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Abstract: This paper attempts to offer a critical survey of the work done in the context of forced migrants’ situations in South Africa. The extant work is broad and important in revealing how South Africa is grappling with an increasing influx of migrants from war-torn African countries and forced migrants’ livelihood and coping strategies. On contrary, the paper reveals that the work is also myopic, and shortsighted in not including and responding to the questions on how forced migrants in South Africa make-meaning, negotiate and construct their socio-political identities. This paper contends that recognizing the voice of migrants on how they make-meaning, negotiate and construct their socio-political identities allows one to see that there are levels of subaltern agency as a response to being forcibly uprooted, including having legitimate opinion/s on what is happening in South Africa and back home. As a result, there is dearth of both non-empirical and empirical studies that explore the construction of identities by both forced migrants in South Africa. The paper suggests for new empirical studies on how forced migrants make-meaning, negotiate and (de)construct their socio-political identities and for scholars to cast a more ‘grounded gaze’ on the motivations propelling migrants’ integration and disintegration in South Africa.
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1. INTRODUCTION

International migration is continually becoming an inevitable phenomenon globally. Trends in international migration is rapidly increasing as the number of migrants grow faster than was ever imagined (UNDESA, 2015). According to the 2019 UN Refugees Agency Report (UNHCR, 2019), over 79 million people had been forcibly displaced globally. A number of international migration scholars cite political, economic and social factors when explaining reasons as to why Africans are migrating to other countries. For instance, Lemenih et al. (2014) cite the example of Ethiopia where war and insecurity forced people to move out of that country in search of refugee elsewhere. According to Lemenih et al. (2014), during the 1974 uprising in Ethiopia, many Ethiopians escaped to neighbouring countries because of the hunger, hardship and political unrest that was experienced in that country. In the height of political violence, people go to countries where they hope to get better standards of living (Lemenih, Kassa et al. 2014, Metcalfe-Hough 2015, Flahaux and De Haas 2016). Metcalfe-Hough (2015: 2) says that while countries like Somalia, South Sudan, Mali, Eritrea, Nigeria, Sudan and the Central African Republic are facing the same challenge of insecurity, many people from these countries risk their lives trying to cross the Mediterranean and Sahara Desert to travel to Europe in an attempt to escape from insecurity and uncertainty in their home countries for a better life.

Furthermore, literature reveals that the mass influx of African migrants to Europe is raising a widespread attention with sensationalist media reportage likening it to ‘exodus’ where desperate Africans are escaping from poverty at home in search of opportunities in Europe (Flahaux and De Haas 2016). Today, the growing internal conflicts and economic constraints in countries such as Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), South Sudan, Sudan, Somalia, Central African Republic (CAR), Zimbabwe and Mali among other African countries, an exodus of forced
migrants in large numbers to South Africa has emerged. As a result, South Africa has become number one country in Africa and three globally in drawing an increased number of displaced people or refugees from other parts of Africa. Currently, there is an excess of over 4 million migrants in South Africa (UNHCR, 2020) in South Africa. Most of the migrants, are spatially concentrated in three major cities in South Africa; Johannesburg, Cape Town and Durban.

Today, South Africa receives migrants from across Africa and beyond, thus prompting negative responses from both government and the local communities. Kanayo et al (2019) postulates that after the 1994 democratic dispensation, South Africa experienced a significant shift in its society and many black people were now able to freely migrate within different parts of the country in search of quality life. However, migratory patterns were not only limited to South Africans but foreign nationals as well. In this way, the country became a host to thousands of migrants and refugees from counties such as Congo, Somalia, Ethiopia and Burundi in search of both protection and economic opportunities. Arebgeshola (2010) asserts that migrants may either have positive or negative impacts on a country’s resources. The author describes positive impact to issues such as skills migrants bring with them, including the creation of job opportunities for themselves and to least extent, locals as well. On the contrary, negativities about migrants are issues such as criminal activities, involvement in drugs, prostitution and the spread of diseases such HIV/AIDS among others. The above rhetoric is usually echoed by both the public and sometimes government officials but there has never been substantive evidence to support these claims.

However, in light of the above, there are positive and negative connotations in relation to international migration and as such many migrants still continue to come to South Africa. In this way, South Africa pulls a complex and diverse category of both skilled and unskilled migrants. Mbetga (2014) elucidates that both skilled and unskilled migrants come to seek political freedom and economic opportunities in South Africa. However, the author argues that migrants, popularly called “foreign nationals” have become problematic to South African society. To substantiate the above argument, the authors’ uses the 2008 xenophobic attacks as a reference. The competition for scarce socio-economic opportunities between local nationals and foreign nationals will remain a challenge for some time to come as the country continues to receive large numbers of migrants from different parts of the world, particularly from other African countries (Mbetga, 2014). This has made the government to come up with new legislations that seek to curb the unprecedented inflow of refugees and in assisting new migrants to resettle in the country(Cross, Mhlanga et al. 2011, Shaffer 2012). Despite all the difficulties and the pressure that the South African government is facing, the country remains a leading host of most African migrants.

The above paragraphs shows how scholars are concerned with forced migrants’ situations in South Africa and how the country is grappling with an increasing influx of refugees from war-torn African countries. The various enactments of surviving and active livelihoods by migrants in cities and townships in South Africa, bears testimony to the scholarly contestations in the above paragraph. However, questions on how forced migrants in South Africa make-meaning, negotiate and construct their socio-political identities are yet to be investigated and answered. Thus, meaning-making, negotiation and (de)construction of socio-political identities of forced migrants remains under-researched scenery in South Africa.

This paper contends that recognizing the voice of migrants on how they make-meaning, negotiate and construct their socio-political identities allows one to see that there are levels of subaltern agency as a response to being forcibly uprooted, including having legitimate opinion/s on what is happening in South Africa and back home. Just as the impact of conflict in their home countries shape their identity construction, so does migrants’ situation and lived experiences in South Africa. This paper attempts to, in turn, offer a critical survey of the work done on forced migrants’ situation and lived experiences in South Africa and reveals that it is also myopic, and short-sighted in not including and responding to the questions on how forced migrants in South Africa construct their socio-political identities. The paper suggests that gaining such vital insights and perspectives from forced migrants on how they make-meaning, negotiate and (de)construct their socio-political identities, will allow migration scholars to cast a more ‘grounded gaze’ on the motivations propelling migrants’ integration and disintegration in South Africa.
2. Surveying scholarship on migrants’ situation and lived experiences in South Africa

Currently, the literature shows that in Africa, South Africa has invariably become the proverbial economic and political haven for hundreds of thousands of forced migrants especially from Somalia, South Sudan, Zimbabwe and the DRC. This is putting enormous pressure on South Africa to assume a dominant role in addressing some of the African conflicts, economic deprivation and political instabilities (Makanda 2016, Makanda and Naidu 2019). The foregoing scholars’ work on South Africa’s role in addressing African conflicts and how the country is grappling with the influx of migrants is potentially paving way for more (hopefully new) research trends. For instance, Loescher et al.(2013) is concerned with motivations on why South Africa attracts forced migrants. According to Loescher et al. (2013), South Africa has one of the best asylum seeking and refugees policy. For instance, in South Africa, refugees do not live in camps and are allowed to work. This is contrary to countries such as Kenya where refugees still live in camps. Similarly, Crush and Chikanda (2015) and Sithole and Dinbabo (2016) argue that the current influx of migrants in South Africa is attributed to factors such as economic stress, political instability and poverty in most African countries. For Alemu and Mengesha (2017), South Africa is one of the major destinations for international migration due to the country’s economic and liberal migration policies. Jager and Mapuva (2013), Crush and Chikanda (2015), Sithole and Dinbabo (2016) and and Kalin et al. (2017) focus is on countries that are greatest contributors of migrants in South Africa. The aforementioned contend that the largest number of migrants found in South Africa are from Zimbabwe (over 1.5 million) followed by those from the Democratic Republic of the Congo (447,000). Although the preceding scholars concur that Zimbabwe has not experienced orthodoxy strife which culminates into warfare, the country has been embroiled in political crises which have negatively impacted its economy for the last 20 years. For instance, De Jager and Musuva(2016:23) state that “in the last decade, the protracted economic crisis and political malaise in Zimbabwe have led to the largest inflow of both unskilled and skilled economic migrants into South Africa”.

There are also scholars whose main concern is migrants’ situation, reception, and integration, humanitarian and psychosocial assistance in South Africa. In this category of scholarship, most scholars highlight the plight, perceptions and experiences, survival strategies and psycho-social needs of forced migrants (Misago and Monson 2010, Lakika, Kankonde et al. 2015, Monson 2015, Gordon 2016, Landau 2017, Rugunanan 2020). The aforementioned scholars critique the way in which South Africa is dealing with the issue of migrants within its borders. What is common among scholars in this strand is the view that despite South Africa having a well-articulated refugee’s policy on paper, most migrants in the country lack proper documents. This is limiting their access to jobs, housing and other public services; rental accommodations and permits for businesses. Additionally, Misago and Monson (2010) Kankonde et al. (2015) Gordon, (2016) Landau, 2017 and Smith and Rugunanan (2017) argue that most migrants in the country have become victims of institutionalised xenophobia. For instance, while a section of South Africans perceive migrants as criminals who have come to steal their jobs (Misago and Monson, 2010; Gordon, 2016), it is challenging for the government to offer refugees protection they deserve. For instance, in 2008, there were xenophobic attacks that were experienced across the country’s major urban areas where 62 people dead, wounding over 670, dozens raped and more than 100,000 displaced (Monson, 2015). Similarly, in 2015, there was another wave of xenophobic attacks that were mostly experienced in the city of Durban (Smith and Rugunanan, 2017). Instead of the South African government putting a restriction on the attacks, most of the senior officials were sceptical and in denial of the existence of xenophobic violence (Landau, 2017). Accordingly, Landau says that some of the official used statements that instigated the preceding violence.

Furthermore, some scholars are at leery with the role of that the government of South Africa is playing in protecting migrants’ rights and according them security. For instance, Crush and Ramachandran (2010) argue that there is weak state security accorded to refugees which perpetuates a culture of impunity for offenders who commit crime against foreigners. Marindze (2014) argues that within the Department of Home Affairs (DHA) and South African Police Service (SAPS), there are officials who perceive many asylum claims of insecurity as bogus; this is a key cause of a culture of impunity. Neocosmos (2010) and Mangu (2019) link corruption and laxity among government...
officials as a leading contributor to government’s lack of protection of refugees. In this case, many officials are “collectively going out of their way to repel, hinder, and undermine asylum seekers’ capacity to receive fairly adjudicated claims” (Neocosmos 2010: 48). According to Whitaker (2017), urbanization has also made it difficult for the government and NGOs to get effective evidence documenting and supporting the security needs of migrants and prosecution of those who commit crimes against foreigners. For instance, a study done by Amnesty International in 2012 established that many women refugees who had received livelihood support were forced to locate their business in unsafe areas of Johannesburg (Mangu 2019). A similar study done by World Refugees Council in 2016 established that many women refugees who had established small businesses in Townships of South Africa had inadequate government support for licensing and stocking their businesses (Rugunanan 2020).

3. CRITIQUING THE LITERATURE ON MIGRANTS’ SITUATION IN SOUTH AFRICA

One contends that most literature on migrants’ situation in South Africa focuses on motivations on why South Africa attracts the highest number of forced migrants on the continent, countries that are greatest contributors of migrants in South Africa, reception, and integration, humanitarian and psycho-social assistance and the role of the government in protecting migrants. However, what is moot is a dearth of literature on how forced migrants in South Africa make-meaning, negotiate and construct their socio-political identities. For example, despite most displaced people opting to flee to areas where people with similar political identities are, Landau and Segatti (2009) and Neocosmos (2010) aver that migration has an effect on their de/construction of identity. Also, there is scarcity of literature on attitudes and perceptions that one group of migrants have towards other group(s) of migrants and South Africans. This is because, just as the impact of conflict in their home countries shape their identity construction, so does their lived experiences while in South Africa.

The paper by Adogame (2010) highlighted over a decade ago, how migrants frequently take their cultural practices, be they religious or at least some aspect of their nationhood, with them when they migrate as a way of practising their culture and maintaining their identity while abroad. Therefore, whether in their countries of origin or in South Africa, most migrants’ sociocultural identities are built and maintained. While in South Africa, the use of their home languages, support of different political organisation and teams propagates migrants’ culture and identity. However, the dearth of dearth of literature on how forced migrants in South Africa make-meaning, negotiate and construct their socio-political identities re-affirms Moore and Shellman (2004:723) assertion that forced migration scholarship is dominated by the “idiographic”, meaning that it appears to primarily comprise descriptive case studies, advocacy and awareness pieces, and policy evaluations”. According to Moore and Shellman (2004: 724-725), “the theoretical literature on forced migration tends to take the country or society as the unit of explanation and seeks to identify macro level concepts”, where empirical analyses of data are not overly ‘thick’ or strong.

The assertion in this paper, is that offering ‘thick’ empirical and material contexts of lived experiences of migrants in South Africa, can enhance and deepen the scholarship on understanding how forced migrants in South Africa make-meaning, negotiate and construct their socio-political identities. While the above points to the kinds of qualitative research being suggested, other scholars propose theoretical models that can also change the shape scholarship on meaning-making, negotiation and construction of socio-political among migrants in South Africa. Ukah (2010) argues that while in exile or abroad migrants join different religious groups and faith based movements and communities. Some of these religious movements and faith-based organizations become extended families for particular refugees from one ethnic group or nationality or different nationalities. For example, in Religion and identity de/construction among forced migrants: the case of the Congolese refugees in Durban, South Africa, Makanda and Naidu (2020) underscores how practices, politics and perception of some religious movements, groups and faith based organisation construct identities that differentiates one group of migrants from the other. Although religion is meant to be a source of consolation in the lives of many migrants, the politics, using the case of Congolese migrants in Durban, Makanda and Naidu (2020:1) argue that some “migrants use religious practices at their places of worship to assert and reaffirm their identity and use it as a form of resilience to any external threat to the existence of their culture”. It is the politics, practices and perception of joining different
religious groups and faith-based movements and communities that create spaces for make-meaning, negotiating and (de) constructing socio-political identities of migrants: appeal to one religious or faith-based group differentiates one migrant group from another.

Some scholars suggest social-networking as a platform on which migrants from a particular country or region form networks that facilitate their integration in their host countries. Kalitanyi and Visser (2010) describe social networks as a veritable collection of connected people distributed across different places, maximizing their economic opportunities through mutual aid and multiple displacements. Amisi and Ballard (2005) in *In the Absence of Citizenship: Congolese Refugee Struggle and Organisation in South Africa*, argue that most Congolese social networks act as instruments of expressing dislike for living in South Africa rather than addressing the needs and strategies of families and communities. Similarly, Landau and Freemantle (2018:10) insist on is that there are “instances in which migrant groups assert a collective (usually national) identity (but) that are often based on instrumental and short-lived associations”. Morreira (2010), Hlatshwayo (2011) Fatoki (2014) and Crush et al(2015) are cognizant of the existence of migrants’ social networks and associations that promote entrepreneurial skills and networks of migrants in South Africa. According to foregoing scholars, migrants’ social networks play an important role in providing humanitarian aid to victims of xenophobic attacks in South Africa. What the aforementioned scholars are suggesting is that most migrants’ social networks are characterized by collective processes that are based on the needs and strategies of different migrants’ families and communities.

The aforementioned scholars’ view leads one inevitably to a series of questions, including, “Whose interests should migrants’ association, unity and networks serve? The answer to such question is that migrants’ social networks and unity are an invaluable means of facilitating migrants’ integration and participation in the South African polity and in improving their livelihood opportunities and living conditions, and addressing many of the social and economic challenges affecting them. Portes et al (2008) points out that migrants unity, networks and bonds in most cases are used as defensive stance in cases where one or more migrant group(s) find themselves discriminated against in a host country. According to Portes (2008), migrants’ unity or bond in South Africa is centred on dual loyalties; that is ongoing relations between migrants and their places of origin as well as integrating into their host communities. While Morreira (2010), Hlatshwayo (2011) Fatoki (2014) and Crush et al(2015) see the existence of migrants’ social networks and associations as tools of promoting entrepreneurial skills of migrants in South Africa, they are essentially platforms for social identification of migrants social, cultural, economic and political identity and belonging in the South African polity.

There are also scholars who argue that migrants mobilise themselves and encourages others to participate in some form of actions, be they religious, economic political or cultural in their host countries. For instance, Vesely et al (2017) argues that migrants encourage each other to attend cultural celebration and religious practices or to join political formations. As a result, this becomes an instrument of cultural, social, economic and political integration; integrating into a group or community with a similar socio-political and economic background. Such cultural, social, economic and political integration ensure that all members of a particular migrant group(s) tolerate, respect and accommodate each other despite their diverse nationalities. On the flip of the coin, such cultural, social, economic and political associations becomes means of ensuring that members of one group of migrants (from one country) practise and maintain their cultural identity. This provides spaces where each group of migrants may make-meaning, negotiate and construct their cultural, social, economic and political identity.

While Vesely et al(2017) suggest that forced migrants are considered to be vulnerable because of the psychological wounds they harbour from the traumatic experiences of war and economics stress from their home countries and during the flight for refuge, Hlatshwayo (2011) argue that there are increasing xenophobic attacks that target African migrants in South Africa. This leads to migrants to unite so as to come up with ways of coping with the existential threats of xenophobia. As a result, migrants built resilience and their capacity to cope with migration setback, barriers, threats and limited resources in South Africa, is increased. The politics of uniting together as migrants from different parts of the world in dealing with difficulties of their migration journey constitutes a socio-political identity that forms part of a process that constructs, reconsructs, maintains and appropriates different aspects of migrants’ socio-political identities and survival strategies in South Africa.
To further substantiate the politics of dealing with migration setbacks in South Africa, Uwimpuhwe and Ruiters (2018) argue that migrants form associations that provide vital physical, social, moral and sometimes financial support and for mobilizing resources aimed at building migrants’ new lives in South Africa. This also becomes a formal way of protecting the migrants from being targeted as ‘foreigners’ in cases of anti-foreign attacks: resiliency to anti-foreign attacks in South Africa. Such migrants’ associations not only satiate migrants’ need for stability, safety, affection and identity, but also act as spaces for meaning-making, negotiation and construction of migrants’ socio-political identities.

Given the pervasive label of ‘parasite’ and misconceptions that forced immigrants are associated with in South Africa, meaning-making, negotiation and (de)construction of migrants’ socio-political identities can play an important role in either integrating or disintegrating migrants within the South African polity. For instance, meaning-making, negotiation and (de)construction of migrants’ political, cultural, social and economic identities may/not play an important role in social cohesion and coexistence between the different migrant communities or between refugees and South Africans. Potentially, negotiation and construction of migrants’ socio-political identities may determine how prejudices and behaviours that reject, exclude and often vilify persons based on the perception that they are outsiders or foreigners to the community are construed. Thus, meaning-making, negotiation and (de)construction of migrants’ socio-political identities remains an important but under-researched theme in forced migration studies.

From an empirical point of view, there are a number of organizations that researchers can work with in order to generate qualitative research from migrants themselves. What this paper is suggesting is for researchers to carry out particular qualitative and ethnographic studies, by drawing on the lived experiences, insights and arguments of the empirical realities of different migrant communities in South Africa on how they make-meaning, negotiate and construct their socio-political identities. Additionally, these studies can potentially seek to probe the assumptions that African migrants are forming both informal and formal association as a way of dealing with xenophobia in South Africa.

Also the paper stresses the need for studies to include the seemingly forgotten role of migrants in South African politics, by focusing on the migrants themselves. Some of the studies could potentially focus on identifying how migrant communities can contribute to the consolidation of the South African democracy and what lessons can South African political elite learn from the presence of the influx of migrants in the country. There is also a need for studies that may probe and identify how social, political, economic and cultural identities of migrants contributes positively or negatively to the South Africa’s social cohesion project and or those that may identify if there are some semblance and similarities of identities among different groups of migrants. Still, some scholars can empirically come up with need to develop a new framework that will be crucial in understanding how the forced migrants’ children construct/deconstruct their identities. Lastly, some studies need to evaluate the extent of intergenerational transfer of identities between the host and mother countries’ space and to locate if there are some forced migrants’ constructed identities within the transnational realm.

It is suggested that such a focus seeks to ascertain if the involvement of the meaning-making, negotiation and construction of migrants’ socio-political identities can offer a grassroots based contribution that fits within the mission of the government’s social cohesion project which seeks to critically engage and strive to re/address the disadvantages, inequities and imbalances of South Africa. Such studies may also shape the formulation and transformation of South Africa’s immigration policy (like the establishment of migrant-migrant and migrant-local forums on peaceful co-existence). For instance, South Africa has provided a space where different groups of migrants have been protesting against questionable political events in their countries of origin. Some migrants have protested against South Africa’s interest or lack of in interest in the political affairs of their country. Still, some migrants have protested against the treatment of “African foreigners” in South Africa. For example, in 2012, Congolese refugees who were protesting against the questionable re-election of Kabila questioned the way in which South Africa was conducting its peacebuilding affairs in the DRC. They accused the role of the South African National Defence Force (SANDF) in training Congolese Battalion whose aim was to crack down dissidents of Kabila and postelection protesters. Another example is the protest was in Cape Town where migrants protested against lack of security from...
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government. More recently, as reported in News24 on 4th August 2020, Zimbabweans living in South Africa took to the street and protested against human right violation in Zimbabwe and lack of interest from South Africa in resolving the political menace in that country (Maphanga, 2020). The foregoing protests and demonstration by migrants clearly indicates that they have some perception on the dynamics of events that breeds conflicts in their countries and would like South Africa to intervene.

Qualitative studies of the events such as the demonstration cited above, this paper suggests, will in turn offer empirical reference points to the discourse on how migrants construct their political opinion. Gaining such vital insights and perspectives from forced migrants in South Africa will allow one to in turn, cast a more critical gaze on whether or not xenophobia and exclusion of migrants in South African social and professional spaces are elements of a hostile anti-migrant public culture at all social levels or as a result, of negative migrants’ socio-political identities. This kind of focus, questions, from a qualitative perspective, with migrants’ voices included, whether it is in the interest of the South Africa in its refugee’s Act (No. 130 of 1998) to ensure that migrants are integrated and live in harmony with South Africans. Contrary to the government interest in its social cohesion project, some of the socio-political identities can easily become a platform on which prejudices, and behaviour that reject, exclude and often vilify South Africans by migrants are constructed and negotiated. Qualitative studies that focus on meaning-making, negotiation and construction of social, cultural, political and economic identities. This kind of focus potentially highlights meaning-making, negotiation and construction of socio-political Identities among migrants as subaltern individuals who often live and straddle multiple intersecting worlds, the home country and the host country (South Africa).

4. Conclusion

This paper begun by offering a critical survey of the work done on forced migrants’ situation and lived experiences in South Africa. The paper commends the efforts of scholars for their focus on motivations on why South Africa attracts the highest number of forced migrants on the continent, countries that are greatest contributors of migrants in South Africa, reception, and integration, humanitarian and psycho-social assistance and the role of the government in protecting migrants. However, the paper has criticised the myopic and shortsightedness of scholars on how forced migrants in South Africa construct their socio-political identities. As a result, the paper suggests a need for both non-empirical and empirical studies that gain vital insights and perspectives from forced migrants on how they make-meaning, negotiate and (de)construct their socio-political identities.
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