

Rethinking migration and development in a post-apartheid setting.

Paper for presentation at seminar on "Unequal development: the globalization of apartheid", Goldsmiths College, 2006

Deborah James (LSE)

The call for papers asks us to consider how "apartheid has become a universal principle of world society". In reconsidering the changing relationship between migration and development, this invites us to focus, first of all, on the workings of the classic apartheid system: particularly the relationship it established between the different poles of what liberal economists considered at the time to be a "dual economy". Following Marxist critiques, it invites us to look at links which existed in that system between migrants as part of the urban labour force, the reproduction of the labour force in the rural periphery which many argued was functional in capitalist accumulation, and the provision by the apartheid regime of "development" within a racially skewed system of state welfarism that has been termed "racial modernism" (Bozzoli 2004). We must then ask, how have such links been reconfigured in a post-apartheid era, not only in South Africa but globally?

Earlier anthropologists' focus on migration - in South Africa and elsewhere - tended to focus on the reproduction of the labour force on a variety of levels: political and social as well as economic. The underdevelopment of rural areas - or their dependency - was conceptualised in terms of the unpaid (or "domestic labour") component of production, which kept workers' families sustained so that workers would have a secure place to which they could retire. From the point of view of individual workers, this was conceptualised as "long term investment in the rural social system" (Murray 1981). This was taken as an explanation of migrants' conservative political and economic values. Since they did not "belong" in urban areas they had no commitment to engaging with urban-based political activities. Since their only connection to "the market" was via a closely-regulated system of state-controlled labour recruitment, they seemed uninterested in rural entrepreneurship (Ferguson 1990). They invested in the rural social system and relied on traditional authorities/chiefs and older patriarchs to keep this system in place on both political and domestic levels: to guard the hearth in anticipation of their eventual return and retirement. This bifurcated system appeared as a dualistic and dichotomous one, with only the migrant as a connecting principle between the two worlds.

Despite the apparent and evident exploitation in such a system (there were debates over the extent to which apartheid policies proved "functional" for capitalist accumulation), the fact that migrants originated from one single national space implied some national-level responsibility for "development". Within the racially skewed system of state welfarism, agricultural projects were set in place in an attempt to bolster the economy of the reserve areas (Delius 1996). These were, albeit in distorted form, early examples of state-driven development. They failed: Ferguson cites them as an example of his broader

point that development projects may serve alternative purposes related to state control even though unable to generate incomes in the way originally proposed (1990).

In contrast to South Africa's apartheid system, where both metropole and peripheries were included within a single country and where an armoury of laws and legislations attempted to keep migrants housed in the peripheries while regulating the rate and extent of their flow into the metropole, the neoliberal approach to development increasingly emphasises "the market" as a neutral and abstract force that can attract labour to places where it is most needed. Development projects - now ostensibly decoupled from matters of labour recruitment - are also becoming more "market" oriented. There is a stress on micro-credit schemes which some writers see as fundamentally exploitative (Gill 2000; Rankin 2001), and on the provision of opportunities to develop "small businesses". The focus of exploitation now changes - if indeed the term "exploitation" is used at all in the present context. Are such development projects - occurring alongside international migration but seldom seen as connected to it - likely to render people separated and disjointed from broader communal types of support, as much of the critical literature on neoliberalism claims (ibid.; Leys 2001; Hortin et al 2001)

An anthropological perspective can help us examine these questions in more detail. It can do so, in part, by trying to re-examine the link between migrant remittances and other interactions with the market and/or forms of economic "growth" in sending areas. What are the changes in the destiny and circulation of migrant remittances, and how have these practices changed? Do remittances feed into other kinds of enterprise, or are they a last resort when other enterprises fail? Such considerations will allow us to draw some conclusions about the shortcomings of neoliberal style development practices, set within a context of largescale global labour migration, which are targeted at allowing small scale entrepreneurs to take advantage of "market" opportunities.

To enable a grounded critique of such new approaches to development, anthropology can provide fresh insights into economy: it can give us an idea of how the market operates in relation to other social forces and influences - conceptualised by Gudeman as "community" and "culture" (2001). This allows us to understand the relationship between

- * the practices of different migrants within a specific "home" setting. How far do submitters of remittances become disconnected from non-migrants? Do migrant remittances have a more limited circulation than previously? The paper will compare earlier practices by migrants in apartheid South Africa and a recent study of remittances by Ghanaian migrants (Mazzacuto 2000, 2005)
- * the relationship between migrants' activities/remittances and their other interactions with the market.

Here, there is first the question of how small-scale producers' vulnerability to market forces might drive them in turn to become dependent upon migration, thus perhaps exacerbating the accumulated economic deficit of sending countries as described in the companion paper in this session (Mitchell 2006). Deborah Sick's work on Costa Rica, for example, shows how coffee farmers, drawn into the global market, were later thrown up on the shores of this market when they were undercut by producers from elsewhere:

many, in their determination to keep their farms in operation, then ended up as migrants to the US (1999).

Second, there is the question of migrants' investing their earnings into market-oriented production. This, under conditions of neo-liberalism, can threaten their hard-won savings, leaving them nowhere to turn. This occurs within the setting of the World Bank's "one size fits all" insistence on promoting development by creating small scale farmers who can interact with the market unaided by the state except via targeted loans and small-scale credit systems. These in fact render such producers hugely vulnerable, as will be demonstrated by using an example of my recent work on South Africa land reform (James 2006).

References:

Bozzoli, B 2004 *Theatres of Struggle and the End of Apartheid*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press

Delius, Peter 1996 *A Lion Amongst the Cattle*, Johannesburg: Ravan

Ferguson, J 1990 *The Anti-Politics Machine: 'development', depoliticization and bureaucratic power in Lesotho*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press/Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Gill, Lesley 2000, *Teetering on the Rim: global restructuring, daily life and the armed retreat of the Bolivian state*, New York: Columbia University Press.

Gudeman, S 2001 *The Anthropology of Economy* Oxford: Blackwells

Hortin, Sarah, Joanne McCloskey, Caroline Todd, and Martha Henricksen 2001 "Transforming the Safety Net: Responses to Medicaid Managed Care in Rural and Urban Mexico" *American Anthropologist* 103(3): 733-746

James, Deborah 2006 *Gaining Ground? "Rights" and "Property" in South African land reform*, London: Glasshouse Press/Johannesburg: Wits University Press

Leys, Colin 2001 *Market Driven Politics: Neoliberal Democracy and the Public Interest*, London: Verso

Mazzacuto, Valentina 2005 "Ghanaian migrants' double engagement: a transnational view of development and integration policies" *Global Migration Perspectives Paper No. 48*, Global Commission on International Migration, www.gcim.org

_____ 2000 "Transnational networks and the creation of local economies: economic principles and institutions of Ghanaian migrants at home and abroad" www2.fmg.uva.nl/ghanatransnet

Mitchell, S 2006 "Migration and development: Opportunity or exploitation?" paper for presentation at seminar on Unequal development: the globalization of apartheid, Goldsmiths College, 2006

Murray, Colin (1981) Families Divided, Johannesburg: Ravan

Rankin, Catharine Neilson 2001 "Governing development: neoliberalism, microcredit and rational economic woman" *Economy and Society* 30(1)

Rapley, J. 1996 *Understanding Development: Theory and Practice in the Third World*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Reiner

Sick, Deborah 1999 *Farmers of the Golden Bean: Costa Rican Households and the Global Coffee Economy*, Northern Illinois University Press,