of the Western Cape,
Bellville Cape Town
E-mail: gmaringira@gmail.com*

The life of Zimbabwean migrants forms a broad theme discussed in the chapters of this book. There are, for example, four chapters devoted to Zimbabwean professionals in the United Kingdom. Tevera and Crush focus on why Zimbabwean professionals left the country. For them, it is not conclusive whether the push or pull factors facilitated their migration. Yet a combination of both is seen at play. Abel Chikanda reveals how the health sector has been affected with the migration of nurses to the UK and other Western countries. He suggests two major reasons: the failure of the Zimbabwean government to pay better wages and the opportunities that exist abroad especially in the health sector. But with more than two thousand unemployed qualified nurses, the question is begged: why is it that they are not leaving Zimbabwe to seek employment elsewhere in the world? The answer might lie in the fact that there are no more job opportunities abroad or because Zimbabwe now uses the \$US as their currency and nurses like some other professionals hope to get employment in government or the private sector. In this case, 'voting with their feet' thus becomes a great risk.

JoAnn McGregor explored the lives of Zimbabweans in the UK Care industry which comes not as work for them but as more of a survival strategy. Many still see care work as degrading, robbing them of their status, a condition which I consider traumatic as it shatters their worldviews. Kauffman (2002) describes such an experience as "loss of assumptive world" which exists in the psyche of a people as suggested by Oloyede (2009) in another context. How Zimbabwean migrants cope with such a 'degrading' and 'demeaning' work is however not clear from McGregor's piece. Dominic Pasura gives an account of how life has become regendered in the UK. In his contribution he sees the regendering of life as bringing with it divorce and move-in practice because men and women live together without cultural marriage practices.

Blair Rutherford writes about Zimbabweans working in South African farms, many of them having migrated from the rural parts of Zimbabwe. Daniel Makina on the other hand argues that many of the Zimbabwean migrants in Johannesburg came from Zimbabwe's main two cities, Harare and Bulawayo. But what is not explicit in Rutherford's study is whether migrant farm workers in South Africa were those farm

workers who were displaced in Zimbabwe during the fast track land reform programme or they became farm workers on arrival in South Africa. As Alexander (2003) notes, during the land invasion many farm workers were forced to leave the country.

An issue which the book grapples with is the number of Zimbabweans living in South Africa. The South African media portray Zimbabwean migrants as 'pouring' and 'flooding' into the country claiming that there are three million Zimbabweans living in South Africa. Crush and Tevera argue that such figures are exaggerated because the media and the government have a history of making up numbers about migration to raise alarm. In the same vein, in Chapter 17, Polzer argues that such an exaggerated number of Zimbabwean migrants in South Africa is far from the truth and in most cases it is the politicians who mention such figures for the purpose of delaying action and responding to migrants' situation. The confusion over numbers is based on the fact that many Zimbabweans in South Africa enter the country illegally using undesignated points of entry. What is clear is that since the 1980s there has been a substantial increase in the number of Zimbabweans migrating to South Africa while there has been a decrease of those migrating to the United Kingdom, a result of relaxation of immigration policies and tightening of visa in the two countries respectively (Crush and Tevera, 2010).

The migration of Zimbabwean skilled nationals has often been seen as a 'brain drain'. However, Crush and Tevera argued that the prospect of migration brings with it remittances which are often seen as survival strategies. Diaspora communities play a social, economic and political role to connect migrants to help each other and their home communities as Crush and Tevera show. Muzondidya (2010) argues that diaspora communities do not only help migrants but provide assistance to their families back in Zimbabwe. Muzondidya gives the example of funeral associations among Zimbabweans in South Africa which help in bringing home those who die in the country. However, Polzer in Chapter 17 notes that while such informal social networks are common among Zimbabweans in South Africa, they are not an end in themselves. The extent to which they exist and remain helpful is doubtful.

Zimbabweans outside the country maintain very close contacts with their kin at home, for example, those in Southern Africa are said to return home relatively frequently. This form of movement has been termed 'transnational migration' and it has been so common among many Zimbabweans in the diaspora. Crush and Tevera (2010:19) define transnational migration as 'a pattern of migration in which persons, although they move across borders, settle and establish ongoing social relations in a new state, maintain ongoing social connections with the polity from which they originated'. The idea of transnationalism may mean that while migrants can be integrated and assimilated in host countries, they often retain their own values through maintaining ties with home. However, for many Zimbabweans transnational migration is not a choice but a product of the cold reception they receive in the host country as in the case of South Africa.

The strength of the book is the discussion of the history of migration in Zimbabwe,

which is seldom discussed in much of the migration literature. Most literature on Zimbabwe often see migration as a 1990 phenomenon and fail to contextualize it within the country's colonial and post-colonial history. Alois Mlambo highlights the inward migration in the eighteenth century during Zulu expansionism and British colonialism. He elaborates on how Zimbabweans were later forced to flee colonial repression under Ian Smith regime in the 1970s to work in South African mines. While Mlambo gives such an insightful history he did not provide a detailed explanation of how circular migration was experienced and how it was ethnically driven especially in Matabeleland during the *Gukurahundi*, a war conducted by Zimbabwe African National Liberation Army (ZANLA), the armed wing of the Zimbabwe African National Union-Patriotic Front (ZANU-PF) against dissidents and the Ndebele people. More importantly Mlambo overlooks one of the questions relating to current migration and its difference from previous migration. Such a discussion would have given a vivid explanation of how some groups migrate while others remained in Zimbabwe.

Potts gives an analysis of internal migration mostly from rural to urban area which was common following independence. However, many people still maintained their ties with the families in the rural areas and with the rural economy. In her account, Potts sees the first years of independence as a 'decade of normality', but like Alois Mlambo, Potts does not take into consideration that some provinces such as Matabeleland experienced war forcing many to migrate to South Africa and Botswana as refugees. Jocelyn Alexander (1998) gives a detailed account of how dissidents and other Ndebele people were hunted by Zimbabwean soldiers and how the hunted finally found sanctuary in Botswana and South Africa. One of the reasons why many researchers have neglected the Matabeleland war in post-independent Zimbabwe is the fear which is still griping survivors. Somehow because *Gukurahundi* affected one region it makes it difficult to have what was experienced in the broader national memory discourse. Other events are given attention; for example, Potts discusses how the Economic Structural Adjustment Programmes (ESAP) of the late 1980s, the land reform programme in 2000, Operation *Murambatsvina* 2005 (Restore order) which saw the demolition of informal settlements in the urban areas all facilitated internal migration as well as outward migration. Potts does not view events in Zimbabwe within a framework of violence and politics, but sees them as economic and apolitical. She tends to emphasize the post 2000 crisis as the period during which internal migration should be understood in Zimbabwe. But events in Zimbabwe were much more intertwined and the crisis can be traced back to the early eighties shortly after independence. Hammar and Raftopoulos (2003:4) who refer to "multiple of crisis" in their edited book: *Zimbabwe's Unfinished Business: Rethinking Land, State and Nation in the Context of Crisis* note that, 'Zimbabwe's deepening economic and political crisis was well underway long before the dramatic events triggered by the constitutional referendum in February 2000'.

One of the gaps in migration literature is the experiences of women. This is partly

because women's experiences are often lumped with those of men resulting in them being continuously marginalized in the migration discourse. In the book, Kate Lefko-Everett explores the challenges many Zimbabwean women face such as bribing the police at the border. The text does not only provide an account of the women who cross the border to South Africa, but it also reveals how women have become household heads in the face of Zimbabwean crisis. Many Zimbabwean women are often reported and labeled in the South African media as commercial sex workers, but the chapter overlooks this experience. Nyangairi (2010) shows in her study of commercial sex workers in central Johannesburg that these women became sex workers by circumstance. In many cases they have legitimized commercial sex seeing it as the only option of work, which allows them to remit money back home.

There is a discussion in the book on remittances which the three chapters by Barcking and Sachikonye and others seem to agree on. In all the three chapters, it is suggested that remittances contribute to the alleviation of household poverty (Tevera, Crush, and Chikanda; Barcking and Sachikonye; Maphosa). In all cases remittances are seen as a response to the crisis in Zimbabwe. The chapter by Barcking and Sachikonye analysis remittances received in urban Zimbabwe; Maphosa's study focuses more on a much neglected area. His study focuses on how the rural people in Zimbabwe have migrated to South Africa contrary to dominant trends of urban to urban migration. He argues that those who came from the rural areas remit back to these areas and invest in buying cattle and goats which can be re-sold when they encounter problems. In both the rural and urban areas, remittances have been used as survival strategies, and a necessity. What differs is the use over a given period of time. What is not clear in all the three chapters is the frequency of remittance flow from South Africa to rural or urban areas in Zimbabwe. In a broad sense it is not clear whether there is a high flow of remittances to urban or rural areas in Zimbabwe. It may be suggested that remittances flow more to the urban areas than to the rural areas because of the value placed on investment in urban areas. Barcking and Sachikonye nevertheless try to make some distinctions on the flow of remittances between high density and low density suburbs in Harare and Bulawayo, the 1st capital city and the 2nd respectively.

Mawadza and Crush examine the role that has been played by the South African media in perpetuating xenophobic stereotypes such as reporting migrants as 'aliens'. But the media does not report on how migrants themselves have responded to such stereotypes. Muzondidya (2010) argues that Zimbabwean migrants in South Africa uses 'counter hegemonic discourses' in which they refer to themselves as moral and educated. It also shows how the media has contributed to the marginalization of migrants in South Africa. Mawadza and Crush see media response toward migrants as xenophobic media discourse which describes migrants as not belonging to South Africa, but as threats to South African resources. What Mawadza and Crush overlook is the fact that the South African media echoes the Zimbabwean ZANU-PF politicians opinion in

response to Zimbabwean migration, one which sees Zimbabwean migrants as cowards and traitors who do not have the nation at heart.

Migration for many Zimbabweans is not a choice but a response to the crisis in the country. Several scholars in this book see it as such. It is also seen as a challenge to the host countries but few have analyzed it as a problem to the Zimbabwean government in that when a state loses its own people whether skilled or unskilled, it sends a signal of bad and mal-administrative governance. The book is a useful one in many ways.

References

- Alexander, J .1998. Dissident Perspectives on Zimbabwe's Post-Independence War, Africa: *Journal of the International Africa Institute*, Vol. 68, No. 2 (1998), pp. 151-182.
- Hammar, A; McGregor, J; Landau, L. 2010. Introduction: Displacing Zimbabwe: Crisis and Construction in Southern Africa, *Journal of Southern Africa*, 36: 2, 263-283.
- Hammar, A and Raftopoulos, B. 2003. Zimbabwe's Unfinished Business: Rethinking Land, State and Nation In A, Hammar, B. Raftopoulos and S. Jensen (Eds.) (2003) *Zimbabwe's Unfinished Business: Rethinking Land, State and Nation in the context of Crisis*, Avondale, Weaver Press, Harare.
- Kauffman, J. 2002. *Loss of the Assumptive world: A theory of traumatic loss*, Brunner-Routledge, New York.
- Muzondidya, J (2010) Makwerekwere: Migration, Citizenship and Identity among Zimbabweans in South Africa In J. McGregor and R. Primorac (Eds.) (2010) *Zimbabwe's New Diaspora: Displacement and the Cultural Politics of Survival*.
- Nyangairi, B. 2010. *Migrant women in sex work: Trajectories and perceptions of Zimbabwean sex workers in Hillbrow South Africa*, MA dissertation submitted to the department of Forced Migration Studies, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg.
- Oleyede, O. 2009. Biafra in the Present: Trauma of Loss, *African Sociological Review*, 13 (1) 2009.