Todaro, M. P., 1969, A Model of Labor Migration and Urban Unemployment in Less Developed Countries, *American Economic Review*, 59, I, 138-48.
Van Binsbergen, W. M. J., 1977, Occam, Francis Bacon, and the Transformation of Zambian Society, paper read at the International Seminar on Migration and Rural Development in Tropical Africa, Afrika-Studiecentrum, Leiden, 1977; published in: *Cultures et Développement*, 9, 3, 1977, p. 489-520.
Van Velsen, J., 1977, Labour migration and International Boundaries in Southern Africa, oral presentation, International Seminar on Migration and Rural Development, Leiden.
Wallerstein, I., & Gutkind, P., 1976, *The Political Economy of Contemporary Africa*, Sage, Beverly Hills/London.
Wolpe, H., 1972, Capitalism and Cheap Labour-Power in South-Africa: From Segregation to Apartheid, *Economy and Society*, I, 4:425-56.

Marxist and Non-Marxist Approaches to Migration in Tropical Africa

by Thérèse J. F. A. Gerold-Scheepers & Wim M. J. van Binsbergen

1. INTRODUCTION [1]

Recent work on migration in tropical Africa displays a dazzling heterogeneity. Part of the current literature, particularly the more strictly geographical and demographic studies, is of a primarily descriptive nature. It presents quantitative data about migrants, migration streams, areas of departure and destination; underlying theoretical models remain implicit, the data are supposed to speak for themselves and to derive their meaningfulness from common-sense interpretations [2]. The conceptually and theoretically more sophisticated studies aim at *explanation* of migratory phenomena and even of the total complex of transformations of which migration forms only one aspect. Here, for some years, the major distinctions have been those between structural and methodological-individualist approaches, and, within the structural approach, between recent marxism on the one hand and structural-functionalism on the other, the latter having dominated the social-scientific study of African migration since the 1950s.

Methodological individualism sees all social life (including migration) as ultimately revolving around the conscious, rational perceptions, motivations, calculations and volitions of actors. The structural tradition, more in the mainstream of social-science thinking, stresses, beyond the individual cognitive and motivational elements, wider social-structural conditions. From the structural point of view, these conditions set the framework for individual action, predetermine individual perception even, and, often altogether escaping the actor's awareness, decisively shape the pattern of social relationships.

The methodological-individualist approach to migration concentrates on individual migrants, who implicitly are viewed as atomistic, a-historical free social agents. Anthropologists and sociologists working in this direction [3] have emphasized the economic factor in migrants' motivations, although, as we shall see below, other factors (social, cultural, psychological, political) have also received some attention. Neo-classical economists studying the direction and volume of migration streams from the same angle, have pointed out that migration occurs from low income to high income areas, and from rural areas to towns - interpreting this as signs of individual migrants aiming at maximalization of their incomes. Recently, new impetus has been given to this approach by Todaro (1971), whose views have subsequently been expanded by Godfrey (1973) and Knight (1972). Byerlee et al. (1976:6f) in principle accept the Todaro approach, but they try to incorporate it in a wider theoretical framework representing all

1) We are indebted to J.-L. Amselle, J. Gugler, K. de Jonge, H. A. Meilink and F. Snyder for helpful comments on earlier drafts of this paper.
2) Cf. Gould & Prothero 1975; Udo 1975; Dubois 1975; also the greater part of the contributions to the special issue of *Cahiers ORSTOM* (1975) is characterized by this one-sided approach.
3) See Gugler 1969; Gulliver 1955; Mitchell 1959.

the factors (including non-monetary costs and returns related to risk, attitudinal characteristics, social ties and expectations) that influence the decision to migrate. Gugler (1976) criticizes the Todaro model because of the vagueness of its basic components. An ambitious attempt to apply Todaro's views in a specific research setting, that of internal migration in Zambia, is Bates (1976); however, the extreme shortcomings, both theoretically and empirically, of his and similar non-structural approaches have been amply exposed by Van Binsbergen (1977).

The alternative to the methodological-individualist approach to migration, is the structural approach, in both its marxist and non-marxist versions. These we shall now discuss, in the light of what seems to be the crucial question linking migration and rural development: does migration foster rural development by bringing about an optimal distribution of human resources, or, on the contrary, does migration constitute a drain on the labour and material resources of rural areas, thus exploiting them instead of contributing to their development? The equally fundamental question as to what constitutes rural development (higher rural incomes, a higher 'quality of rural life'? increasing dependence on capitalist mechanisms? or both?) we shall refrain from discussing here. We shall, moreover, concentrate on anthropological and sociological studies (cf. H. Meilink's discussion of economic approaches elsewhere in the present volume).

II. THE STRUCTURAL-FUNCTIONALIST APPROACH

The idiom of structural-functionalism revolves on patterns of social relationships creating broad enduring sections within a society (rural versus urban communities; ethnic groups; classes in the sense of status groups; formal organizations; kin groups; age cohorts; sexes etc.); these sections interact with one another, and through both cooperation and conflict produce an integrated and self-perpetuating society. Migration then appears as one of the ways in which these interactions between sections takes place, serving various positive and negative functions for the sections or groups involved. Classic examples of this approach include: Van Velsen (1961), Gluckman (1961), Skinner (1965). From the part of economics, we could quote cost-benefit analyses of migration, assessing the economic advantages of migration for both the departure and the destination areas, as examples of a structural approach (cf. Berg 1965; Elkan 1960).

The major recent publication on migration in the structural-functionalist tradition is the book edited by Parkin (1975): *Town and Country in Central and East Africa*. As a recent culmination of this tradition, two points are striking about this book: the rather positive view of migration as apparent from most contributions (which stress the migrants' positive effects with regard to the development of both areas of departure and destination, by the diffusion of ideas, values, techniques and income) [4]; and the rather superficial, eclectic theoretical content.

In his introduction, Parkin perfunctorily cites Amin's (1974) views concerning the influence of overall strategies of development (assigning to a region the role

[4] The same view pervades many other structural-functional migration studies, e.g. Mabogunje (1972); Hill (1963); Sudarkasa (1974-75); Adepoju (1977).The development of the areas of origin by returning migrants has been assessed by Elkan (1960) and Berg (1965). Not only Amin (1974:103-7) but also non-marxists such as Byerlee et al. (1976:59f) question the positive development effects of returning migrants.

of labour reserve, cash crop production, or neither) upon the direction and volume of migration. Confining himself to modern migrations, Parkin of course has no reason to identify the causes behind pre-colonial migrations in Africa. However, his analysis of modern migration remains rather bleak. It hardly benefits from such insights into African migration as Amin and other marxists have gained, but instead leans heavily on Mitchell's (1959) classic distinction between the 'rate of migration' (determined by the collective impact of economic forces) and the 'incidence of migration' (determined by the social and cultural factors influencing the individual decisions of would-be migrants). Gugler has criticized this approach as ignoring not only non-economic (e.g. political) causes operating at the collective level, but also economic causes which bear upon individual decision-making (1967:142f). In passing we note that both Parkin, Mitchell and Gugler, while essentially structural-functionalists, in their emphasis on individual motivation incline heavily towards the methodological-individualist position.

A similar dilemma is clear from Garbett's case study (1975) in Parkin's book. Dissatisfied with migration analyses based on individual motivations alone, Garbett expects to find a way out by shifting from individual to group decision making. The individual's decision is determined by the decision of his kin group (1975:118f). Garbett presents this model claiming that the variations within the general migration pattern are not sufficiently accounted for by economic, ecological or political factors. He admits, however, that in Zimbabwe a close connection exists between 'circular migration' and the capitalist economy; but this line of argument is not pursued any further.

In the same volume, Uchendu (1975) advances the thesis that inter-rural migration contributes to rural and even to national development. He emphasizes the significance of 'export capacity' and the 'intensity and duration of inter-rural migration' (1975:168), having considerable confidence in the results of 'interaction between man and his environment' (*ibid*). Although this may be right for the areas explicitly discussed by Uchendu (Geita in Tanzania, Kisii in Kenya, and Teso in Uganda), and perhaps also for some other areas [5]), his approach is limited in that he does not include the causes of emigration from the departure areas in his study. Admittedly, he deals with the emigration from the 'land-hungry areas' and from 'over-populated Sukumaland' to Geita (1975:169), but the significance he attaches to cause and effect of the emigration is overly superficial.[6]) Uchendu advocates a break-through of agriculturally self-sufficient areas. However, when he argues that 'policy decisions which affect the various sectors of the national economy are increasingly mediated by national institutions' (1975:173), this raises the question of whether incorporation of peasant communities in the national economy might lead to sham development, particularly when the emigration areas would be assigned the function of supply areas for the national centres. In his comments on Uchendu's contribution, Parkin emphasizes the aggravation of contradictions between the 'landless' immigrants and the 'landlords', in the 'land-surplus' areas as described by Uchendu - this in spite of (or

[5]) The greater part of the contributions to Prothero (1972) have been written in the same vein.

[6]) Cf. Egero (1974), who recognizes the positive aspects of the migration of the Sukuma to the cotton areas, yet advocates a stabilization of the migration process 'to the advantage especially of the labour supplying areas whose people would then be available for the development of these areas themselves' (1974:32).

due to?) the state-controlled land policy of the national government (Parkin 1975b:17f). Parkin's eclecticism is again revealed here: unexpectedly, and implicitly, he comes close to marxist views concerning the effects of migration on the departure areas. Parkin even asserts that the three areas studied by Uchendu belong to the category of rural areas which are characterized by Amin (1974; cf. Parkin 1975b:19) as 'organized for large-scale export production which have already entered the capitalist phase, which implies private appropriation of the land and the availability of wage labour'.

The last contribution in Parkin's book to be discussed here is Colson and Scudder's (1975) study of the resettlement areas of the Zambian Gwembe district (cf. Colson 1971). The study entails a comparison between the adaptation process of rural migrants in two communities, following the flooding of their original home areas when the Kariba dam was constructed. In Mazulu the adaptation process proceeded more smoothly than in Musulumba. A number of reasons are invoked to explain this difference. First, Mazulu is said to have enjoyed more favourable environmental conditions, and to have shown a greater ability in farming. Moreover, in that community the developmental potential was already higher prior to resettlement, e.g. one was familiar with development programmes (1975:192f). Thus Colson and Scudder's analysis considers, in combination, people's abilities and motivations, ecological circumstances and local history, as factors in their adaption to resettlement.

Again, Parkin's comments are in a surprisingly marxist vein, when he muses on the possible effects that the extension of urban wage-employment may have on 'peasant agricultural self-sufficiency'. He wonders whether such a state of affairs is likely to foster an urban proletarian class consciousness (1975:23f). However, the absence of a systematic, integrated theory reduces his remarks, and most of his introduction, to at times brilliant yet marginal comments, which largely corroborate what could already be suggested on the basis of less recent literature (cf. Gould 1974; Magubane & O'Brien 1972): that structural-functionalism has failed to develop an integrated theory of migration and related phenomena, in the light of which the abundance of good case studies could be meaningfully compared, and their similarities understood.

Let us now turn to a structural approach, marxism, which, as regards relative merits, seems to form the mirror-image of structural-functionalism: it has the general theory, but falls short in empirical spade-work.

III. MARXIST APPROACHES

Marxist studies of migration [7] have in common with the non-marxist structural approaches that they analyse and explain migration primarily at the level of the social structure, regardless, to a very large extent, of the motivations and perceptions of the individuals who are actual or potential migrants. Thus Amin (1974:93), in a scalding attack on methodological-individualist approaches to migration, has stressed that what we should look at is 'the processes of the system which cannot be discovered from the motivations'. The distinction between marxist and non-marxist structural thinking, therefore, lies in a different theory of social structure. Both see any given society as composed of a limited number

[7] Cf. Amselle (1976a); Rey (1976a); Meillassoux (1975): Amin (1974).

of different sectors. However, structural-functionalism stresses the continuity and integration of the total society, usually underplaying its internal contradictions and its changes over time, attributing great explanatory value to formal-organizational (groups, bureaucracy) and ideological (normative, religious) elements, and assuming that the overall social structure applies more or less equally in all the various sectors. Marxism, on the other hand, looks at contemporary African society as a composite of *qualitatively different* sectors: different 'modes of production', or a capitalist sector versus a domestic, rural sector. The specific internal structure of each sector, or mode of production, is given not primarily by formal-organizational and ideological elements, but by the ways in which production and reproduction take place; and this is always considered to imply conflict revolving around the control of production and reproduction, and the alienation or expropriation of products, or surpluses. Modern African society is viewed as the process by which pre-existing structures are encroached upon by capitalism, in such a way that surpluses generated in the former are expropriated so as to perpetuate ('reproduce') the latter. Capitalism has emerged in the modern world as a specific mode of production characterized by: the separation between producers and their means of production; the commodity nature of production factors (including labour and means of production) and products: they can be bought and sold; and the fact that the economy has come to determine all other aspects of social life, to such an extent that society 'reproduces' itself solely through the economy. Migration, then, is interpreted as one aspect of the penetration of capitalism: it is one of the possible mechanisms by which rural producers are divorced from their means of production in a pre-capitalist mode of production, and by which they enter, more or less as 'free proletarians', into capitalist production. While the historical expansion of capitalism is thus viewed, by marxists, as the main explanation of migration, they disagree as to the precise ways in which migration reflects and furthers this expansion. Nor do they evaluate the effects of migration on the rural communities of departure in the same manner, although they all consider these effects negative, exploitative. The background of these disagreements is their lack of consensus on basic theoretical issues in marxism, and - largely through polemics - the rapid theoretical development in this section of African Studies. All this makes it extremely difficult to summarize and discuss these approaches within the limits of the present article.

In what has been called the most original book in years to be written by an anthropologist (Panoff 1977:133), Meillassoux develops his theory of migration on the basis of an elaborate model of the domestic community and its economy. For Meillassoux, the capitalist sector always (i.e. not only in Africa) relies on the domestic sector for the reproduction of its labour. Migration is the major way in which capitalist enterprise in Africa can secure labour, which is being reproduced in the peripheral domestic communities, and at the expense of these communities. With the example of seasonal migration (a form of migration which once was very prominent throughout Africa, and which still is of considerable importance), Meillassoux demonstrates that through migration capitalism benefits in a peculiar way from the domestic economy. Not only is the migrant worker, as any direct producer under capitalism, exploited in that the surplus value he generates through his labour, is expropriated; in addition, his labour is *over-exploited,* in that capitalism also appropriates (during the slack season in which the peasant is employed by distant capitalist employers) such interest on labour

('rente de travail') as that peasant's previous production in the rural subsistence sector has generated, during the productive season. For given this interest on labour, the capitalist employer can confine himself to paying the migrant worker only a subsistence wage ('salaire d'appoint'), just enough to let the migrant survive from day to day during the period of his capitalist employment. The domestic community, and not capitalism, carries the burden of producing his labour force through his non-productive childhood, as well as keeping him alive as soon as he leaves capitalist employment. The peripheral domestic communities thus subsidize the capitalist sector at their own expense. The ubiquitous poverty of rural Africa bears witness to this state of affairs. But far from aiming at the destruction of these communities, capitalism in Africa has made their survival (albeit in an entirely subservient and exploited form) the cornerstone of its own success - as is most clearly demonstrated by apartheid and bantustans in South Africa.[8]) For this general set-up to work, it is imperative that migration, even if it ceases to be seasonal, yet remains circular: the domestic communities can only fulfill the role assigned to them by capitalism, if the migrants' foothold in the places of capitalist employment (towns, mines, plantations) remains insecure - in other words if they are kept from becoming really 'free' proletarians which, at the places of capitalist employment, reproduce as a distinct social class which is differentiated from the rural peasantry. To sum it up, modern migration in Africa is the major mechanism through which imperialism asserts itself as the 'mode of reproduction of cheap labour' (Meillassoux 1975:137f).

Meillassoux' thesis is not entirely new. More than twenty years ago Deane (1953) analysed the relationship between Central-African rural communities and capitalism in basically the same way, although with less sophistication and not as part of an integrated theory of African domestic communities. Meillassoux is capable of accounting, in a systematic way, for such well-known empirical facts as the surprising survival of rural communities and pre-capitalist modes of production; the ubiquity of extensive urban-rural networks; the reluctant urbanization of Africa in the colonial period; the colonial colour-bar, and the racist situation in Southern Africa. However, one wonders whether the persistence of African rural societies is entirely due to capitalist interests. Could these interests (even if mediated through administrative structures actively propagating the 'illusion of tribe' (Southall 1969), indirect rule etc.) at all form a sufficient explanation for this persistence? Might not these rural societies' internal dynamics have constituted an equally powerful factor? And, consequently, might the continued operation of urban-rural ties not partly be explained by migrants' positive adherence to these internal dynamics, *beyond* their economic necessity to retain a rural foothold? When we recall Van Velsen's (1961) classic argument on labour migration as a positive factor in Tonga tribal society, it is clear that Meillassoux is not alone in his views on this point. We are, as an alternative, not suggesting anything like a self-perpetuating, autonomous existence of African 'traditional culture'. But surely, with marxists as Rey (1973) stressing the built-in resistance of African pre-capitalist modes of production vis-à-vis capitalism, the question needs to be reconsidered (cf. Van Binsbergen, forthcoming).

Similarly, Meillassoux' approach does not seem to have an answer for the dramatic urbanization of Africa following territorial independence. What changes occurred in the nature of capitalist enterprise in post-colonial Africa, or in the relations between post-colonial Africa and the metropole, that allowed for the very marked shift from circulatory migration to permanent urban dwelling, giving rise to an urban proletariat divorced from rural production and reproduction? Could it be that with the overthrow of colonialism African states, now at least to some extent dependent on popular support from the part of their subjects, had to relinquish the political power to effectively control the flow of labour? Or is it rather that modern capitalism has as much interest in an expanding group of consumers (which in modern Africa is mainly located in the towns) as it has in cheap labour, and that recently the balance has tipped in favour of the former interest? Whatever the answer, Meillassoux' theory of migration seems to apply better to colonial, than to post-colonial Africa.

Finally, one would like to see an extension of Meillassoux' approach, towards comparison between the drain on the rural community due to migration and the effect of the main other form of capitalist incorporation: rural cash-crop production. Is it possible, with Meillassoux' conceptual apparatus, to proceed beyond the truism that cash-crop production constitutes a threat to rural food production?[9])

Amselle (1976b) also interprets migration in the light of the expansion of capitalism. He stresses that migration will ultimately lead to the separation of the migrants from their rural means of production. This process will come about gradually. As long as there are socio-economic relations between the migrants and their home areas (Amselle refers to this as the 'migratory network'), capitalism will sustain these contacts because they produce the cost of living of the migrants (1976b:30-34). Whenever areas function as labour reserves this will go hand in hand with substantial changes in the pre-capitalist relations of production (1976b:29f). According to Amselle, these aspects of migration have been neglected hitherto. He criticizes most current research as overly descriptive, concentrating only upon the characteristics of the areas of departure and destination. He objects to different forms of migration being classified according to binary typologies (e.g. temporary/permanent) which 'are meant to show the causes and respective influences of internal and external determinative factors with regard to migration' (1976b:11). Such typologies, he claims, evoke distinctions which in reality do not exist, since capitalism is the underlying factor uniting them all (1976b:34). Therefore, Amselle prefers not to distinguish between 'old migrations' and 'modern migrations'. Although land scarcity, conflicts between generations, or a particular ethnic group's structural tendency to migrate, may be occasions for migration, as factors these are always subordinate to capitalism. For the same reason Amselle criticizes the conventional distinction between rural and urban migrations. The crux of the migration issue concerns not the ultimate

[8]) Meillassoux (1975:179f); Magubane (1975); Kantor & Kenny (1976). The latter authors claim, however, that labour migration does not *a priori* contribute to the growth of capitalism.

[9]) In this context, it is interesting to compare Meillassoux' approach with that of Arrighi (1973) - a marxist outside the French group discussed in the present article. In Arrighi's analysis of the creation of an industrial labour force through migrancy in Zimbabwe since the beginning of the colonial era, proletarianisation gained impetus when African farmers could no longer operate on the capitalist market through the sale of agricultural products. Without anything like Meillassoux' specialized theoretical framework, Arrighi proceeds to explain the peasants' increasing dependence on labour migration by reference to two related processes: the manipulation of industrial wages (whose real value constantly declined), and the increasing reliance, among the peasants, on manufactured products.

geographical destination of migrants, but rather the position of the migrant in the relations of production in the destination area, wherever that may be (1976b:22f).

We agree with Amselle that migration research should not start out from *a priori* distinctions. His analysis, however, is somewhat limited by the emphasis on external factors alone, notably the penetration of capitalism. In addition to this factor, could there really be no internal factor, built into an ethnic group's specific social structure, and capable of explaining, if only partially, why some groups, or their members, tend to migrate more than others? Moreover, does capitalist incorporation always produce the same familiar patterns of migration? Is there no *indirect* impact of changing relations of production to be considered? The importance of the latter point is clearly demonstrated by Asiwaju (1976). He considers the migrations from Ivory Coast and Upper Volta to Ghana during the French colonial regime as 'protest migrations'. He stresses that political protest actions, including migrations, were the symptoms of economic exploitation. By starting from the premise that the capitalist mode of production absolutely determines the motives for migration, Amselle perhaps too readily excludes such possible factors as political oppression [10]), religious considerations (Works 1972), escape from social control (Olofson 1976), colonization [11]), or climatic disasters (Herring 1976).

Rey (1976b, cf. 1973) also holds that migration is solely a consequence of capitalism. His analysis is based on the marxist theories of imperialism, especially those of Otto Bauer and, to a lesser degree, of Rosa Luxemburg (1967). Both these authors have discussed the mobilization of labour for the benefit of the expansion of the capitalist sector. Bauer recognized the relationship between accumulation of products within the capitalist sector and the recruitment of labour overseas. Luxemburg, on the other hand, stressed the export of labour from the rural areas of capitalist countries to overseas territories. In her view the distinction between capitalism and pre-capitalist modes of production was not merely analytical, but involved a clear temporal sequence.

Rey considers both mechanisms to operate concurrently. The non-capitalist countries function as a continuous source of export of (forced) labour and cash crops to the capitalist countries (1976a:50f). Rey does not entirely agree, however, with Amin (1974:88f), who considers the migration process to be determined by overall strategies of development. Rey wonders why, under the same strategy of development, the migration pattern yet varies for the different societies subject to that strategy. He expects an answer from an investigation of the contradictions within the non-capitalist mode of production, and the opportunities for capitalism to benefit from such contradictions. Every mode of production revolves, in its relations of production, around a number of fundamental contradictions between groups controlling each other's labour and expropriating each other's products: men versus women, elders versus youth, masters versus slaves. These contradictions provide an opening for capitalism to penetrate, by striking an alliance between capitalists and exploiting pre-capitalist groups, e.g. the elders and chiefs in a lineage-based community, who dominate the young men by their control over the circulation of women. Through such alliances capitalism links

[10]) Dorjahn (1975); Tiffin (1975); Asiwaju (1976); Buijtenhuijs (1977).
[11]) Grossman (1972:167) refers to 'expanding migration associated with tenant farming'.

up with a pre-capitalist mode of production. In the context of migration this would mean that exploitation of young men as migrants workers may coincide with that of young men as bride-seekers, paying over their earnings in the capitalist sector to elders in exchange for women. Thus part of the proceeds from the capitalist exploitation of the direct producers accrues to the dominant class in the pre-capitalist mode of production. In other pre-capitalist communities capitalism is less capable of using internal contradictions; and there the participation in capitalism (e.g. through migration) may be less marked or even absent.

Comparing Rey's approach with that of Meillassoux, the striking difference is that Rey attaches much more importance to the internal differentiation and class conflict within the domestic communities. For Rey, capitalism is not the only exploitative factor in Africa. Nor is its dominance over other modes of production taken for granted: it has to be studied as a dialectial process of class alliances. Although Meillassoux (1975:146f) denies that his domestic communities constitute a distinct mode of production, yet Rey's approach, allowing for specific local forms and variation, can add the necessary corrections to the visionary but somewhat sweeping generalizations by Meillassoux.

The marxist approaches to migration discussed so far contain a number of potentially testable hypotheses. Thus Meillassoux' analysis of seasonal migration in terms of interest on labour would suggest that societies with a mode of production not involving a slack season (hunting, gathering) would, in terms of migration, respond differently to the penetration of capitalism, at least in its early stages. Rey's views would suggest that societies in which the elders' economic and marital control is particularly strong, would develop different migration patterns from societies with relatively autonomous age groups such as the Nyakyusa (cf. Wilson 1951). Amselle's analysis would suggest that migratory networks (in other words, urban-rural ties) would take an entirely different form once migrants have secured relatively stable and permanent positions in the capitalist sector. But while both Rey and Amselle have edited a volume of case studies on migration, none of the articles (by such authors as Samuel, Le Bris, Fiélou, Baldé, and Rey himself) in these books explicitly apply and test their theories.

Samuel (1976) gives some insight into how contradictions develop within the traditional production unit. He notes the exploitation of young emigrants working in France by the traditional authorities at home, who lay a claim to the migrants' income. However, Samuel's data are not representative, as they are based on what happened to a haphazard selection of a few immigrants into France (belonging to the Hal Poular and the Soninké). In order to substantiate Samuel's thesis that the present exploitation is but an extension of pre-existing slavery, one would need to know how many young people are thus held in the inescapable grip of the elders, the amounts of money involved, etc.[12]) Le Bris deals with the settlement of pioneers in the colonization area of Togodo (South-east Togo). He gives a picture of the internal contradictions in Togodo originating from the fact that land-titles and labour are in the hands of pioneers, who already held

[12]) There is much literature on the causes and effects of migration of Africans to Europe, e.g. Adams (1977); Zehraoui (1976); Kane & Lericollais (1975); Dupresson (1975); Samuel (1978); see also the bibliographical survey by M. Aghassian (1976: 116f).

key positions in the villages of their homelands. The author himself admits that his case study does not touch on the essential problem of the rural exodus in Southeast Togo (1976:190). While Rey stresses the importance, for the migration pattern, of internal contradictions in the area of departure, Le Bris merely analyses contradictions in the area of destination [13]). Rey's own short case study (1976b) deals, amongst others, with the disruption of the pre-colonial Gangam community under the effect of oppression by the Tyokossi. However, his ideas of the relationship between the migratory process and the penetration of capitalism (as formulated in his introduction), hardly come in. Likewise, in Amselle's edited book, Fiéloux' case study merely assesses to what extent migration of the Lobi in Southwest Upper Volta and Northeast Ivory Coast have resulted in the change of their socio-economic institutions. This is very unlike Amselle's approach to migration, which considers migration not as an independent input variable but instead as an intrinsic part of a historical process: the penetration of capitalism. Again, Baldé's case study of migrations from Guinea to Senegal does not contain an explicit link with marxist migration theory.

Overlooking the marxist studies of African migration as discussed in this section, we are impressed by their attempt to interpret migration systematically by reference to the fundamental overall transformation of African society, which this approach attributes to the penetration of capitalism. Better than current non-marxist approaches does this approach give full weight to what, at the subjective or common-sense level, appear to be the crucial aspects of modern migrations in Africa: labour, exploitation, increasing dependence of powerless individuals upon world capitalism, and increasing drainage of rural economies. However, with all its obvious potential, two great weaknesses are clear: the failure, so far, to translate eloquent and illuminating abstractions into ordinary, prosaic case studies; and the relative theoretical immaturity of the approach, which accounts for the fact that significant related problems have remained out of scope, so far: rural development as an alternative to migration in the context of capitalist penetration; the survival of non-capitalist modes of production in so far as such survival is not due to capitalist intervention; the spate of post-independence urbanization in Africa; and the fact that, even if the penetration of capitalism is to be the ultimate key to the contemporary transformation of Africa, yet this process creates social, political, religious etc., conditions which in themselves will have relatively autonomous effects on migration - effects requiring a more incisive analysis than the pious repetition of the words 'capitalism' and 'exploitation'.

A further limitation of the marxist approaches is that they mainly apply to one type of migration: circulatory labour migration. Yet much migration in contemporary Africa does not serve the immediate purpose of joining the capitalist labour market: migration of women, children and elderly people to join relatives who elsewhere are involved in capitalist production; and migration of young people in the pursuit of education. No doubt it is possible to interpret also these forms of migration as aspects of the penetration of capitalism. Thus education might be seen as an anticipatory concession to the demands of the capitalist labour market. Also through education part of the costs of the reproduction of skilled

[13]) Cf. Rocheteau (1975), who likewise fails to elaborate on the problem of the rural exodus along the lines stipulated by Rey (1976a), yet provides more insight into the transition of class relationships and modes of production both in the areas of origin and in the pioneer areas.

or semi-skilled labour for the capitalist sector is once again borne by the domestic sector, which moreover has to do without such productive labour as the youngsters would have been engaged in, had they not gone to school. But a satisfactory marxist analysis of non-labour migration has not yet been made.

This takes us to a further point. Marxist analyses tend to stress the extent to which domestic communities are exploited by capitalism, through migration. In non-labour migration this aspect is less self-evident. Thus the structural-functionalist Christopher (1976, cf. 1977) sees a connection between discontent with employment in the rural sector and the desire to share in the *benefits* of town life, particularly urban schooling. Does not sometimes the abstract, formal marxist argument (which considers the expropriation of surplus-value and interest on labour as exploitation) take on moral overtones, without proper assessment of the realities of the situation in terms of actual, concrete gains and losses? Abstract marxist analysis would deem all industrial employees in North-Atlantic society to be exploited, (though not over-exploited). No doubt they are, in a formal sense; yet most African peasants and migrants would not hesitate to exchange places with them; even though these workers should be recognized as being alienated and manipulated. If we can account for these differences between African and North-Atlantic workers' conditions, both on the level of theory, and on the level of political practice, class struggle, trade-unionism etc., marxist analyses of the penetration of capitalism may not remain so utterly negative and fatalistic. Beyond the formal context of expropriation and exploitation, are there no possible benefits from the participation in capitalist production, - benefits which under certain conditions and perhaps only for certain individuals, may yet partly outweigh the detrimental effects of migration? Van der Klei (1977) even goes to the extent of reversing the marxist argument and interpreting seasonal migration in the Lower Casamance (Senegal) as exploitation of the capitalist sector by the peasants. Similarly, Gugler (1976:185f) calls the move to town a 'gold rush', where migrants join the 'urban economy game'. These alternatives to the marxist approach do not sound particularly convincing. But also in view of Rey's emphasis on the contradictions within pre-capitalist modes of production (contradictions which the penetration of capitalism may reinforce, but which it might also dissolve - to the possible benefit of the underlying groups of women, youth and slaves), we should not be too sure that under all conditions modern migrations constitute a negative phenomenon.

IV. CONCLUSION

If we agree that the perceptions and motivations of individual migrants are merely surface phenomena, which far from explaining migration are themselves to be explained by reference to more fundamental conditions, it is a disappointing conclusion that none of the marxist and non-marxist structural approaches to migration which we have surveyed here, offer as yet a fully satisfactory explanation. The muddled, eclecticist theorizing in recent non-marxist approaches, suggests that future real advances in African migration studies are not likely to come from that direction. One wonders whether structural-functionalism in African Studies will ever recover from the blow it received, sometime in the 1950s-60s, when the truth was brought home that the horizon of African society is not confined to the micro social process of the village. Eminently capable, as this approach has been, of tackling research problems in a local setting, it has

yet failed to produce the comprehensive macro view which is presently required, if we are to come to terms with the migratory phenomenon against the background of the overall transformation of African society. Recent marxist approaches seem to be much more promising, despite considerable theoretical and empirical shortcomings - some of which we have pointed out.

At present, marxist and non-marxist structural analysis approaches to migration are still far apart. Both marxist and structural-functionalists reject the classic push-pull model, but for different reasons: the former because they consider the penetration of capitalism a more fundamental factor underlying the specific push and pull factors; the latter because push-pull models stress the economic dimension at the expense of social, cultural, political and ideological factors. Moreover, marxists reject the urban-rural dichotomy as superficial: for capitalism, as the crucial explaining variable, can also take rural forms. For structural-functional approaches to migration, on the other hand, the urban-rural dichotomy has always been an important analytical tool.

The two variants of structural analysis are still separated by a different conceptual language, by differences in respectability in academic life, and (although to a lesser extent than is commonly taken for granted) by different political views concerning the predicament of African peasants and the urban poor. However, as marxists may be expected to turn to concrete empirical research in order to substantiate and enrich their theories, and as structural-functionalists will discover the riches of marxist theory in terms of synchronic scope and particularly historical depth, it can be hoped that these two approaches, whose fundamental similarities we have stressed above, will grow towards one another, producing, among other possible achievements, a viable social theory of African migration.

REFERENCES CITED

Adams, A., 1977, *Le long voyage des gens du Fleuve*, Paris, Maspero.

Adepoju, A., 1977, Migration, Economic Opportunities and Occupational Mobility: A Case Study in Western State, Nigeria, *Quarterly Journal of Administration, 11* (3): 167-83.

Aghassian, M., 1976, Les migrations en Afrique au sud du Sahara. Bibliographie sélective, in: Amselle, 1976a; 101-18.

Amin, S., ed., 1974, *Modern Migrations in Western Africa*, London, Oxford University Press.

Amselle, J.-L., ed., 1976a, *Les migrations africaines. Réseaux et processus migratoires*, Paris, Maspero.

Amselle, J.-L., 1976b, Aspects et significations du phénomène migratoire en Afrique, in: Amselle 1976a: 9-39.

Arrighi, G., 1973, Labour Supplies in Historical Perspective: A Study of the Proletarianization of the African Peasantry in Rhodesia, in: Arrighi, G., & J. S. Saul, *Essays on the Political Economy of Africa*, New York & London, Monthly Review Press, p. 180-234.

Asiwaju, A. I., 1976, Migrations as Revolt: The Example of the Ivory Coast and the Upper Volta before 1945, *Journal of African History, 17* (4):577-94.

Baldé, M., 1976, Un cas typique de migration inter-africaine: l'immigration des guinéens au Sénégal, in: Amselle 1976a:63-98.

Bates, R. H., 1976, *Rural Responses to Industrialization: A Study of Village Zambia*, New Haven & London, Yale University Press.

Berg, E. J., 1965, The Economics of the Migrant Labor System, in: Kuper 1965:160-81.

Birks, J. S., 1975, Overland Pilgrimage in the Savanna Lands of Africa, in: Kosinski & Prothero 1975:297-307.

Buijtenhuijs, R., 1977, Les Tchadiens au Soudan: Migrations inter-étatiques et protestation politique, paper read at the International Seminar on Migration and Rural Development, Leiden, 1977.

Byerlee, D., J. L. Tommy & H. Fatoo, Rural-Urban Migration in Sierra Leone: Determinants and Policy Implications, *African Rural Economics Paper*, 13, 1976.

Cahiers ORSTOM, 1975, *12* (2), Migrations sénégalaises. La vallée du Sénégal (2).

Christopher, G. C. 1976, Les causes de la migration de la campagne à la ville: le cas de la Côte d'Ivoire, *Cahiers ivoiriens de recherche économique et sociale*, Juin, no. 10, p. 43-71.

Christopher, G. C., 1977, Circulation de la main d'oeuvre et le milieu socio-économique de la zone dense, *Cahiers ivoiriens de recherche économique et sociale*, no. 13, p. 7-51.

Colson, E., 1971, *The Social Consequences of Resettlement. The Impacts of the Kariba Resettlement upon the Gwembe Tonga*, Manchester, Manchester University Press.

Colson, E., & Scudder, T., 1975, New Economic Relationships between the Gwembe Valley and the Line of Rail, in: Parkin 1975a:190-210.

Deane, P., 1953, *Colonial Social Accounting*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

De Jonge, K., ed., forthcoming 1978, *Les migrations au Sénégal et en Gambie*, African Perspectives, Leiden.

Dorjahn, V. R., 1975, Migration in Central Sierra Leone: The Temne Chiefdom of Kolifa Mayoso, *Africa, 45* (1):29-49.

Dubois, J. P., 1975, Les Serer et la question des Terres Neuves au Sénégal, *Cahiers ORSTOM, 12* (1):81-120.

Dupresson, A., 1975, Les travailleurs Soninké et Toucouleur dans l'Ouest parisien, *Cahiers ORSTOM, 12* (2):189-208.

Egero, B., 1974, Migration and Economic Development South of Lake Victoria, *BRALUP Research Paper*, no. 32.

Elkan, W., 1960, *Migrants and Proletarians. Urban Labour in the Economic Development of Uganda*, Oxford University Press, London.

Fiéloux, M., 1976, Les migrations Lobi en Côte d'Ivoire: Archaisme ou création sociale? in: Amselle 1976a:43-61.

Garbett, G. K., 1975, Circulatory Migration in Rhodesia: Towards a Decision Model, in: Parkin 1975a:113-25.

Godfrey, E. M., 1973, Economic Variables and Rural-Urban Migration: Some Thoughts on the Todaro Hypothesis, *Journal of Development Studies, 10* (1):66-78.

Gould, W. T. S., 1974, International Migration in Tropical Africa: A Bibliographical Review, *International Migration Review*, 8:247-365.

Gould, W. T. S., & R. M. Prothero, 1975, Space and Time in African Population Mobility, in: Kosinski & Prothero, 1975:39-49.

Gluckman, M., 1961, Anthropological Problems Arising from the African Industrial Revolution, in: Southall 1961:67-82.

Grossman, D., 1972, The Roots of the Practice of Migratory Tenant Farming: The Case of Nikeland in Eastern Nigeria, *Journal of Developing Areas, 6* (2):163-83.

Gugler, J., 1969, On the Theory of Rural-Urban Migration. The Case of Subsaharan Africa, in: Jackson 1969:134-55.

Gugler, J., 1976, Migrating to Urban Centres of Unemployment in Tropical Africa, in: Richmond and Kubat 1976: 184-204.

Gulliver, P. H., 1955, Labour Migration in a Rural Economy. A Study of the Ngoni and Ndendeuli of Southern Tanzania. *East African Studies*, no. 6, Kampala.

Gutkind, P. C. W., ed., 1970, *The Passing of Tribal Man in Africa*, Leiden, Brill.

Herring, R. S., 1976, The Influence of Climate on the Migrations of the Central and Southern Luo, *Kenya Historical Review 4* (1):35-62.

Hill, P., 1963, *The Migrant Cocoa Farmers of Southern Ghana. A Study in Rural Capitalism*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge,

Jackson, J. A., ed., 1969, *Migration*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Kantor, B. S., & H. F. Kenny, 1976, The Poverty of Neo-Marxism: The Case of South Africa, *Journal of Southern African Studies, 3* (1), :20-31.

Knight, J. B., 1972, Rural-Urban Income Comparisons and Migration in Ghana, *Bulletin of the Oxford Institute of Economics and Statistics, 34* (2):199-228.

Kosinski, L. A., & R. M. Prothero, eds., 1975, *People on the Move. Studies on Internal Migration,* London, Methuen.
Kuper, H., ed., 1965, *Urbanization and Migration in West Africa,* University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles.
Kane, F., & A. Lericollais, 1975, L'Emigration en Pays Soninké, *Cahiers ORSTOM, 12* (2):177-87.
Luxemburg, R., 1967, *L'Accumulation du Capital,* Maspero, édition nouvelle.
Le Bris, E., 1976, Les migrations agricoles internes dans le sud-est du Togo, in: Rey 1976a:139-91.
Mabogunje, A. L., 1972, *Migration Policy and Regional Development in West Africa,* London, McGill Queen's University Press.
Magubane, B., & J. O'Brien, 1972, Migrant Labor in Africa: A Critique of Conventional Wisdom, *Critical Anthropology 2* (2):88.
Magubane, B., 1975, The 'Native Reserves' (Bantustans) and the Role of the Migrant Labor System in the Political Economy of South Africa, in: Safa & Dutoit, 1975: 225-67.
Meillassoux, C., 1975, *Femmes, greniers et capitaux,* Paris, Maspero.
Mitchell, J. C., 1959, The Causes of Labour Migration, *Bulletin of the Inter-African Labour Institute, 6,* p. 12-46.
Moss, R. P., & R. J. Rathbone, eds., 1975, *The Population Factor in African Studies,* Univ. of London Press.
Olofson, H., 1976, Yawon Dandi: A Hausa Category of Migration, *Africa, 46* (1):66-79.
Panoff, M., 1977, Claude Meillassoux et le mode de production domestique, *Revue française de sociologie, 18* (1):133-43.
Parkin, D., ed., 1975a, *Town and Country in Central and Eastern Africa, Studies presented at the Twelfth International African Seminar, Lusaka, Sept. 1972,* London, International African Institute.
Parkin, D., 1975b, Town and Country in Central and Eastern Africa: Introduction, in: Parkin 1975a:3-44.
Prothero, R. M., ed., 1972, *People and Land in Africa South of the Sahara: Readings in Social Geography,* London, Oxford University Press.
Rey, P.-P., 1973, *Les Alliances de classes,* Maspero, Paris.
Rey, P.-P., ed., 1976a, *Capitalisme négrier. La marche des paysans vers le prolétariat.* Paris, Maspero.
Rey, P.-P., 1976b, Les formes de décomposition des sociétés pré-capitalistes dans le Nord-Togo et le mécanisme des migrations vers les zones de capitalisme agraire, in: Rey 1976a:193-209.
Richmond, A. H., & D. Kubat, eds., 1976, *Internal Migration: The New World and the Third World,* Sage Studies in International Sociology, 4, London/Beverly Hills, Sage.
Rocheteau, G., 1975, Pionniers Mourides au Sénégal: Colonisation des Terres Neuves et transformations d'une économie paysanne, *Cahiers ORSTOM, 12* (1):19-53.
Safa, H. I., & B. M. du Toit, eds., 1975, *Migration and Development. Implications for Ethnic Identity and Political Conflict.* World Anthropology, Paris/The Hague, Mouton.
Samuel, M., 1976, Les contradictions internes à la paysannerie continuent à agir au sein de la migration en France, in: Rey 1976a:69-138.
Samuel, M., 1978, *Le prolétariat africain noire en France,* Maspero, Paris.
Skinner, E. P., Labour Migration among the Mossi of the Upper Volta, in: Kuper 1965:60-84.
Southall, A. W., ed., 1961, *Social Change in Modern Africa,* London, Oxford Univ. Press.
Southall, A. W., 1970, The Illusion of Tribe, in: Gutkind 1970:28-50.
Sudarkasa, N., 1974-75, Commercial Migration in West Africa, with special reference to the Yoruba in Ghana, *African Urban Notes,* series b, no. 1:61-103.
Tiffin, M., 1975, Population Movements in the Twentieth Century: A Nigerian Case-Study, in: Moss & Rathbone 1975:24-37.
Todaro, M., 1971, Income Expectations, Rural-Urban Migration and Employment in Africa, *International Labour Review,* 104:387-413.
Uchendu, V. C., 1975, Inter-rural Migration and East African Rural Development, in: Parkin 1975a:165-77.
Udo, R. K., 1975, *Migrant Tenant Farmers of Nigeria: A Geographical Study of Rural Migrants in Nigeria.* Lagos, African University Press.
Van Binsbergen, W. M. J., 1977, Occam, Francis Bacon and the Transformation of Zambian Society, paper read at the International Seminar on Migration and Rural

Development, Leiden, 1977; *Cultures et développement, 9* (3):489-520.
Van Binsbergen, W. M. J., forthcoming, *Ritual, Class and Urban-Rural Relations: The Nkoya of Zambia.*
Van der Klei, J. M., 1978, L'Histoire migratoire d'un village diola (Casamance, Sénégal): Une analyse synchronique et diachronique, paper read at the International Seminar on Migration and Rural Development, Leiden, 1977; in: De Jonge, 1978.
Van Velsen, J., Labour Migration as a Positive Factor in the Continuity of Tonga Tribal Society, in: Southall 1961:230-41.
Wilson, M., 1951, *Good Company: A Study of Nyakyusa Age-Villages,* London, Oxford University Press.
Works, J. A. jr., 1972, *Pilgrims in a Strange Land. The Hausa Communities in Chad,* Wisconsin, University of Wisconsin.
Zehraoui, A., 1976, *Les travailleurs algériens en France. Etude sociologique de quelques aspects de la vie familiale.* Paris, Maspero, nouvelle édition.